12

MAKING HOME

Paolo Boccagni and Jan Willem Duyvendak

Introduction

In both anthropology and sociology, many scholars have dealt with shifting boundaries between the formal and informal, the private and the public, and the domestic and the extra-domestic. And more often than not, they did not deal with these dichotomies just descriptively; they used them in a highly normative way. The obvious starting point here is Sennett's observation in *The Fall of Public Man* that "private emotions" have taken over the public domain: "Confusion has arisen between public and intimate life; people are working out in terms of personal feelings public matters which properly can be dealt with only through codes of impersonal meaning" (1977, 5). But these impersonal meanings – in the eyes of many urban sociologists the cornerstone of civilized urban behavior – tend to disappear in times in which personal meanings take over the public realm. The very ordinary scene of people who speak loud on their mobile phones in any public space, bringing into the common realm more or less intimate aspects of their private lives, is a powerful symbol of this long-standing development. Sennett's objections against the "tyranny of intimacy" grew out of his concern that the dominance of personal emotions would cause "dead public space." Yet, whether these private practices do result in the "end" of the public space is an empirical question, which calls for original investigation (Koch and Latham 2013).

Many sociologists share Sennett's position that the blurring of private and public is possibly a negative development. Most of them though, most famously Jürgen Habermas (1981) in Europe and Arlie Hochschild (1979) in the US, do not think that the private is colonizing the public, but rather the other way around: the "system" – the market and/or the state – are penetrating deeper and deeper into people's private places, their homes. A variety of questions related to the commodification of everyday lifestyles and tastes, or to the "intrusion" of public officers

(e.g., health and care workers) into domestic environments, can be researched along these lines. In this scenario it is not so much the public that is disappearing but the private, or rather, the distinction between the two. How far the private versus public distinction holds, and in which domains, is a question that can be empirically addressed by investigating what exactly people bring from the private into the public, and the other way around.

A bridge across the private-public divide: home and homing

The complex and ambiguous interplay between the private and the public can be helpfully revisited, in our view, through the notions of *home* and *homing*. Sociologically, home stands not only for one or more distinctive places but also for a meaningful social relationship being enacted with(in) them, with all of the aggregate consequences in inter-group relations and societally (Dovey 1985; Kusenbach and Paulsen 2013; Lloyd and Vasta 2017).

As a place, home is more obviously understood as synonym with, but not fully reducible to, house and dwelling (Coolen and Meesters 2012). Studying home as a private space means de-naturalizing and researching anew the taken for granted backdrop of our everyday lives, as long as we have at least one. In practice, studying the "private side" of home involves at least four distinct domains. The first has to do with the social and cultural variation in infrastructures and patterns of domesticity. The functional and symbolic ways of differentiating domestic interiors, together with more "objective" indicators (e.g., house tenure, infrastructural quality, overcrowding, etc.), are a mirror of broader societal arrangements. In a nutshell, they display and reproduce class-based, gendered, and racialized inequalities, as well as values, tastes, and lifestyles (Blunt and Dowling 2006). Another research area, at a deeper and more micro-level, involves the study of material culture and the social practices associated with it: how the artefacts people select and use, and the ways they decorate their domestic spaces, embody not only their tastes but also their individual and family alignments, identities, and memories over time (Miller 2001). In the third place, researching home as a private space leads to appreciate the lived experience of the built environment: how certain housing arrangements and conditions are constructed as more or less conducive to "positive" emotions such as privacy, intimacy, or comfort, for different arenas of dwellers (Atkinson and Jacobs 2016). Last, in-depth research can be done on the fine-grained bases of family life and day-to-day social reproduction. Studying domestic routines and cultures is also a way of unveiling the underlying division of care labor along gender and generational lines. In this sense, once again, what happens inside the home mirrors more or less unequal social arrangements on larger scales. It also paves the way for their reproduction (Hochschild 1979).

As a social experience, however, home is not fundamentally defined by any particular location. It is rather based on a tentative and emplaced attribution of special emotions to specific socio-spatial settings. In this optic, as an emplaced set of social

relations, home need not overlap fully with the dwelling(s) we inhabit. Instead, it can also involve the public sphere, as long as more or less selective and ephemeral "portions" of it are *made* home-like by particular individuals or social groups, often on a temporary basis and possibly in contentious ways.

