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Belonging among diasporic African communities in the UK: Plurilocal homes and simultaneity of place attachments.

Abstract

This paper compares the emotional attachments to place(s) of first and second generation African migrants in the UK. Qualitative studies from the field of migration studies have tended to examine generational cohorts in isolation from one another rather than alongside each other. This paper responds to this research gap by asserting the importance of an intergenerational lens in exploring generational differences and similarities in the shaping of post-migration lives. The practices and expressions of belonging in, and to, places of current residence are arguably of critical importance to the challenge of ‘living together’ in ethno-culturally diverse contexts. Yet it is well established that members of diasporic communities often have complex relationships to their host societies and their feelings of belonging may be stretched and simultaneously ‘here and there’. Scholars often assume that a transnational optic is appropriate for the study of first generation migrants who frequently retain multifarious socio-cultural, economic and political links to their countries of origin, but less suitable for second generation individuals who are assumed to experience stronger emotional attachments and territorialised articulations of belonging to local place-based contexts. This paper troubles such an assumption. Through exploring the emotional attachments to place(s) of first and second generation Zimbabwean, Somali, Sudanese and Kenyan migrants, the paper interprets the emotions associated with senses of belonging through ideas of plurilocal homes and simultaneity of attachments to different places.
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Introduction

People are now living in times that are acutely shaped by the social, political, cultural and economic characteristics of globalisation. As has been widely documented, the movement of people around the world is an important constituent part of these sets of global flows and processes (King, 1995; Vertovec, 2009). Although the migration of people is far from being a new phenomena (e.g. Winder, 2004), the so-called ‘new mobilities paradigm’ of the late 20th and early 21st century (Urry, 2000) has largely resulted from an increased amount and greater diversity of global migration. It is this differentiated growth of migration flows into destination societies that poses new questions and challenges for heterogeneous locales due to multiplicity and difference becoming routinely encountered (Massey, 2005, Simonsen, 2008a). Indeed, Stuart Hall (2000) has argued that the question of how we can ‘live together’ in multicultural societies is a defining one in the first decades of this century. Such concern has led to much literature around the politics and practices of living together in diverse multicultural cities and speculation abounds as to how encounters can enhance understanding of difference, promote harmonious juxtaposed lives and generally be constitutive of ‘good relations’ (Keith, 2005; Simonsen, 2008b; Amin, 2002, 2004, 2006; Valentine, 2008).

Rather than addressing issues of ‘encounters’ between people marked by difference (quite often, although not exclusively, encounters between diasporic groups and non-diasporic groups), this paper focuses on a part of the migration experience that may contribute to the shaping of eventual relations between newcomers and established community members; that of migrants’ complex emotions associated with belonging to different locales. These emotions can be regarded as powerful processes which enable people to situate themselves in the world through meaning and feeling (Svašek, 2008). A focus on belonging has arguably acquired enhanced political salience in contemporary times, as Anthias (2006:17) suggests; “[c]urrent debates around borders, security and social cohesion have reinforced the importance of engaging critically with the notion of belonging and its centrality to people’s lives as well as political practice”. The instrumentalist impulse of policy makers’ current preoccupation with fostering a sense of belonging (for example, by encouraging ascription to a shared unitary national identity through ‘progressive’ policies such as citizenship ceremonies in Canada, USA, Australia and the UK) should not detract from Anthias’ above observation that belonging is also of central importance to people’s sense of their own identities, their multi-positioned subjectivities and often to their very well-being.

So what is meant by ‘belonging’ and is there something about being a migrant or child of a migrant that might shape feelings of belonging in particular ways? Yuval-Davis et al (2006) have argued that belonging revolves around emotional investments and desire for attachments. In the same edited collection Anthias (2006:21) adds that belonging is about the ways in which, “social place has resonances with stability of the self, or with feelings of being part of a larger whole and with the emotional and social bonds that are related to such places”. The emotional aspects of belonging are placed centre-stage by these writers, and similarly Ho (2009:791) draws on the burgeoning area of emotional geographies (Anderson & Smith, 2001; Davidson et al, 2005; Thien, 2005) to suggest that “[b]elonging should thus be examined as an emotionally constructed category”. In focusing on the emotions associated with senses of belonging, these authors argue that belonging can only be fully understood through an appreciation of the felt realm. Feelings of belonging may be powerful or subtle, clear or nuanced, straightforward or complex; but they are unequivocally not accessed and understood only through a set of dispassionate ‘rules’ of citizenship or group membership (e.g. a Kenyan woman being perceived to automatically belong to an African women’s group in the UK; she may or may not feel like she belongs to this group based on the intersection of other positionalities such as class, age, ethnicity, sexuality and so on).

It is often the case that migrants have multi-positioned relationships to different locales on account of their migratory journeys from a source to a destination area, the likely network of social, symbolic and material ties retained to their homelands, and the newer sets of social relations formed in host communities. Migrants are therefore observed to experience simultaneity in their attachment to different places (Wilson and Peters, 2005) as a result of being ‘here and there’ and ‘straddling worlds’ (Gidwani and Sivaramakrishnan, 2003). In recognition of

\footnote{In this paper we are using Svašek’s (2008:218) broad definition of emotions which regards, “emotions as processes in which individuals experience, shape and interpret the world around them, anticipate future action and shape their subjectivities”. It is an approach which acknowledges that emotions are shaped not only by direct social interaction with other people but also by imagination and memories and further by multi-sensorial engagement with non-human objects, images and landscapes.}
these complex sets of relationships across at least two locales and the accompanying heightened emotions experienced (Skrbiš, 2008), it is suggested that diasporic groups embody a, “shifting landscape of belonging and identity” that is, “tied to a globalised and transnational social fabric rather than one bounded by the nation-state form” (Anthias, 2006:25, see also Massey and Jess, 1995). This perspective on fluid belongings is also often closely related to migrants’ articulations and understandings of ‘home’ and the emotional connections that flow from feelings of belonging to particular home(s) (Mallett, 2004; Evans, 2009). Blunt and Dowling (2006) suggest that diasporic groups have complex relations with home which links to Staeheli & Nagel’s (2006:1601) description of home as ‘plurilocal and multiscalar’ for many migrants and their descendents. By this, these writers mean that there is something inherent within mobility and transnationality that leaves migrants very likely to feel home is a variously located place (for example, attachments could be concurrently felt to present residence, the place that close family/kin reside, and country of origin).

