Title:

A Tale of Two Cities: The Discursive Construction of 'Place' in Gentrifying East London

Abstract:

In recent years, the East End of London has been dramatically transformed from a poor, working-class area, to one of the most fashionable neighbourhoods in the world. Adding to a growing body of research which examines the sociolinguistic dynamics of gentrifying neighbourhoods, this paper draws on data from two ethnographic projects to examine how young people from the gentrified (i.e., working-class) and gentrifier (i.e., middle-class) communities index place-attachment in East London. I demonstrate that for the gentrified community, place attachment is related to the ethnic and cultural genealogy of the immediate, local neighbourhood. Whilst for the gentrifiers, place-identity is associated with the cosmopolitan economic and social opportunities of the city. I argue that whilst these communities occupy the same physical neighbourhood, these discourses suggest that they conceptually and socio-culturally reside in two very different cities. [Words: 135].

Key Words: Gentrification, place, space, East London

Running Title: The Discursive Construction of 'Place' in Gentrifying East London

Word-count: 10326

INTRODUCTION

Over the last thirty years, London's East End has been transformed from a poverty-stricken district characterised by high levels of deprivation and crime to an area which has quickly become home to some of the most fashionable neighbourhoods in the world (Butler & Robson 2003; Saumarez Smith 2017). Historically a working-class area characterised by large-scale manufacturing industries and sprawling social housing estates, several decades of urban regeneration and deindustrialisation have substantially altered the identity of East London. Factories and workhouses which once housed vast industries have since been converted into luxury apartment complexes and upmarket commercial districts, advertised to a new, economically mobile middle-class (e.g., Davidson & Lees 2005). Consequently, many of the traditional working-class population have been displaced (Lees, Slater, & Wyly 2008) with residents forced to relocate to boroughs in more affordable – and geographically disparate – neighbourhoods.

In this paper, I draw inspiration from a recent body of research on the sociolinguistics of place-making (Johnstone 2013; Britain 2016; Montgomery & Moore 2017; Cornips & de Rooij 2018) to examine the dynamics of 'belonging' and 'place' in the gentrifying East End of London. Drawing on insights gathered during two separate ethnographic projects in the area, I examine the discursive strategies that young people who are part of the 'gentrified' community (i.e., those working-class individuals who have hereditary and generational ties to the area) and those who are part of the 'gentrifying' community (i.e., those middle-class individuals who have recently relocated to the area) use to conceptualise 'place'. Adding to a growing body of research which addresses the sociolinguistic implications of urban regeneration (see *inter alia* Papen 2012; Trinch & Snajdr 2016; Baro 2017; Goncalves 2018; Vandenbroucke 2018), I explore youth perspectives on gentrification and place from an intersectional perspective (Yuval-Davis 2006; Christensen 2009). Specifically, I analyse the ways in which young people's ethnic and classed identities influence and affect their attachment to the local

2

neighbourhood and the wider city of London. Examining the discursive strategies present in their narratives leads me to argue that whilst members of the two communities physically reside in the same geographically bounded neighbourhood, these individuals metaphorically and socio-culturally occupy two very different cities.

In the next section, I briefly review the existing literature on gentrification and language before introducing the concepts of 'place' and 'space'. I then detail the context of my fieldwork and research methods before analysing the discursive strategies that working-class and middle-class individuals use when discussing place. Finally, I conclude with an overview of the ramifications of these findings.

GENTRIFICATION AND LANGUAGE

The term 'gentrification' refers to 'the transformation of a working class or vacant area of the central city into middle class residential or commercial use' (Lees, Slater, & Wyly 2008:xv). Since the coinage of the term in the 1960's (Glass 1964), research has attempted to examine the political, economic, and social consequences of gentrification (see *inter alia* Palen & London 1984; van Weesep 1994; Butler & Robson 2003; Lees et al. 2008; Butler & Hamnett 2011; Campkin 2013; Saumarez Smith 2017). This includes work which has explored the racial and ethnic inequalities associated with the displacement of communities (e.g., Hwang 2015; Lees 2016), the restructuring of class populations caused by the influx of a new middle-class (e.g., Bridge 1994; Munt 1987; Jackson & Butler 2015), as well as the changing cultural identity of the regenerating neighbourhood (e.g., Pratt 2018; Erbacher 2011).