Whether one refers to the private domain or to the public one, our research suggests that three emplaced emotions are particularly critical to the context-dependent effort of homemak*ing*: feeling *secure*, as a feeling of material and personal protection, but also as an "ontological" experience of order and continuity in external reality; feeling *familiar*, what may stem from extended and routinized interaction with a setting (and possibly its inhabitants) over time; and a feeling of *control* over one's day-to-day life circumstances and the social environments underlying them. In all of these dimensions, home can be appreciated less as a state of things than, phenomenologically, a tentative achievement – a matter of aspirations and claims. It follows that, as a category of analysis, home designates not only a distinct entity but also a set of practices that are expected to substantiate it over time. We propose to frame this process as *homing*. Relative to *homemaking*, this notion emphasizes not only the socio-material practices through which a sense of home is reproduced but also the variable constellations of cognitions, emotions, and moralities that inform them over time, in light of the assets available to individuals and social groups and of the structure of opportunities which they face (Boccagni 2017).

Furthermore, the discursive category of "home" is a powerful social representation which crystallizes historically and culturally shaped moral values, including those related to what a good home should mean and what feeling-at-home should be like (Kaika 2004). What is evoked and contested as home in this sense can embrace a multiplicity of scales, ranging from a street to a neighborhood, a nation, and beyond, even through virtual and diasporic spaces. The public discourse of home intersects with deep-rooted representations, along ethno-national, class, or religious lines, regarding to whom public space (or meaningful parts of it) belongs; who is entitled or legitimated to participate in it, for what purposes, in what terms; how far the public domain can be occupied and appropriated, literally or metaphorically. From the most visible side of public rallies and protests to more mundane forms of everyday interaction, majority-minority interactions are often played out along these lines, whether based on immigrant background or other salient markers including age, religion, and sexual orientation.

Once home is revisited as a processual and ever-reversible achievement, involving also the public space, the private-public interface can be reframed as a porous and evolving continuum, rather than a dichotomy; indeed, as a matter of "thresholds of domesticity" being negotiated and selectively crossed in everyday life, under different conditions and positions of power (Boccagni and Brighenti 2017). Who can feel more or less at home in the public space, depending on the person's "fitting" into what is considered to be "acceptable" and "normal," one's vulnerability, resources, and opportunities to manifest him- or herself? This, we argue, makes homemaking in the public a significant terrain to explore majority-minority relations as mutual views, needs and expectations that are negotiated vis-à-vis shared

living environments. The focus of analysis shifts from the abstract and "groupist" terms of identity politics to the terrain of everyday practices, as ways of enacting contextually-oriented views of home. Such practices, however, are not necessarily without conflicts. Whereas home in the private is more easily secured – at least for most of us – in terms of the previously-mentioned characteristics of security, familiarity, and control, this is much more of an embattled and unstable endeavor in the public space.

On the circulation and entanglements of home

Analyzing the historical evolution of the notion of home and its equivalents across languages, as markers of humans' need to exert attachment and control over space, would call for a study in itself (Rybczynski 1986; Rykwert 1991; Somerville 1997). Importantly, the genealogy of *the* home as distinct and autonomous domestic space for the household is way more recent than that of *home* as such. While the predominance of the home as private dwelling dates back to the last couple of centuries in most Western countries, some form of special association with particularly meaningful and emotionalized settings, domestic or otherwise, is far preexisting to that. It can actually be found all across human cultures (Birdwell-Pheasant and Lawrence-Zuniga 1999). For sure, the terms that parallel "home" in other languages are culturally specific. Nonetheless, the underlying social experience has some degree of generalization. Home, Agnes Heller said, is "perhaps the oldest tradition of the *homo sapiens*, privileging one, or certain, places against all the others." It is indeed "one of the few constants of the human condition" (Heller 1995, 1–2).

Less straightforward, and perhaps more intriguing, is the conceptual diffusion of home as a specific research topic. This can be appreciated along an interdisciplinary continuum between the "extremes" of environmental psychology and architecture, starting from seminal studies such as Altman and Werner (1985) and Benjamin and Stea (1995). In-between, research on the relevance and implications of home as a concept can be found in sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, and geography, as much as in planning and urban studies. The same analytical focus is shared across as diverse realms as local welfare, health, and social care, housing, material culture, everyday life, emotions, and belonging. The circulation of home as a social analytics can be appreciated at many levels, well beyond the sheer (and increasing) number of dedicated publications: the influence of international networks and conferences (ISA's RC 21 and RC43 being two cases in point), the start-up of large-scale dedicated projects (such as Elsevier's *International encyclopedia of housing and home* [Smith 2012]), the institutionalization of research units (e.g., Queen Mary's *Centre for Studies of Home*) and journals (e.g., *Home Cultures)*. At least in some countries, such as the UK and the Netherlands, "home studies" is almost institutionalized as an interdisciplinary research area in itself.