Migrants and their descendents as categories are of course differentiated, and both policy-makers and academics often emphasise ‘generations’. Such descriptors are frequently imbued with explanatory significance when investigating migrant lives. Within North American contexts in particular there is debate around generational differences and the nature and definitions of cohort group boundaries (e.g. Warner & Srole, 1945; Orepesa & Landale, 1997). Generations are most commonly associated with the ‘family generation’ whereby generation is seen as succession; a familial generation is defined as the average time between a mother’s first child and this next generation’s first child. Within migration studies, this definition gives rise to different ‘migrant generations’. First generation migrants are defined as people born outside the country to non-host country parents. From there on the definitional clarity of migrant generations becomes somewhat muddied. The second generation is generally defined as children born in the host country of one or more immigrant parents or those who arrived before primary-school age (Thomas & Crul, 2007). Yet a further category has also been discerned; that of the 1.5 or midway generation, to recognise the different experiences of those who arrive after primary school but before later teenage/early adulthood years (after around age 13) which enables them to be somewhat socialised into host country life through educational experiences and youth culture (Rumbaut, 1997).

Explorations of the experiences of second and 1.5 generations has become more commonplace in light of a general discrediting of the classical, linear theory of integration into mainstream society (i.e. the longer a person resides in a host country, the more integrated and unproblematically settled they will become). Both Gans’ (1992) idea of ‘second-generation decline’ and Portes and Zhou’s (1993) theory of ‘segmented assimilation’ indicate this shift in thinking. The suggestion is that downward social mobility may occur for second (and third) generation children of migrants due to racial and ethnic discrimination combined with a narrowing of labour-market opportunities. This work must, however, be balanced by acknowledging research which indicates the variable and differentiated experiences of settlement and integration across racial and ethnic groups.

Alongside this focus on second and 1.5 generation migrants’ lives in countries of residence, there has also been a growing amount of research on the transnational experiences of such groups and how they relate to parental homelands (see for example, Christou & King, 2006; Levitt & Waters, 2002; Smith, 2006; Phillips and Potter, 2009). In a recent paper, Levitt (2009) points out that most scholars assume a transnational optic is suitable to study first generation migrants, but less suitable for second generation migrants. We would agree with Levitt in arguing against this assumption and endorse her suggestion that, “when children are brought up in households that are regularly influenced by people, objects, practices and know-how from their ancestral homes, they are socialised into its norms and values and they learn how to negotiate its institutions.” (Levitt, 2009:1225). This transnational optic for second generations therefore brings into focus the broader role of relations/ship to the homelands of parents, and the impact that these relations have upon how belonging is experienced emotionally. As Thomson & Crul (2007) point out, the character of homeland relations for descendents of migrants may depend on contextual factors such as parental socio-economic status, transmission of cultural knowledge of homelands and pressures on/opportunities

---

2 There is additionally the concept of social or historical generation (Pilcher, 1995; Mannheim, 1952) that veers away from a familial notion of a generation and instead defines a generation as cohorts of people who were born within a certain date range and share general cultural experiences of the world.

3 Writers like Modood (2004) have importantly pointed out that not all ethnic minority children/second and third generation individuals are reacting to racial discrimination in the same way; for example in the case of the UK British-Indian pupils often out-perform comparative cohort groups of ethnic minority children.
The overall aim of this paper is to question the assumption that a transnational optic is more appropriate for the study of first generation migrants - who frequently retain multifarious socio-cultural, economic and political links to their countries of origin - but less suitable for second generation individuals, who are assumed to experience stronger emotional attachments and territorialised articulations of belonging to local place-based contexts. As such, the paper’s contribution is first, to extend nascent efforts to explore belonging as emotionally constructed and second, to overcome the tendency of migration studies to examine generational cohorts in isolation from one another through looking at two generations alongside one another. In this way the paper responds to recent geographical literature calling for an intergenerational lens to consider age relationally (Vanderbeck, 2007; Hopkins and Pain, 2007) to enable the exploration of generational identifications, cultural values and transnational ties (e.g. Hopkins, 2006; Conradson and McKay, 2007; McGregor, 2008; Evans, 2009). Through examining the attachments to place(s) of first and second generation Zimbabwean, Somali, Sudanese and Kenyan migrants, this paper focuses on generational difference and sameness of emotional belongings. The paper is structured into two main sections. The first explores emotional belongings among first generation African migrants in the UK, and the second compares these experiences to senses of belonging for their children. Before moving on to the empirical sections, an outline of the study on which this paper draws together with a brief contextualisation of Zimbabwean, Somali, Sudanese and Kenyan communities in the UK are required.

**Contextualisation and study outline**

This paper draws upon findings from a research project that explored the experiences of African migrants living in the Yorkshire and Humber region of northern England; the location was chosen due to the relative paucity of studies of African migrants in this region in comparison to other metropolitan areas. Participants in the study were from four African communities; Sudanese, Somali, Kenyan and Zimbabwean. Interviews and focus groups were conducted during 2008/9. The project carried out 40 biographical interviews within 20 families of African origin living in Yorkshire & Humber (one parent and one child generation interview in each family). Biographical methods have been shown to be valuable in capturing lived experiences and personal accounts of human agency (Chamberlayne et al., 2000), especially within the context of migration (Nazroo et al., 2004). The biographical interviews broadly investigated migration histories, processes of settlement and participation in new communities, all through an intergenerational lens. Part of the interviews specifically asked about attachments to place(s) and senses of belonging felt by migrants (for example, questions around participants’ feelings of home and arenas in which they feel they do and do not belong); the emotional aspects of these sentiments weren’t pointedly investigated but rather emerged out of the discussions of belonging and place attachments. Seven focus groups were also conducted.

---

4 These four African communities were selected due to their countries of origin being former British colonies or protectorates and their numbers and settlement patterns within the region. Although other identities cut across ‘national’ identities (and will be highlighted where relevant in this paper); these particular African countries were selected on the basis of a shared colonial history and in order to explore the salience of ethnic, religious, national, regional and pan-African identifications and feelings of belonging.