Recently, scholars have also addressed the sociolinguistic dynamics of urban regeneration. Much of this research has focussed on changes to the semiotic landscape of the gentrifying neighbourhood. A case in point is Trinch and Snajdr's ethnographic research in Brooklyn, New York. In that analysis, they analyse shop signs as "place-making technologies" (2016:80), using interviews with residents to contextualise their findings. They distinguish between what they refer to as *Old School*

Vernacular signage, and *Distinction-making signage* which they argue promote two distinct language-based ideologies that reference traditional class struggles. The first type of signage, which they describe as those which include non-standard forms of written English, large typefaces, and other non-Roman scripts, represents 'small-scale, free-market capitalism and independent, diverse, open commerce' (2016:86). This is contrasted with 'distinction-making signage', defined as those signs which are text-sparse, and which signal exclusivity which, for some residents, represents exclusion. A similar approach is used by Papen (2012) who combines textual and visual analysis with interviews with sign producers to analyse the Linguistic Landscape in the Berlin neighbourhood of Prenzlauer Berg. In that analysis, she demonstrates that street artists use public space as a site of contestation, where they represent their political and artistic ideas – what she sees as a form of citizen protest.

The current paper adds to this trajectory of work by focussing on youth perspectives of urban (re-)generation. Whilst there is a growing body of research on discourses of gentrification (e.g., Baro 2017; Goncalves 2018; Vandenbroucke 2018), much less work has examined the ways in which young people relate to and experience changes in the urban environment (Howarth 2002; Butcher & Dickens 2016). Nevertheless, as a demographic who have little control over the displacement and precarity caused by gentrification (Watt 2013; Butcher & Dickens 2016), it seems necessary to explore the perspectives of youth and young adults (Butcher & Thomas 2003).

Before introducing the research context, it is necessary here to define how I conceptualise 'gentrification'. Following other scholars, my analysis is informed by three assumptions. First, since gentrification leads to a displacement of working-class residents due to an influx of more affluent residents and businesses, I assume that it is a classed process, such that its effects can be examined in relation to London's entrenched social class structure (Butler & Robson 2003; Lees et al. 2008). Second, I assume that gentrification is a 'global urban strategy' (Smith 2002) that is a product of neoliberalism where the 'city' is central to the accumulation of wealth and market success (Kelly 2014). Neoliberal

urban policies are seen in the support of public sector housing schemes, an increasing emphasis on home ownership (e.g., the right-to-buy; Hackney 2019), as well as the policing of gentrification activism and protest itself (Lees et al. 2008:166). Thirdly, I assume that gentrification – particularly in London – is racialized in the extent to which Black and minority ethnic individuals who experience higher levels of poverty and deprivation are disproportionately affected by the effects of urban regeneration (Kohn 2013; Hwang 2015; Lees 2016; Atkinson & Bridge 2005). This point is particularly important for the current paper, since I argue that it is necessary to examine 'place-making' from an intersectional perspective. That is to say that, the individuals attachment to is informed not only by their experience as a member of 'the working-class community' but also in relation to the *multiple* and *intersecting* social characteristics of the individual (Yuval-Davis 2006; Christensen 2009).

I discuss these points here not only to clarify my definition of the term 'gentrification', but also to expose the assumptions that inform my interpretations of the data discussed herein. Before turning to a discussion of the data, I introduce the notions of 'place' and 'place-making' that I analyse in relation to the changing social landscape of East London.

PLACE

The concept of 'place' has always been a central focus in sociolinguistic research. As early as Labov's (1963) influential work on Martha's Vineyard, scholars have sought to analyse language use in relation to geographically bounded communities. In earlier research, however, 'place' was conceptualised as a relatively static concept. As Coupland (2010:101) notes, many of these accounts were influenced by a dialectical tendency to conflate 'place' with the 'speech community'. Consequently, 'place' was often conceptualised as some objectively given location, usually a geographic locale, as determined by the placement of isoglosses and boundaries on a map (Johnstone 2004:68; Coupland 2010:101; Montgomery & Moore 2017:1-2).