How home has come to be recognized as a major, interdisciplinary, and ultimately contentious research topic is not self-evident. In fact, there is much of a merit in inquiring how home "travels" as a concept, and what accounts for its

variable influence in national academic and public debates. As its interdisciplinary diffusion suggests (cf. Blunt and Dowling 2006; Duyvendak 2011, 2017; Boccagni 2017), the success story of home as a concept relies on many factors. It does not have simply to do with the omnipresence of home (or its language equivalents) as a category of practice, with its loose conceptual boundaries (making it suitable for different uses), or with its deeply normative underpinnings. More fundamentally, researching home facilitates an interplay of meaningful contributions from different disciplines on conceptual and empirical issues that cut across their respective domains. Processes of social inclusion (on multiple scale), the working balance between the private and the public, the right and potential to appropriate and control space, the discourses and practices of boundary-making between inside(rs) and outside(rs), or the everyday (domestic) reproduction of identity, belonging and inequality are all cases in point.

To be sure, the circulation of home as a category of analysis is far from even or homogeneous. Rather, it has resulted in remarkable forms of segmentation, in at least four respects (cf. Boccagni, Pérez-Murcia, and Belloni 2020). First of all, along disciplinary lines: much more literature on home has so far been produced in social and cultural geography, and to some extent in anthropology, than in sociology. Along national lines, moreover, the literature on home is disproportionately more widespread in Europe, and to a lesser extent in Canada and Australia, than in the US. In the third place, there is a remarkable fragmentation in terms of research scale: micro-accounts based on very local and specific case studies by far outnumber research with a broader and comparative scope. Another axis of segmentation has to do, more importantly, with the tendency of much literature to reproduce the commonsense distinction between house and home, rather than focusing on their interaction. Generally speaking, the field of housing and urban studies is not so open to "qualitative," relational, emotionally, and biographically embedded understandings of home, unless by discarding them as a secondary matter of culture (or of "cultural studies"). There are exceptions, of course, including research on the lived experiences of dwelling spaces, in light of their affordances (Clapham 2011). Another exception comes from the literature on homelessness and severe deprivation, where the question of what home is or should be like is made more conspicuous and crucial by its absence (Kellett and Moore 2003; McCarthy 2018).

As remarkable are the *entanglements* of home, or the context- (and path-) dependencies of the ways of viewing and using it. Even when it is assumed as a category of analysis, home cannot be fully disjointed from its pervasive and highly diverse use as a category of practice, under the influence of different linguistic, national, or socio-cultural backgrounds. Language, therefore, is the most obvious terrain of entanglement of home. The meaning of this concept in English, and its distinction from house or dwelling, is not fully reproducible in other languages in which research is done, literature is produced, and home as social experience of a special place is negotiated day after day. This may be an issue for comparative research, or even only for transnational dialogue among researchers, whenever different language backgrounds are involved.

Indeed, the semantic field created by the ways of using the correspondents of "home" across languages, with the underlying meanings and functions, would make for a research subject in itself. Against this background, the conceptual transition from *home* to *homing* aims precisely to enlarge the scope for comparative analysis. The focus should then be less on home as a noun, or a corresponding object, than on a set of practices and interactions associated with it: individuals' (and groups') ongoing and contentious negotiation of a sense of security, familiarity, and control toward particular places, in light of the views, emotions, and moralities associated with them.

Another major entanglement involves the values associated with home. The predominance of positive or utterly romanticized views of home, in the common sense, makes it complex to critically engage with the potentially negative aspects of home as a real place. Likewise, the institutionalized privacy embedded in the home tends to invisibilize its "dark sides" for different dwellers. In itself, the coexistence of a plurality of values and moralities underpinning the same notion is not an analytical issue, nor is it specific to home. Yet, the over-prevalence of normatively positive tones obscures a simple and fundamental point: whether a specific (domestic) environment is constructed as home-like indeed, by whom, and at the expense of whom else, is an empirical question.