5 Participants were recruited through snowballing from key informants, African community groups in the region and existing knowledge of the communities through the investigators’ previous research. Participants were told that the broad purpose of the study was to explore how families experience migration and settlement in a new country and how their attachments to place and senses of belonging frame their everyday lives. The first generation comprised 8 fathers and 12 mothers; the second generation comprised 11 sons and 9 daughters. The younger ages of the second generation meant that interviews tended to be shorter than with the chattier first generation; hence there are more quotes from the first generation in this paper. The educational background of the first generation broadly reflects the official statistics on African migration which show that there is a high propensity for migrants to be educated to degree level and or to hold professional qualifications (Census 2001). The study had certain criteria for selecting the second generation participants within each family. First, there were age and length of residence criteria; participants had to be aged 16 and over and resident in the UK for 5 years or more. These criteria were applied to ensure that the sample could reflect on experiences of living in the UK and experiences of work and integration post-school age. This narrowed down the interview possibilities in each family. Second, the study focused on representing both genders which affected selection within each family.
within the four communities, organised by gender and age where appropriate. All of the participants in this study have lived in Britain for at least five years, with the longest period of residence being 40 years. The parental generation ranges from ages 40-60s, with the child generation ranging from late teens to 30s. The families in this study span a range of migration paths (migrant workers, students, family joiners, refugees, EU citizens).

The communities involved in this study were selected based upon a mixture of criteria; population size, faith, migration pathway and history within the region. There are shortfalls in official statistics on African migration in the UK, with actual numbers being higher than official figures would suggest and data for some communities, such as Sudanese, being imprecise. The history of Zimbabwean migration to the UK is long standing and accelerated in early 2000 due to socio-economic conditions in Zimbabwe under the Mugabe regime. The 2001 census recorded 49,303 Zimbabweans in the UK with 1,996 residing in the Yorkshire & Humber region (Census 2001). However, research attempting to more precisely map the Zimbabwean population found that community leaders estimated there are between 200,000 and 500,000 Zimbabweans in UK, around 30,000 of whom reside in cities in the Yorkshire & Humber region (IOM 2006a:15). The earlier arriving families in this study migrated for employment and to study whereas the later arriving families have come under the asylum route as a result of socio-economic policies in Zimbabwe post-2000.

The UK is perhaps the oldest Western destination of Sudanese migration. Those who came to the UK up to the late 1980s were mostly professionals, business people or students. Following the 'coup d’état of General Omer Al-Bashir in June 1989, both the nature and magnitude of Sudanese migration to the UK have changed dramatically. A great number of Sudanese arriving in the UK since 1989 have sought asylum due to the worsening political situation and the continuing civil strife and conflicts in Sudan, and those who arrived pre-1989 found they were unable to return. The Sudanese community were selected for two reasons; although official statistics are unavailable on the Sudanese population, they are estimated to be a relatively small national migrant population (approximately 21,000; IOM 2006b:14) but with significant numbers in Yorkshire and Humber where there is a clustering of families from Northern and Western Sudan (Leeds City Council 2005; IOM 2006b). The Sudanese community was also chosen because the population contains both Muslim and Christian faiths; we wanted to increase the diversity of participants in terms of the representation of different faiths.

Kenyan migration also has a long standing history in the UK; originally this population in the UK contained mostly students but due to unrest in Kenya post-1980 more families moved for employment and settled in the UK (IOM 2006c:12). Census (2001) figures on Kenyans are relatively high with 129,356 being recorded in the UK and 3,333 located in the Yorkshire & Humber region. Leeds, Bradford and Sheffield are key destinations for Kenyan communities in the region. The history of Somali migration is also long standing (Somali seamen came to work in the British Merchant Navy from the early 20th century) with a high occurrence of three generation families in the region. This population constitutes the majority of Muslim families in this sample and was also chosen for its diverse migration paths. Somalis originally moved for employment (industrial work in the 1950s/60s), followed by increasing numbers coming as refugees from the 1990s onwards (due to civil war) to more recent waves of secondary migration from other EU countries that have swelled numbers over the last 10 years. Official figures for the Somali population estimate 43,515 nationally, with 1,497 living in the Yorkshire & Humber region (Census 2001). These figures, however, are regarded as an underestimation given the large number of Somalis known to be residing in cities in the region, particularly Sheffield (the IOM (2006d:20) estimates numbers of Somalis in Sheffield alone to be 10,000).

---

6 The number of focus group participants ranged from 6 to 14 individuals; participants were mostly from different families to those involved in the interviews but there were a couple of participants in each focus group who were also interviewed. The data is referenced in square brackets in this paper to indicate nationality, gender and generation; this is to retain the anonymity of the respondent. In the quotes the abbreviation R refers to ‘respondent’ and I to ‘interviewer’, and three square bracketed ellipsis dots are used to indicate that a few words have been edited to remove repetitions or to clarify the meanings of confused speech.

7 Inaccuracy of census numbers is well documented, with high numbers of unrecorded migrants due to movement post-2000, the hidden and unregistered nature of some migrant communities, and issues around the way that census data is gathered. In contrast the International Organisation for Migration figures use community resources to map numbers and location of migrant communities; which is also acknowledged not to be 100% reliable.
Exploring the emotional belongings of first generation African migrants

The lives of first generation migrants involved in this UK study are patterned and shaped by persistent and ongoing social relations with their countries of origin. McGregor’s (2008) study of Zimbabwean professionals in the UK points to the importance of the presence, or not, of parents’ children in Britain as it is argued that this has a crucial bearing on parents’ identity and belonging and on the nature of transnational flows to the homeland. Participants in this study all have their children with them in the UK which influences the extent of embeddedness in Britain (see later) but does not necessarily erode experiences of transnationality. ‘Being a transnational’ for participants in this study gives rise to notions of ‘straddling lives’ and sentiments of being emplaced both ‘here’ and ‘there’ simultaneously (Portes et al, 1999; Faist, 2000). Some of the respondents described such experiences as ‘inbetween-ness’ and their feelings of belonging subsequently emerge as ‘stretched’:

“[B]ecause merely being here and working here, living here – I'm British, but still I have very strong feelings that I belong there [Kenya] ... I belong there, so I'm, I'm between ...” [Kenyan, father]

Such emotional attachment to distant places invokes ideas of ‘plurilocal homes’. This term refers to the suggestion that home is a multi-placed material and metaphorical space that is further likely to be multiscalar; as Staeheli & Nagel (2006:1603) say, “[T]ransnationalism allows people to forge a sense of belonging and home that is not tied to any single place, but, rather, constructed through connections between ‘here’ and ‘there’”. An idea of home as unbounded resonates with first generation migrants in this study (and also many second generation migrants; as will be explored in the next section) as they often maintain various kinds of ties to homelands at the same time as becoming embedded (in varying degrees) to homes in the UK:

Home for me is here. Except I can see the possibility of moving to Sudan and having a home there also. But really I’ve got two homes. [Sudanese, father]

I feel like I’m in both worlds. To some extent I feel, yes I am an African woman. I know my culture. I love my culture. I'm proud of my culture. But at the same time I’m also British. Because for me adopting the British culture was just an extension of what it was for me in Kenya, only a bit more. So I’ve got, I’m both. When I go to Kenya I fit in. When I’m over here I’m all right, I’m OK. So yes I’m both. I’m lucky I’ve got two homes. [Kenyan, mother]

The latter quote can also be viewed through a lens of postcoloniality for the respondent recognises the British influence in Kenya during her formative years and hence insertion into the British nation-state felt somewhat familiar. Experiences of postcoloniality may influence the ability to straddle cultures; indeed postcolonial approaches urge recognition of the ways that connections between the past and present shape contemporary cultures (McEwan, 2009) and, we might add, emotionally inflected landscapes of belonging. The way that cultural contexts imprint on individuals’ senses of self is illustrated by this respondent’s description of themselves as a ‘citizen of the world’ who is resistant to being pigeon-holed:

I don’t put myself in a small docket, I like to think of myself as a citizen of the world who, a person from mostly Kenya, Beirut and Britain and everything else you know but in that order because that’s the way I gauge the world, I gauge the world from my cultural upbringing you know. That’s why I’m the product of my culture. [Kenyan, mother]

In such ways, mobility can be seen to clearly shape feelings of belonging. The described ‘inbetween-ness’ that results from social life taking place across borders can lead to first generation migrants describing feelings of transiency; “I say maybe transiency, I feel in between. It’s half way through” [Kenyan, mother]. These feelings are sometimes related to acknowledgements that identities are similarly complicated and non-unitary through relations with countries of origin; “my identity is half way” [Zimbabwean, father]. The very nature of being ‘a transnational’, for both first and second generation migrants, increases the likelihood of experiencing multiple identities or ‘translocal

---

8 A related area of research, beyond the remit of this paper, is the ‘emotional labour’ and material demands of maintaining transnational ties across space to family/kin members ‘back home’ (see for example, Conradson & McKay, 2007; Ryan, 2008, Evans, 2009).
subjectivities’ (Conradson and McKay, 2007) as a consequence of living in fluid social spaces and distanced places (Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004; Pries, 2005). Some of the first generation migrants in this study thus perceived their identities in a tiered or layered manner:

Kenyan, then African. Then British if you want. In that order. [Kenyan, mother]

R: Being Somali, that’s who you are, that’s really what you are - Somali. Well then certainly in some way I have grown in somewhere is different. Somali is, that’s where you come from. [...] Being British and living here it’s different thing. Well if you see, my life, I think it belongs to more England than Somalia. I think that that’s important to me because my children are English.
I: Yeah, so it’s layers of identity?
R: Yes it is. [Somali, father]

The two previous respondents both felt their country of origin is core to how they perceive their identity, but they also felt this to be layered alongside a sense of a British or English identity. Such a hybridized sense of identity for this Kenyan woman was more assertively tied to a notion that her tribal identity is her primary association and one that she feels very strongly:

I feel I’m a Masai. Yes I’m British now but I call myself Masai/British. It will always be that. A Masai/British. I can’t say British/Masai. No Masai/British. It will always stay that. I am strongly in those lines. [...] I was brought up Masai race. Some element of the Masai I don’t like but majority I do like. We’ve always strongly maintained our culture. Nature and the relationship between the animals and the community. I feel that is me. So that is my identity really. Even though I am naturalised and become British it doesn’t take away my heart as a Masai. [Kenyan, mother]

A member of the Zimbabwean female focus group suggested that tribal identities may remain or even become more salient for particularly first, and not second, generation migrants in host countries as they make efforts to preserve their country of origin identities; “I think you want to hold on to all of your identity once you move away from it. I think that is one of the reasons” [Zimbabwean, mother]. Sentiments of a core or deep primary identity, be it ethnic, racial, national or supra-national, were mentioned by several first generation migrants in this study and were accordingly related to senses of belonging:

My race you can say I’m from Africa. I am still African although I’ve got a British passport. [Sudanese, father]

Zimbabwean, that will never change. I mean I can get my citizenship but the truth remains. [...] I’m Zimbabwean. [Zimbabwean, father]

These quotes show that long-distance nationalism of various sorts mark public diasporic associational life in important ways for first generation participants in this study; for the second generation these identifications are present but often less intensively experienced (see next section). Like the Zimbabwes in McGregor’s (2008) study, first generation participants in this research identify themselves variously in ethnic, national and pan-African terms. A sense of belonging to an ‘African diaspora’ (Akyeampong, 2000; Koser, 2003), however, was invoked less frequently than ethnic or national group identities. The exception to this was when parents marshalled a sense of ‘African-ness’ to favourably compare ‘African values’ of respect for parents/authority figures to negative lax discipline that was seen to pervade British schools.

Many of the first generation participants in this study spoke emotively (often through discourses of ‘love’) of the importance of their national and occasionally supra-national identities, in similar ways to the above, yet also discussed the need to feel some form of identification with Britain in order to feel like they belonged to their local spaces. The daughter of a Kenyan first generation migrant explained how her mother had changed since she had been in the UK in order to ‘fit in’, and this respondent described making certain efforts with work colleagues in order to mix with people and try to integrate and be recognised by a wider community of practice⁹:

---

⁹ McGregor (2008) also notes that having children in the UK can deepen senses of embeddedness in Britain due to enhanced practical encounters with structures of British society that result from bringing up children.
They are just work colleagues. Even when I join them it’s because you want some kind of identification, not that I really enjoy going out with them. So it will be something like somebody is going to a new job or retiring, or hen nights. You kind of join them because you want some kind of identification. You don’t want to look like you disapprove of everything. [Kenyan, mother]