In more recent work, however, and influenced largely by earlier developments in human

geography (e.g., Relph 1976; Buttimer 1976), sociolinguistic research has often taken a phenomenological approach, making a theoretical distinction between 'place' and 'space'. Within this school of thought, scholars have analysed 'place' not just in relation to some physical location, but as a process that emerges in the lived world of everyday *experience* (Tuan 1991). Consequently, there has been a shift away from theorising 'place' as a static, bounded entity, towards examining how place is *constructed* and *produced* in interaction (Johnstone 2004). Much of this work has focussed on the ways in which language functions as a type of 'place-making activity'. This includes discourse-analytic work which examines the discursive construction of place in interaction, as well as research which has examined the sociolinguistic distribution of features and their place-related socio-indexical meaning(s) (e.g., Papen 2012; Johnstone 2013; Trimaille & Gasquet-Cyrus 2013; Trinch & Snajdr 2016; Ribbens-Klein 2017; Montgomery & Moore 2017; Cornips & de Rooij 2018).

In the move towards embracing more fluid notions of place that are grounded in human experience, scholars have often documented the ways in which urban spaces and locales are conceptualised by different communities. For instance research has examined how speakers index 'belonging' in relation to specific place linked identities (e.g., Yuval-Davis 2006) as well as the 'centralization' and 'peripheralization' of different place-related identities. For Cornips and de Rooij (2018) it is through the discursive construction of 'place' that we can observe the marginality that is experienced by those who are excluded from mainstream discourse. A case in point is Banaś' (2018) analysis of the discursive construction of belonging in narratives by migrant Japanese women living in Amstelveen, the Netherlands. She suggests that the women use linguistic features, such as the pronouns 'I' and 'we', to orient away from the native community, instead aligning with their migrant peers. This creates a sense of belonging amongst the ingroup of migrants whilst reaffirming the (perceived) exclusionary divide between the community they belong to, and the society they find themselves in.

Issues of marginalisation and belonging are likely to be magnified in gentrifying neighbourhoods

where the emergence of a bourgeoisie leads to inevitable social, cultural, and economic disparities between the two communities (Atkinson & Bridge 2005; Lees et al. 2008:xxi). For some, these disparities may result in a type of 'Othering', where in-group and out-group distinctions are exacerbated in relation to class, linguistic, and cultural differences (cf. Duszak 2002; Krzyzanowski & Wodak 2011). Such issues are likely to be observed not only in the ways in which members of the working-class community discursively construct belonging in relation to the newer gentrifying community (cf. Banaś 2018), but also in the ways in which the gentrified community are 'Othered' by members of the newly-arrived middle-class. Amongst youth, these issues may be heightened, given that this demographic experience higher levels of urban marginalisation (Butcher & Thomas 2003). In what follows, I explore these issues in the context of the gentrifying East End of London.

RESEARCH CONTEXT: EAST LONDON

The research context that I discuss here is the inner-city area of East London, broadly defined by the two councils, Hackney and Tower-Hamlets (see figure 1). Historically, London's East End was home to large-scale production and manufacturing industries owing to its proximity to the River Thames and the construction of the London Docks in the 1800's. At this time, the population was mostly employed in manual industries such as the silk-weaving trade in Spitalfields and the ship-building yards in the Docklands.

[FIGURE 1]

With an influx of new industries, came an increased demand for affordable housing. Residents often experienced cramped and dangerous living conditions, with many living in slums. As a consequence, East London quickly became synonymous with poverty, criminality, and deprivation (Saumarez Smith 2017). These issues were compounded during World War Two when, owing to the concentration of industry in

7

the area, intensive bombing campaigns devastated East London.

To address labour shortages following the war, migration was actively encouraged. Initiatives such as the introduction of the British Nationality Act in 1948 which conferred citizenship on Commonwealth members invited migrants to reside in the UK, with many settling in East London. There, migrants established vibrant diasporic communities, such as the Afro-Caribbean community in Hackney Town and the Turkish community in Stoke Newington (north Hackney).

From the 1960's, however, East London fell into decline and a period of de-industrialisation ensued, leading to the closure of many of the industries that employed the local community. In search for better opportunities, many of the White working-class community, often referred to as 'Cockneys', relocated to outer London boroughs and parts of Essex to new suburban towns – a period sometimes referred to as 'White flight' (Bridge, Butler, & Lees 2011; Fox 2015).