Having said that, the gamut of values associated with home cannot be reduced to the beliefs and mind frames of specific individuals. It is rather the product of historically institutionalized views of house, dwelling, and domesticity under a variety of influences, including those of public policy. Questions such as the relative importance and "deservingness" of home ownership, the visibility and accessibility of the domestic environment from the outside, or the functional and symbolic differentiation within the domestic space can be studied only against the background of national, classed, and gendered genealogies of the idea of home. There is little universal, in this sense, in what a good-enough home should look like.

Some more remarks can also be made on the ways of circulation and entanglement of the concept of *homing*. In this case, the *circulation* can be traced back from an extended research tradition in biology and natural sciences. This basically regards an innate behavior that leads exemplars of several animal species to go back to their areas of origin at some point in the life course. The same notion has been increasingly adopted, whether analytically or metaphorically, in migration, diasporic, and cultural studies. Common across these figurative uses is a somewhat unarticulated yearning to return to a past point of reference. In this understanding, "home" is something ascriptive – what lies at the origin and might, should, or by instinct *is* recovered. Instead, the constructive and open-ended notion of homing which we advance here has to do with the ideal and future-oriented dimension of home. On the other hand, the *entanglements* of homing have to do with its exclusive use in the Anglophone world but also with substantively different ways of employing this notion in different disciplinary domains, with little or no interaction between them.

A privileged research field on the making of home: migration and majority-minority relations

Migration, as a social experience, is a good example of a phenomenon than can be better understood in terms of homing. From the side of receiving societies, immigrant settlement tends to enhance, by reaction, the symbolic and even physical boundaries of what used to be home – a widespread psycho-social mechanism with major political implications. What is often at stake is less home as a domestic space than a sense of *not* feeling at home anymore in the street, district, or even nation by natives because of the settlement of strangers (Duyvendak, Tonkens, and Geschiere 2016). It is also in this way, by reaction to external "pressures" such as those induced by migration, that the notion of home starts to travel to scales other than the dwelling. Cities and nations at large are conceptualized as homes, by extrapolating the supposed characteristics of the private home into the public space.

Interestingly, migrants tend to experience a parallel "scaling out" of the boundaries of home vis-à-vis their countries of origin, which tend to be framed as home altogether, particularly among first-generation newcomers (e.g., Wiles 2008). A specular conflation underpins diaspora-reaching appeals, whereby emigration countries flatter emigrants' nostalgic allegiance to the national home in order to attract their money and human capital investments (Skrbis 2008; Ralph 2009; Boccagni 2014).

Majority and minority relations may differ as well regarding processes of identification with, and appropriation (even *control*) of, the public sphere: the ways in which, and the reasons why, public space is constructed as more or less home-like, based on the sense of security, familiarity, and control which emerges from the interactions with it. For all of these dimensions, much phenomenological research on the home (e.g., Lawrence 1897) has shown the relevance of *length of stay*; there is no reason to underplay the influence of this factor when it comes to home in the public. Long-settled citizens – who often will consider themselves as "natives" – can be expected to associate more easily a sense of home with the outer environment, or with specific parts of it – streets, shops, parks, etc. Everything else being equal, they are more likely to feel it as homely indeed (or to recall the past time when it was perceived as such), and to cultivate a sense of "moral ownership" over it (Kasinitz 2013). However, the process of attaching a sense of home to public space, and possibly to its "quasi-public" (Smets and Watt 2013) and "hybrid-domestic" (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2017) variants, can involve native majorities and immigrant minorities alike. In fact, it is affected by the distribution of several socio-demographic variables, ethnicity and legal status being only two among them.

While the appropriation and appropriability of public space have been extensively addressed in the literature on urban diversity (e.g., Berg and Sigona 2013) and ethnic concentration (e.g., Smets and den Uyl 2008), a major point remains: migration-driven heterogeneity makes the home-likeness of outer environments less a natural fact than a potential outcome of distinctive processes of "domestication"

(Koch and Latham 2013), and possibly of "privatization" (Kumar and Makarova 2008) and "personalization" (Ley and Duyvendak 2017).