Another respondent in the Kenyan focus group stated that; “I’d like to think that I’m a Kenyan by blood but I live in England and live that British life [...] I’ve already integrated in my community and become active” [Kenyan, mother], thereby suggesting that she feels her sense of belonging to Kenya emotively (‘by blood’) yet views her ability to feel simultaneous belonging to Britain as socially enabling for her everyday life. The sentiments of one particular Kenyan woman shed a different light on this issue of multiple identities in that particular elements of identity may be enacted and/or performed to differing degrees in various spatio-temporal contexts. Through the quote below, we can see how this particular Kenyan woman is appearing to subsume the African part of her identity:

I’m African on the outside. On the outside, but on the inside I’m white. Most Africans - all they eat in their houses is African food. All the places they will go to are the places where there are other Africans. Anything else they do it has to be African. I’m the opposite. When I came in 2002 I was the only black person in [place name]. Everybody was asking me, aren’t you finding that odd. I’m telling them, no I’m actually in my element. I love it. I love it because to me that is the world. It’s the way of life that I want. I don’t see why I should put myself in the box. Yes I’m African, I know I’m African. I don’t need to prove it to nobody. [...] Africans want to go to where there are only Africans. I will avoid all the Africans like the plague. [Kenyan, mother]

The above respondent talks of her identity in ways that reveal notions of ‘disidentification’ from her black African identity. Although this is similar to Valentine and Sporton’s (2009:739) finding that many young Somalis in the UK disavow the identity ‘black’ as “just skin colour – an external veneer – rather than an emotional (inside) attachment”; we deepen such analysis through exploring why such disidentification appears to be occurring. Context and migration pathway is all important, and in this particular respondent’s case, it seems that her drawn-out refugee acceptance has left her more attuned to neo-assimilationist British policies that project a particular set of national values and associated ‘acceptable’ identities (see Kofman, 2005). As such, she appears to be absorbing the implicit message that whiteness, and not blackness, should be at the core of ‘Britishness’. Observing the above narrative should not of course be taken to imply that this respondent’s ‘Africanism’ is persistently disavowed – indeed Valentine and Sporton (2009:736) remind us that, “particular subject positions may become salient or irrelevant in particular spaces”. In this way, and demonstrating very different outcomes to the above respondent due to less traumatic migration pathways (and relative socio-economic advantage in the case of the second respondent that allows regular trips back to Kenya), these first generation migrants below describe de-emphasising the British element of their identities to the powerful emotional attachment to, and ‘love’ for, their country of origin:

I am Sudanese. [...] Singing in your own dialogue. You can’t pretend you are British. [Sudanese, mother]

I really don’t see myself as being British at all and I have lived in Britain for 6 years but I really strongly don’t see myself as British. I mean you can live here and stuff but you can never really be fitting in, and you’ll always be reminded that. I don’t know, maybe it’s just because I’m fiercely nationalistic. All my friends they speak Swahili 24 hours a day, I’m listening to Kenyan music 24 hours a day, everything I do in my life is somehow related to Kenya in one way or the other. I’m always thinking of going back to Kenya, I always have daydreams of what I’m gonna do when I go back to Kenya so I’m hanging up on Kenya. I’m in love with Kenya and I don’t see that changing so when people ask me where I’m from I’ll gladly say Kenya. While I’m here even if I’ve got a British passport and people ask me what I am I’d say I’m still a Kenyan because that’s who I am, I am a product of where I’m from, I’m Kenyan. [Kenyan, father]

Such passionate and emotionally inflected narratives that promote country of origin identities may be partly in opposition to the increasingly assimilationist overtones of British integration and citizenship policies (Blunkett, 2003; Home Office, 2002, 2008). Ehrkamp (2006) finds in Germany that Turkish migrants feel ‘cynical and resistant’
towards expectations of assimilation and it seems that first generation migrants in this study who feel relatively secure in their immigration statuses, such as the above respondents, reject the expectation of a unitary host country identity. Far more than second generation Africans in this research, the below first generation respondents feel that their ‘true’ home is their country of origin and they are more likely to invoke national (and sometimes pan-African) identities as they dream of returning to their native lands at some point in the future (see also Basu, 2005; McGregor, 2008):

*It is really home here [UK]? Probably it will never be. I will say Africa or Somaliland, yes, as home. That’s why I say before east and west, home’s the best. Yes, wherever you go you feel it’s temporary, it’s temporary.*

[Somali, father]

*Kenya is my home, I tell people I will go back. I know it will be quite difficult especially when the kids are here. Because the family is settled. But I would like to go back. Go back where my parents are there, to be near them. I miss my mum.* [Kenyan, mother]

Aside from this dreamt of desire to permanently return at some point in the future, Fortier (2000) frames the importance of homeland visits for diasporic groups in terms of them being performative acts of belonging. Such valued opportunities for co-presence with family/kin (Baldassar, 2008) alongside identity reinforcing outcomes of country of origin visits were discussed among the respondents of this study, but also mentioned were the confounding heightened emotional encounters that both first and second generation migrants experience upon travelling back to their homelands. The intense emotional confusion and dislocation of the second generation will be explored shortly, but the first generation focus here on feelings of sadness

*When I think of the two lives, when I go home to Africa I feel very sad, I don’t feel as comfortable as at home [UK home], I feel very sad because all my friends have either died, or grown old, or moved away. I don’t see all my friends where I used to play. I don’t see them anymore. Either they die or move, whatever or grown old as well. Every time I go they say so and so, or so and so’s daughter - but I don’t recognise people any more. I feel very sad. What do you think about, are you going home? I say, yes I’m going home. But you are home. No I don’t feel that now.* [Somali, mother]

*That’s what happened to my mum, last summer she went back to Somalia because her children they got married and she said, I’m going back there to have my life. After nine months she came back. She didn’t have any friends she used to have, she found it difficult to stay and she came back here.* [Somali, daughter]

As illustrated in the above quotes, some of these feelings of non-belonging in countries of origin are related to the time that has elapsed since respondents permanently resided in their homelands. This is linked to a growing unfamiliarity with ‘the system’ and a reluctant acknowledgement that at least they are now familiar with British systems and ways of life:

*Because here [UK] I know my way. I can do all the things and whatever. But in Sudan I need to ask people everything, because I don’t know the system there now. I have lived here for a long time.* [Sudanese, mother]