For some time, East London continued see higher levels of deprivation than elsewhere in the capital. In the 1950's and 60's, much of the East End was controlled by gangs, including the infamous Kray Twins. The area continued to be associated high levels of crime and deprivation well into the 2000's. In 2002, the Independent newspaper dubbed a stretch of road in the Hackney neighbourhood, Clapton, 'Britain's murder mile' in reference to the eight people who were murdered on the road over two years (Mendick & Johnson 2002). To some degree, perceptions of criminality were reflected in statistical measures of crime and deprivation. In 2007, Hackney and Tower Hamlets were reported as the 2nd and 3rd most deprived boroughs in the UK on the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2007).

Nevertheless, over the past 20-30 years, East London has seen considerable improvements in living conditions. Since 2007, the two boroughs have seen an exponential decrease in levels of crime and poverty. Just eight years later, Hackney and Tower Hamlets rank as the 49th and 24th of deprived boroughs in the UK (IMD 2015).

These improvements have occurred alongside visible and perceptible changes in East London.

Today, Hackney is home to a vibrant cultural scene, comprised of leading artists, musicians, and fashion designers. It is often described as one of the 'trendiest' neighbourhoods in London (Saumarez Smith 2017). In 2017, Shoreditch – a neighbourhood in the south of Hackney often referred to as 'hipster heaven' (Anthony 2018) – became the most expensive tech and creative district in the world (Rayner 2018). To account for the increased demand in residential and commercial space, councils have often adopted intensive regeneration and densification policies (e.g., Hackney 2019). These policies have led some commentators to warn of an apparent 'cultural cleansing' (Anthony 2018) in which the distinctive cultural and ethnic genealogies of East London are erased.

RESEARCH METHODS

The setting that I describe here, and the data that I consider herein, are taken from two separate ethnographic projects conducted in East London. First, an extended period of fieldwork with 26 adolescents at a youth-group that was part of a wider project on language use in East London (Ilbury 2020) and second, a separate ethnography of 16 London-based young adults' digital practices on the mobile messaging app, WhatsApp, that is part of a broader project on digital interactions.

The first dataset is from an ethnography of a Hackney youth-group which I refer to as 'Lakeside' where I was involved as youth worker in the general running of the centre for two years from October 2016 to October 2018. There I conducted research on the linguistic practices of the young people in relation to more general patterns of sociolinguistic variation in East London (cf. Cheshire et al. 2008).

The dataset that I focus on in this paper comprises mainly of interviews which took place at Lakeside with 11 adolescents aged between 11-17. The group are ethnically diverse, but most are second generation African-Caribbean, representing the largest ethnic group in the area. The youth-centre is based in the centre of social-housing estate that continues to experience some of the highest levels of deprivation in the borough. Interviews covered a range of topics such as their heritage, the youth group, and their interests. This was concluded with a task where the participant was presented

with a map of the local area and asked to identify areas that they were familiar with. When they

recognized a location, I would ask follow-up questions to find out more about their perceptions of the

area. This task was directly related to the focus of the broader study which considered variable patterns

of language use amongst adolescents in East London. Thus, the discussions I examine and the themes

that I analyse are not contrived but rather emerged in the natural course of the interview and the map

task. To protect the identities of my participants, all identifying information is anonymised and

participants are assigned pseudonyms.

The second source of data is a corpus of WhatsApp messages sent by 16 young adults (14

females, 2 males) aged between 24 and 25 across three conversational groups. The WhatsApp corpus

was collected as part of a wider project on digital patterns of interaction amongst young adults in

London, which involved ethnographic observations of participants outside of the mobile messaging app.

All individuals are middle-class and highly educated with all but one completing University education.

There is less ethnic diversity amongst them with all but two users identifying as White British. All users

are originally from the South/South-East of England. Importantly, all these individuals can be classified

as 'gentrifiers', with most of this group relocating to gentrifying neighbourhoods of London. Those who

did not live in East London were based elsewhere in the city but frequently visited the area, most often

to experience the East London's notorious cultural and nightlife scene. Thus, whilst some of these

individuals did not physically reside in the area, their experiences of and engagements in East London

significantly shape their attachment to 'place'.

The WhatsApp interactions that I analyse here are taken from a corpus of 96,463 messages sent

between August 2015 and May 2017. Conversations are diverse but are mainly informal interactions

amongst friends. Topics include general phatic communication, social plans, and life events. Thus, as

with the interviews recorded at the youth group, the discussions and themes that I analyse in this paper

are not contrived but emerged naturally in conversation. Relevant interactions were identified by

performing key-word searches on the dataset, using derivatives of the terms 'gentrification', 'London', 'city', and various East London place names to identify any relevant threads. All data has been anonymised and participants were assigned pseudonyms.