From social analytics to pragmatic inquiry: a threefold categorization for the empirical study of home

Based on the conceptual overview in the previous sections, we argue that the negotiation of a sense of home in the public, at the roots of majority-minority relations, can be unpacked at three analytical levels. The processes of making home in the public can be analyzed, in the first place, in light of the commonsensical ways of *framing public space as home*, whereby some groups or categories are assumed to be "naturally" belonging there, contrary to others; second, in terms of subjective ways of *feeling at home there*, if and when a space elicits a sense of home to particular individuals or groups, unlike others; third, by looking at the ways of actively *claiming public space as home*, whenever majority-minority relations are shaped by claims for territoriality, or for some space to be the exclusive home of some, at the expense of others. Each level deserves elaboration in its own right, even though they are closely related (cf. Hochschild 1979).

Framing public space as home

Historical and locally sensitive research shows that the processes whereby a public space is framed as the "natural" home of some groups – typically the mainstream ones – come at the expense of others (Duyvendak 2011). The widespread perception of a legitimate ownership of space is what matters here, even when the notion of home is not explicitly used to name it. There is a merit in unveiling the ways in which one space has been assumed as the belonging of a given group or category – in fact, of different ones, possibly conflicting with each other, over time. Much of the ways of framing the public domain as home has to do with deep-rooted power and prestige hierarchies along ethno-national, religious, political, or cultural lines. It can be justified and made effective through indigeneity and autochthony (e.g., Geschiere 2009), the length of residence, the everyday use of space, or the similarity between a particular social group and the features of the space in question.

Nonetheless, there is little obvious or automatic in this implicit form of home-like appropriation of the public. Studying its development over time, in a local or national context, helps denaturalize the conflation of home with "upwards scales" such as homeland, nation, or state (Walters 2004; Davies 2014). This enables to deconstruct the ways of associating a group with a public place – and on a larger scale, a population with a bounded territory, as highlighted by the critiques of sedentarism (Malkki 1995) and of methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2003).

Whatever the determinants, any historically-dependent association between a group and a home-like public space is made far more visible, and somehow questioned, by extended contact between the "home-owner" group and outsiders such

as newcomer immigrants – more strikingly, when the latter's socio-demographics and lifestyles diverge, or are perceived to diverge, from the mainstream. Under these circumstances, the predominant commonsensical perception of the public-as-home is brought to more explicit awareness and may call for new ways of legitimation or justification. Home-in-the-public turns then into a political, potentially contentious question.

Feeling at home in public space

People's ways of making home in the public have also a strong emotional dimension. Attaching a sense of home to some extra-domestic circumstances is a highly selective, emotionalized, and temporally shifting experience. It is often related to particular settings, as well as to meaningful relationships and/or deep-rooted routines to be enacted there. Studying the emotional side of the ways of making home in the public, therefore, entails doing research at a micro-level, with a biographic and/or ethnographic focus, to trace the processes whereby people and social groups feel at home or not in a given setting. Again, this aspect of home-in-the-public involves long-term residents but also newcomers and other minorities, ethnic or otherwise. For immigrant newcomers, most notably, feeling at home in a public space – if only for a while – may be related to the sense of "controlling" it, or of expressing their own habitual lifestyles with some degree of freedom from the external gaze and control; or, still different, to participate in shared activities (related to leisure, food, religion, etc.) which either connect them with the past home experience, or bridge across the boundaries with majority groups.

Under different labels, the potential of public space to nourish a sense of home has been addressed in several case studies on the "domestication" of semi-public spaces among immigrant and ethnic minority groups. A case in point lies in the South Los Angeles urban gardens studied by Hondagneu-Sotelo (2017), where Central American families gather to cultivate "home-like" herbs and plants, thus connecting with their past home life through the activities they perform, their relationship with a "natural" environment and their mutual co-presence. Another example is Law's (2001) study of Hong Kong's "Central" – a large public space in which Filipino migrants organize informal food markets which recreate a home-like ambience "through sights, sounds, tastes, aromas" (2001, 263). Plenty of similar instances can be found across migration studies (e.g., Saint-Blancat and Cancellieri 2014, on religious "home-like" rituals being performed in public urban spaces). The typically short temporality of this emplaced sense of home in the public makes it no less meaningful or important to the life experience of those involved.