It is important to mention, however, that several first generation migrants in this study expressed feelings of non-belonging and exclusion not only to countries of origin, but also to Britain. As Svašek (2008) suggests; feelings of non-belonging are not of course restricted to migrants, yet there is often something in the journeying of transnational migrants that leaves them more likely to experience feelings of homelessness/loss and hence non-belongings from local contexts. Such non-belonging may be linked to not being allowed to belong due to persistent messages of exclusion, or not desiring to subscribe to a discourse of British belonging that is perceived not to resonate with subjective belongings, or a combination of both. It must be noted that feelings of belonging may not be dictated entirely by the individual claiming to belong; but also influenced by that claim of belonging being recognised or legitimated by a wider community; as Anthias (2006:19) says, “[T]o belong is to be accepted as part of a community” (our emphasis). These respondents elaborate:

*R: We do feel fairly foreign. We don’t feel like we belong.
I: Are you made to feel foreign by people here?
It is important to emphasise the salience of citizenship and immigration statuses for the shaping of inclusion/exclusion experiences and related emotional attachments to place. Britain has constructed a vast edifice of civic stratification (Kofman 2002, Morris 2002) which streams migrants into specific categories and awards differential rights and contingent access to citizenship. A particularly vulnerable group are asylum seekers and refugees (Dwyer, 2005; Brown, 2008) and participants in this study who came to Britain under this migration pathway tended to feel more social exclusion than first generation migrants who came as economic migrants or family joiners. Yet it would be misleading to suggest that such experiences within landscapes of immigration restrictionism were only manifest in the lives of first generation asylum seekers and refugees; sadly exclusion was encountered in some guise by most first generation participants in this study and various feelings of non-belonging emerged. In comparison, the second generations in this study tended to experience more specific racial and/or religious discrimination. The arenas in which prejudice was encountered by first generation migrants crossed employment spheres, educational places and everyday neighbourhood spaces. The perceived ‘reasons’ for discrimination covered structural inequalities as a consequence of citizenship and immigration statuses, skin colour, religious association and more general feelings of being identified as the ‘other’ with the associated presumption of non-belonging. Particular feelings of exclusion were reported by Muslim participants in this research to be a result of Islamophobia and the damaging effects of religious intolerance since the 9/11 attacks in the U.S. and the 7/7 London bombings.

In summary, this section has shown that first generation Africans in northern England feel a variety of emotions through their experiences of plurilocal homes and simultaneity of attachments to different places. Many feel very strong emotional attachments to their homelands which are expressed in discourses of love; influenced by nostalgic memories of living in homelands, dreamt of and actual return to places of birth, and the circulation of material and emotional ties with family/kin in countries of origin through transnational networks. Alongside this, participants express pragmatic and less emotionally-infused belongings to the local places in which they now reside; sometimes deepened through length of time resident in Britain and often combined with enhanced embededness through the raising of children in local spaces. However this only represents a partial picture as first generation African migrants also reveal a range of more negative emotions such as distress and sadness that emanate from feelings of non-belonging in local contexts due to the habitual encountering of prejudice and discrimination. The following section moves on to explore the second generation’s attachments to places in order to further identify differences and similarities from the parental generation.

The persistent transnationality of second generation Africans

The above section of the paper has revealed that a transnational optic is illuminating when exploring the ways in which first generation migrants negotiate, and emplace themselves within, the different spatio-temporal contexts from which their belongings emerge. This portion of the paper demonstrates that a transnational optic is also a valuable lens through which to explore the emotional belongings of second generations; groups who are less readily thought to be shaped by transnationality due to the presumption of stronger emotional attachments and territorialised articulations of belonging to local place-based contexts. An arguable trope of much literature exploring second generation lives (e.g. Alba & Nee, 2003; Kasinitz et al, 2004; Kasinitz et al, 2008) is that these groups engage with their ancestral homes to a much lesser degree than their parents, that they feel more rooted to their country of

---

10 Sveinsson’s (2010) UK study involving 11 small-scale community studies found that most migrants experienced widespread prejudice and discrimination through deskilling, exploitation and unequal treatment in the labour market.
residence rather than their parents’ country, and that they are subsequently able to claim stronger host country identities with associated feelings of belonging to the nation. Such a narrative is borne out by some of the second generation individuals in our study and parents’ descriptions of their children:

We love it here so much because we are used to it. We have been here more than we have been back there [ancestral country]. We are not attached to it. But if we leave here we are going to be so attached to it because our life has been here, we have so many memories. So many good memories. If we leave and go some place else we’ll be like, no. We are English, Yorkshire. [Somali, daughter]

I feel home is [British city name], that’s where I feel home is. [Somali, daughter]

I remember Chico had a project at school and he came home and he said ‘oh mum I’m sorry I had to use an example from your country’. What? That’s really good. And, I’m like, so why are you sorry? He said ‘oh because it’s, it’s not really my country’. [Sudanese, mother]

However, a far more dominant discourse in the narratives of the second generation in this study was not the invocation of ‘host country as home’, as focused upon in the literature above, but rather a more nuanced articulation of multiple identities and straddling belongings; as also evidenced among the first generation. Such sentiments emerged in recognition of the social realities for many second generation individuals being shaped by transnational social fields that leave them exposed to ideas, practices, people and goods from their parents’ countries of origin. The forms of exposure may not be as direct or intensely experienced as for first generation migrants, but the circulation of ancestral homeland cultural repertoires in the everyday lives of second generations often complicate notions of unitary belongings to the host country:

I would definitely say a mixture of Kenyan and British. Identifying very much with both. Stuff that is embedded in me from back home. Stuff I’ve picked up. A mixture of both. [Somali, son]

Really personally I don’t feel that I am 100% Sudanese or British. I don’t feel I can say I’m 100% either. If you asked me where I am from I would say Sudan. But then again I don’t feel that I’ve grown up there. I don’t know much of the culture there. I can’t say that I’m from Sudan. But if you ask me if I’m British, well I’ve grown up here, I live here, my life is here. At the same time I don’t originate from here. I don’t feel I can say I’m British. [Sudanese, son]

Well I’m British but I know that I’m Somali. My parents have brought me up to identify with my tribe as well, so I know what my tribe is. I know all the details of where I am from. They [parents] wanted to go back [to country of origin] and they made us understand that that is where we are from and that’s where we belonged. When I fill in forms I always put I’m British or Black/British, Black/African, whatever the box says. I always tick it. I know a lot of people don’t like to tick it but I don’t have a problem being Somali and being British. I’m both. [Somali, daughter]