Feeling at home in the public, even for immigrants, is not necessarily bound to specific settings or events. At least in some metropolitan areas, and for some groups (or central figures inside them), ethnic neighborhoods, markets, streets, and other spaces of proximity do provide a sense of home, typically mediated by co-ethnic sociability (Botticello 2007). On a larger scale, ethnic enclaves engender a similar effect, as long as they are accessible repositories of "signs, symbols, language, food and artifacts"

that connect immigrants with the past home-life – often hybridizing it with their new life circumstances, as for Vietnamese-Americans in a Californian "Little Saigon" (Mazumdar et al. 2000). Community development strategies often build on the attachment to particular public spaces and on the investment in them, as provisional and non-exclusive homes. This comes also by opposition to domestic spaces in which patriarchal relations, gender segregation, or domestic violence make some – particularly women and youth – "homeless at home" (Wardhaugh 1999). Several studies of second generation and mixed-race youth in London have provided insights along these lines (Back 2007; Ahmet 2013; Butcher and Dickens 2015).

Claiming public space as home

Homemaking in the public, moreover, holds a significant political dimension. This is related to the ways in which public space is purposefully *claimed* as home, particularly from the side of long-term, supposedly original inhabitants. The stake, in majority-minority relations, regards the legitimacy and reception of any claim for public home (hence, its effective impact). This has major political implications. Unsurprisingly, politicians get often involved in the struggle for control over space – be that a street, a park, a market, or any public facility: who do they consider as the legitimate users and symbolic "owners" of the space involved? Do they try to balance the various claims, by regulating the place in such a way that various groups can use it at the same time or sequentially? Or do policymakers side with one of the claimant groups, for instance those considered to be more "native," "indigenous," or "autochthonous"? How do various political parties position themselves vis-à-vis different minority groups? And what is the meaning of the rise of populist parties in this context, with their very outspoken ideas about "the right to the soil"?

The empirical question is then who claims what, why, when, and what accounts for the claims to be more or less socially and politically accepted and effective. In the case of majority populations, these claims are often considered self-evident. It is only when minorities claim access to the same space, that this "naturalization" becomes visible: the allegedly "neutral" space was de facto "colored" by the majority and not neutral at all.

This may somewhat change when places host people of many backgrounds, and the original majority becomes a numerical minority (Vertovec 2007). This pluralization, however, is no guarantee that people will get along better or that the struggle for belonging will be more peaceful, as some "superdiversity" authors seem to suggest (e.g., Wessendorf's notion of "commonplace diversity" (2014)). On the contrary, those who consider themselves to be "native" will feel threatened in their position and may cling to populist and nativist positions (Alba and Duyvendak 2017).

Conclusion

Appreciating the various extents and ways in which home *is* in the public, shows that the question is neither whether the public sphere is "homely" or not, nor

whether it should be "homely" or not. We believe that the broader sociological tradition in which the colonization of the public by the private (as in the work by Richard Sennett) is the dominant theme, is overly normative and not empirically questionable. Whereas that literature often raises very general claims regarding *The Fall of Public Man*, or the (market) colonization of the public sphere, we argue for more contextual and fine-grained research on the mixed ways in which public space gets characterized by the domestic. This tends to facilitate feeling at home for some, but for sure not for all, and makes "publicness" less a formal, overarching attribute than a matter of degrees and thresholds to be practically negotiated and selectively crossed.

Once analytically projected into the public, home retains its sociological significance as a shorthand for all attempts at appropriating space for any purpose, symbolic or instrumental, that goes beyond its transitory and functional use. Public space emerges as a highly differentiated, conflictive, and fragmented arena, whenever different attempts and claims for appropriating it are in tension with each other. In such an arena, deep emotions such as those related to home cannot just be "pushed in" via top-down public policy; nor expected to be easily and immediately shared by outsiders such as immigrants, or members of different groups. This is one of the reasons why the appropriation of home-like categories for political purposes is as much a widespread process, as a problematic one – at least for an inclusive political agenda. Home is a fundamentally ambiguous and exclusionary notion. Its consequences as an emotionalized resource for contentious politics are likely to be equally ambiguous.

As long as home carries a "positive" subtext of security, familiarity, and control, this is still and only *to its insiders*. Whatever stands for home is the marker of an insider/outsider divide – hence, home-like to some, but not to most. It follows that home-related claims in the public have different consequences, depending not only on the power balances between the relevant parties but also in light of how extensive and permeable the symbolic walls of a public home actually are.

While ethnic-driven diversity is a major source of pluralization of the public space (although the latter was never really homogeneous in the first place), it also rearticulates the meaning of publicness in still another sense: as a matter of limited overlapping between different, asynchronous ways of appropriating it. The critical question for social cohesion turns out to be not only how far – if at all – people feel at home in the public space, or in selected parts of it. More radically, the question is how far people *can simultaneously feel at home within the same spatial arrangements in the public sphere*. The actual fragmentation of ways of feeling at home in the public suggests the intermittency and indeed fragility of this emotional experience, as long as it is emplaced at all. However, it also points to a major challenge for social cohesion policy on a local scale. More ethnographic research on the temporalities of homemaking in urban spaces is then as important as the study of the underlying spatialities, to find out how light, flexible, and inclusive versions of home-in-the public can be negotiated within majority-minority relations.

In this research, particularly in analyzing the discourses of *framing* and *claiming* home, the work of French sociologists Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot (2006) is of great use. Applying their approach in terms of "worlds of justification," it can be argued – see all empirical developments described previously – that there has been a rise in the use of the "domestic world" in public affairs. This becomes crystal clear when looking at the popularity of "home" outside of the home: claiming and framing "home" is justified in terms of the "domestic world" at the expense of the "civic world." The cognitive frame of justifications goes hand in glove with the *emotional* experience of "feeling home," following Arlie Hochschild's idea (1979) that people (want to) feel what they think they have to feel and have the right to feel. A lot of our world today can be understood when we grasp why and when people think they have the right to feel at home.

Acknowledgements

The research carried out for this article has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 678456).

References

Ahmet, Akile. 2013. "Home Sites: The Location(s) of 'Home' for Young Men." *Urban Studies* 50(3): 621–34.

Alba, Richard, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2017. "What About the Mainstream? Assimilation in Super-Diverse Times." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. doi:10.1080/01419870.2017.1406969.

Altman, Irwin, and Carol Werner, eds. 1985. *Home Environments*. New York: Plenum Press.

Atkinson, Rowland, and Keith Jacobs. 2016. *House, Home and Society*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Back, Les. 2007. *The Art of Listening*. London: Berg.

Benjamin, David, and David Stea, eds. 1995. *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings and Environments*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Berg, M., and N. Sigona. 2013. "Ethnography, Diversity and Urban Space." *Identities* 20(4): 347–60.

Birdwell-Pheasant, Donna, and Denise Lawrence-Zuniga, eds. 1999. *House Life: Space, Place and Family in Europe*. Oxford: Berg.

Blunt, Alison, and Robyn Dowling. 2006. *Home*. London: Routledge.

Boccagni, Paolo. 2014. "Making the Fifth Region a Real Place? Emigrant Policies and the Emigration-Nation Nexus in Ecuador." *National Identities* 16(2): 117–37.

Boccagni, Paolo. 2017. *Migration and the Search for Home: Mapping Domestic Space in Migrants' Everyday Lives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boccagni, Paolo, and Andrea Brighenti. 2017. "Immigrants and Home in the Making: Thresholds of Domesticity, Commonality and Publicness." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 32: 1–11.

Boccagni, Paolo, Luis Pérez-Murcia, and Milena Belloni. 2020. *Thinking Home on the Move: A Conversation Across Disciplines*. London: Emerald.

Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot. 2006. *On Justification: Economies of Worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Botticello, Julie. 2007. "Lagos in London: Finding the Space of Home." *Home Cultures* 4(1): 7–23.

Butcher, Melissa, and Luke Dickens. 2015. *Creating Hackney as Home*. Project Report. Accessed February 19, 2016. www.hackneyashome.co.uk.

Carr, Stephen et al., eds. 1992. *Public Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clapham, David. 2011. "The Embodied Use of the Material Home: An Affordance Approach." *Housing Theory and Society* 28(4): 360–76.

Coolen, Henny, and Janine Meesters. 2012. "Editorial Special Issue: House, Home and Dwelling." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 27: 1–10.

Davies, Margaret. 2014. "Home and State: Reflections on Metaphor and Practice." *Griffith Law Review* 21(2): 153–75.

Dovey, Kim. 1985. "Home and Homelessness." In *Home Environments*, edited by Irwin I. Altman and Werner Carol, 113–32. New York: Plenum Press.