These descriptions of dual or mixed identities among second generation African young people are not dissimilar to the hybrid identities articulated by the first generations in this study (described in the previous section). Ancestral homeland identities and emotional belongings may not be as deep-seated or passionately invoked by the children of migrants (and homeland identities are more likely to be presented by the second generation as national or ethnic rather than pan-African), but this study presents a picture of, “indirect, almost-by-osmosis membership in the homeland community” (Levitt, 2009:1226) as a consequence of the second generation being raised in transnational social spaces often characterised by proactive cultural transmission. It has further been noted that migrant families in particular may be characterised by greater ‘age-integration’ (Riley and Riley, 2000) and closer intergenerational relations due to strong patterns of cultural transmission and reproduction within transnational families (McGregor, 2008)\(^1\). Such exposure brings descriptions of the second generation’s plurilocal homes and also, as the second quote below shows, being embedded among and drawing upon emotive country of origin identifiers:

\(^1\) However, intergenerational tension may also occur in transnational families due to parents’ promotion of country of origin ‘ways of doing/being’ potentially conflicting with those from the host society that heavily influence the second generation, particularly in their formative years.
My home is in my heart. Really my home at the moment is just here. Obviously I can go back to Africa as well. I don’t think I could stay there. I could live with family and visit my grandparents and everyone else. So that is also home. So home is really everywhere. [Zimbabwean, daughter]

I think once people get to know me they realise how much I really do love Kenya. I think it comes out in a lot of things I do and say. Every summer I’ll go down to London to watch the Kenyan rugby team. I’ve got a Kenyan flag in my bedroom. I’ve got Kenyan music everywhere. Kenyan videos. Kenyan food in my fridge. So I think people, once they get to know me, know he is Kenyan. [Kenyan, son]

Such emplacement in transnational social fields gives the children of migrants potential sources of power, information and support that they can deploy in different arenas and at different times; for example, to enable economic or social mobility in their parents’ countries of origin, to pursue kin-based strategies for occupational mobility in host countries, or to facilitate marriage. The above described de-territorialised notions of belonging for the second generations can, on the one hand, be viewed positively as sets of ‘opportunities’ that emerge from diasporic landscapes. Illustrating this perspective are the words of a Somali woman in our study who was reflecting on her children’s perspectives and said, “they think it is wonderful to have two countries, two cultures. They get excited” [Somali, mother] and also a Sudanese young man who described the ‘usefulness’ of his mutable identity in terms of how he wished to project himself in different spaces and at different times. However, there is another side of the coin to the one that evokes a celebratory imagining of migrants full of postmodern potential (Smith & Guarnizo, 1998; Hardt & Negri, 2004); and that is the side where multiple identities and stretched belongings may lead to ‘confused’ emotions in second generation young people:

R1: I’m a very confused child actually. I was born in Ethiopia, I was raised up in Holland and I now live in England and I am Somali […] I think I’m just a Somali but now a British citizen but I was once a Dutch citizen who just happens to be born in Ethiopia. [Somali, daughter]

R2: Yeah, you’re constantly running, you’re trying to adapt to cultural living and trying to find your identity in life, what is your identity, Somali or British and you’re dicing with that you know and trying to fit into all these labels that are jam packed into your head […] There’s always so much conflict in one’s head, like trying to find all these things and you’re running because I run and just not stopping and you keep running. [Somali, son]

Such identity ‘confusion’ was more notable among the second generation than the first generation in this study, most probably due to the young migrants’ immersion in the host country social milieu for a relatively longer period of time in their lives (and during formative years) alongside country of origin influences. Homeland visits can further be seen as a crucial part of second generations’ transnational landscapes that may contribute to this notion of ‘confused’ emotions. The work of writers like Fortier (2000), Baldassar (2001) and Mason (2004) suggest that it is not only among first generation migrants that homeland visits are elevated to journeys of great significance through which identities and senses of belonging are refracted (see also, Pratt, 2003; Sugg, 2003). Homeland visits are of equal importance to the children of first generation migrants in terms of potentially ‘discovering one’s roots’ and exploring and/or fixing senses of belonging and identities. These journeys are central to the transnational social fields of second generations already noted, but they are also often acknowledged by respondents in this study to be potentially destabilising emotional experiences that can shake senses of ‘self’. Such negative emotions are less frequently explored by the above mentioned writers:

A lot of people like find it hard going back and don’t go back ‘cos when you go back there you’re trying to fit yourself up like to be a Somali and then it confuses you, and when you come back here you’re trying to fit into this society so it confuses you more. So I think it’s better like to stay just in one country. [Somali, son]

---

12 Although not the focus of this paper, Evans (2009) also discusses the cultural importance of caring for sick or disabled family members within African families; an ‘emotional labour’ responsibility that may fall upon the shoulders of second generation migrants.
The tag of ‘fish and chips’ to refer to a non-Somali born Somali living in the UK indicates processes of labelling and hints at how this might iterate with articulations of emotional belonging. The idea of imposed, and possibly embraced, identity labels is closely linked to suggestions that belonging is always in the end defined by non-belonging. Indeed, Crowley (1999) says the dirty work of boundary maintenance around who belongs/doesn’t belong is integral to processes and emergent feelings of belonging. It is likely to be because of the above described difficulties associated with the juggling of multiple identities in different time-space contexts (some claimed, some imposed) that several members of the Somali second generation in this study described feeling more comfortable with claiming a relatively straightforward Muslim identity; “[T]he first way I’d identify myself as a Muslim because that’s the most important thing to me, I’m a Muslim and that’s first and foremost” [Somali, daughter]. This is linked to a related issue of a disinclination to claim the identity ‘British’ by some of our respondents because of their skin colour (Gilroy, 1987); “But to be honest, if I say I’m British, well I’m black, so I can’t be British” [Sudanese, son]. An Islamic identity is therefore claimed by some of the Muslim second generation participants in this study in preference to racial, ethnic or national identities (see also McGown, 1999).

Policy makers fear that stretched feelings of belonging and distanced senses of place-attachment among diasporic groups, as found in this study, will necessarily compromise the ability to feel strong senses of belonging to Britain (Werbner, 2002). Yet the findings of this research question the assumption that transnational ties weaken a sense of belonging to Britain (see also Hickman et al, 2008). The same could be said from our research of multiple identities and an asserted Muslim subject position – such translocal subjectivities allow attachments to place-based communities in the UK even if there is an active problematisation of prescribed cultural membership of ‘Britishness’. Indeed, Staeheli & Nagel (2006:1612) found in a US context that the, “multivalent nature of home – incorporating material and metaphorical spaces – did not weaken attachment to the United States for many respondents. Rather, it seemed as though the multiple locations of home in some ways enriched respondents’ sense of Americanness.” Some second generation respondents in this research are clearly struggling at a personal identity level with their stretched and straddling attachments and some feel excluded from hegemonic and top-down discourses of ‘Britishness’ (i.e. an identity perceived by some to be refracted primarily through ‘whiteness’), but we found little evidence of these processes manifesting into feelings of alienation from their own general and variously articulated senses of ‘Britishness’. Stretched and plurilocal attachments were seen by most second generation respondents as being entirely reconcilable and compatible with notions of simultaneous belonging to Britain. The second generation are therefore creating complex practices of their own that negotiate the emotions associated with belonging to both homelands and host-country local places.

In sum this section has shown that second generation African migrants in northern England, similarly to first generations, experience plurilocal homes, stretched attachments and multiple identities. Yet the way in which second generations emotionally encounter such experiences vary in character and intensity from first generations. Some second generation Africans articulate emotions of comfort within, and strategic usefulness of, their countries of origin that are acquired through occasional homeland visits and immersion in transnational social fields. A significant number of our sample, however, felt their homeland encounters left them feeling confused and dislocated alongside the ongoing negotiation of complex insider/outsider belongings in multicultural Britain. Such contested belongings were suggested to sometimes leave second generation Africans feeling alienated from imposed notions of Britishness, yet able to take comfort from, and be confident in, their own more locally oriented belongings that may valorise particular elements of their identity (e.g. religious identifications).

Conclusion

In this article we have focused on the emotional attachments to place(s) of first and second generation African migrants in the UK. In doing so, we have contributed to nascent efforts to explore belonging as emotionally constructed and also to overcome the tendency of qualitative migration studies to examine generational cohorts in isolation from one another rather than alongside each other. This paper revolves around an assertion of the importance of an intergenerational lens (Vanderbeck, 2007; Hopkins and Pain, 2007) to explore generational differences and similarities in the shaping of post-migration lives. The research revealed the lives of first generation
African migrants in the Yorkshire and Humber region of northern England to be patterned and moulded by persistent relations with their countries of origin. Such transnational experiences lead to individuals being emplaced both ‘here’ and ‘there’ simultaneously (Portes et al., 1999; Faist, 2000). The invocation of ‘plurilocality’ follows from their strongly articulated sense of emotional attachment to and love for distant places alongside the pragmatic belonging to local places which leaves ‘home’ as a multi-placed material and metaphorical space (Staeheli & Nagel, 2006).

This living of first generation Africans’ lives in fluid social places and distanced spaces has been shown in this paper to lead to multiple, tiered or layered identities that incorporate supra-national, national, racial and ethnic subjectivities. These identities may be significant or de-emphasised in particular spaces. Many first generation African migrants articulate emotions of ‘inbetween-ness’ and transience that lead to stretched feelings of belonging, and this paper has also highlighted the importance of homeland visits for diasporic groups in terms of performative acts of belonging. Such homeland visits can reinforce emotionally inflected national and/or ethnic belongings but may also lead to feelings of dislocation and being ‘out of place’ (Cresswell, 1996) for diasporic returnees. Indeed, feelings of non-belonging and associated emotions of distress and sadness punctuate first generation African lives not only following homeland visits, but also in their UK lives due to community of practice and political discourse messages of exclusion on the basis of racial, ethno-national and/or citizenship memberships.

When comparing attachments to places and associated emotions among first and second generation African migrants, we found that a transnational optic was just as relevant to deploy for the latter as the former group and equally significant to appreciate when exploring the different spatio-temporal contexts from which feelings of belongings emerge for the children of first generation migrants. Rather than an assumption that second generation individuals engage with their ancestral homes to a negligible degree compared to their parents, the children of first generation African migrants in this research indicated that their immersion in transnational social fields in their everyday lives left them exposed to ideas, practices, people and goods from their ancestral homelands which often evoked emotions of comfort with country of origin identifiers. Such dynamics deconstruct notions of unitary belongings to the host country for second generations and indicate their “almost-by-osmosis membership” (Levitt, 2009:1226) of homeland communities in response to being raised in transnational social spaces often characterised by proactive cultural transmission. The concept of ‘plurilocality’ is therefore salient for many second generation individuals in a similar way to the first generation. Cultural repertoires from homelands, however, are often less directly or intensively experienced by the younger generations and they are generally disinclined to articulate a sense of ‘African-ness’ in favour of national, ethnic or religious identifications.

We do not, however, wish to promote a universal celebratory imagining of the transformative diasporic opportunities available to the children of first generation migrants. Yes, emplacement in transnational social fields gives second generation groups potential cultural information and support that can be deployed in different arenas – and some individuals involved in this research seem to be navigating these fields relatively ‘successfully’. But other second generation Africans describe homeland visits as emotionally confusing, destabilising and dislocating experiences that lead to feelings of non-belonging that, for some, are echoed by exclusions in local UK contexts based on perceived ethno-racial boundaries and related inability to claim membership of hegemonic discourses of ‘Britishness’. Yet despite this alienation from a top-down notion of national belonging, second generation Africans are actively creating and defining their own narratives of translocal belonging that encompass both homeland and host-country emotional attachments. Meanings and identities for second generation individuals are still importantly refracted through localities even when mobility and transnationality permeate their lives.

In sum, this paper contributes to recent literature that illuminates intergenerational identifications, cultural values and transnational ties (e.g. Hopkins, 2006; Conradson and McKay, 2007; McGregor, 2008; Evans, 2009) and it has particularly focused on generational difference and sameness with regard to emotional belongings. The paper has found a number of over-arching similarities between first generation African migrants and their children in terms of their mutual transnational social fields and cultural repertoires leading to shared ideas of plurilocality and simultaneity of emotional attachments to different places. Yet the particular character and intensity of each generation’s emotional belongings vary in the light of different lifecourse points of arrival in the UK shaping relative immersion/integration, differing experiences of homeland visits and cultural transmission, and emerging opportunities for locally oriented belongings that vary according to situational contexts and individuals’ intersecting identities.
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