Duyvendak, Jan Willem. 2011. *The Politics of Home: Nostalgia and Belonging in Western Europe and the United States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duyvendak, Jan Willem. 2017. *Thuis. Het drama van een sentimentele samenleving*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Duyvendak, Jan Willem, Evelien Tonkens, and Peter Geschiere. 2016. *The Culturalization of Citizenship: Belonging and Polarization in a Globalizing World*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geschiere, P. 2009. *The Perils of Belonging. Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1981. *Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Heller, Agnes. 1995. "Where Are We at Home?" *Thesis Eleven* 41: 11–18.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules and Social Structure." *The American Journal of Sociology* 85(3): 551–75.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2017. "At Home in Inner City: Immigrant Community Gardens." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 32(1): 13–28.

Kaika, Maria. 2004. "Interrogating the Geographies of the Familiar." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28(2): 365–86.

Kasinitz, Philip. 2013. "Toward a Sociology of Home." *Sociological Forum* 28(4): 881–84.

Kellett, Peter, and Jeanne Moore. 2003. "Routes to Home: Homelessness and Home-Making in Contrasting Societies." *Habitat International* 27: 123–41.

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

Kumar, Krishan, and Ekaterina Makarova. 2008. "The Portable Home: The Domestication of Public Space." *Sociological Theory* 26(4): 324–43.

Kusenbach, Margarethe, and Krista Paulsen. 2013. "Home/House." In *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*. London: Wiley. doi:10.1002/9781118568446.eurs0551.

Law, Lisa. 2001. "Home Cooking: Filipino Women and Geographies of the Senses in Hong Kong." *Ecumene* 8(3): 264–83.

Lawrence, Roderick. 1987. "What Makes a House a Home?" *Environment and Behavior* 19(2): 154–68.

Ley, M., and J.W. Duyvendak. 2017. "At Home in Generic Places." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 31(1): 63–76.

Lloyd, Justine, and Ellie Vasta, eds. 2017. *Reimagining Home in the 21st Century*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Malkki, Lisa. 1995. "Refugees and Exiles." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495–523.
Mazumdar, Sanjoy et al. 2000. "Creating a Sense of Place: The Vietnamese-Americans and Little Saigon." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20: 319–33.
McCarthy, Lindsey. 2018. "(Re)conceptualising the Boundaries Between Home and Homelessness." *Housing Studies* 33(6): 960–85.
Miller, D. ed. 2001. *Home Possessions: Material Culture Behind Closed Doors*. Oxford: Berg.
Ralph, David. 2009. "Home Is Where the Heart Is?" *Irish Studies Review* 17(2): 183–200.
Rybczynski, Witold. 1986. *Home: A Short History of an Idea*. London: Penguin.
Rykwert, Joseph. 1991. "House and Home." *Social Research* 58(1): 51–62.
Saint-Blancat, Chantal, and Adriano Cancellieri. 2014. "From Invisibility to Visibility? The Appropriation of Public Space Through a Religious Ritual." *Social & Cultural Geography* 15(6): 645–63.
Sennett, Richard. 1977. *The Fall of Public Man*. New York: Norton.
Skrbis, Zlatko. 2008. "Transnational Families." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 29: 231–46.
Smets, P., and M. den Uyl. 2008. "The Complex Role of Ethnicity in Urban Mixing: A Study of Two Deprived Neighbourhoods in Amsterdam." *Urban Studies* 45(7): 1439–60.
Smets, Peer, and Paul Watt. 2013. "Exclusion and Belonging in Urban Public and Quasi-Public Space." *The Open Studies Journal* 6: 27–29.
Smith, S. ed. 2012. *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*. London: Elsevier.
Somerville, Peter. 1997. "The Social Construction of Home." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 14(3): 226–45.
Vertovec, S. 2007. "Super-Diversity and Its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024–54.
Walters, W. 2004. "Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Domopolitics." *Citizenship Studies* 8: 237–60.
Wardhaugh, Julia. 1999. "The Unaccommodated Woman: Home, Homelessness and Identity." *The Sociological Review* 47(1): 91–109.
Wessendorf, Suzanne. 2014. *Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-Diverse Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Wiles, Janine. 2008. "Sense of Home in a Transnational Social Space: New Zealanders in London." *Global Networks* 8(1): 116–37.
Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick-Schiller. 2003. "Methodological Nationalism." *International Migration Review* 37: 576–610.