Here it is worth acknowledging that there are clear differences in these two datasets and this is likely to affect the generalisability of my claims. The Lakeside dataset was elicited directly from the young people in synchronous interviews. The WhatsApp conversations, on the other hand, were extracted in textual format, retrospectively. Whilst these differences may have an impact on the structure and the nature of the data, it should be noted that the two research projects that inform this analysis were not designed to examine the sociolinguistic consequences of urban generation (cf. Papen 2012; Trinch & Snajdr 2016; Baro 2017; Goncalves 2018; Vandenbroucke 2018). However, given the dramatic changes to East London in the past 20 years and the perceived impact of urban regeneration on those who reside in the area, it is significant that these themes emerge in the everyday conversations of these communities. Indeed, at Lakeside, many of the youth workers bemoaned the loss of local and independent shops in the area whilst club management regularly expressed concerns that rising living costs in the area would affect the operation of the centre. Over time, several youth workers were forced to relocate in more affordable, outer-London boroughs and so volunteering at the club was no longer feasible. Whilst amongst the young adults in the WhatsApp study, aware of the regeneration in the area, conversations about new shops and restaurants that emerged during their time living there were common, both on the app and in face-to-face conversation. Thus, I combine these data sources to analyse more generally the extent of gentrification discourses in everyday conversations amongst young people in East London. Whilst I focus on a select few extracts in this paper, the themes that I analyse here are reflective of more general trends that I observed whilst conducting my ethnographic research.

Before presenting my analysis, it is necessary here to specify my positioning in this paper as someone who is part of the 'gentrifier' community. I am a White, middle-class, London-born academic,

who relocated from a more affluent area in South-West London to the borough where I conducted my research. Thus, it is necessary to acknowledge that my account is articulated through the 'gaze' of the gentrifier and my interpretations are necessarily constrained by these biographical facts (Tedlock 1991; Irvine & Gal 2000; Bucholtz 2001; Hegelund 2005). Nevertheless, by exercising a degree of self-reflexivity in my research, I aim to provide an accurate and unbiased account of the narratives that emerged in my fieldwork.

CONCEPTUALISING PLACE AS THE GENTRIFIED

In the first section of the analysis, I examine how working-class adolescents at Lakeside discuss the effects of gentrification. Extract 1 is from an interview with Michael and Josh. Both boys are fifteen. Michael is White British, and Marcus is second generation African-Caribbean. In the extract I ask whether they would be able to identify the specific part of London a speaker was from based on their speech. In this case, the area is Finsbury Park – a North London neighbourhood approximately 3 miles from Lakeside.

Extract 1

1	Christian	could you tell if somebody's from F--Finsbury Park?
2	Michael	nah, not really cos it's kinda similar
[…]		
3	Michael	but if […] central London, they have a different way of speaking and
4		then different people live there
5	Marcus	differently
6	Christian	yeah in what like how are they different?
7	Marcus	more formal
8	Michael	central London are more formal people

Michael initially responds to my question by suggesting that he wouldn't be able to identify if someone was from Finsbury Park because of the similarities between the two areas (line 1). In many ways, this area is comparable to the locale where the youth group is based. Like the area surrounding Lakeside, Finsbury Park is ethnically diverse and, whilst the town centre has been regenerated, the area has not yet been fully gentrified. As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that Michael does not distinguish between the two areas. Rather, Michael indexes an alignment with the working-class demographic that reside in Finsbury Park as a comparable demographic to himself and his community (line 2).

In the following lines, however, and with no prompt, Michael shifts from describing a relatively similar locale, to one that he perceives to be poles apart from his neighbourhood: Central London[2]. At first, Michael frames the differences between the two areas in terms of the distinct linguistic varieties that are spoken there (line 3). However, as he elaborates, his assessment reveals that the differences that he perceives are not purely linguistic but also socio-cultural, in terms of the 'type' of the person that resides there (line 4). The nature of these differences is clarified in lines 7-8. Here, Marcus and Michael's evaluation of the differences between 'us' – the people of the local area – and 'them' – those in the city, indirectly references a class-based opposition between the working- and middle-class, metaphorically indexed as a scale of 'formality'. At this point Michael draws on an ideologically imagined stereotypical persona – or what Agha (2003) terms a 'characterological figure' – of the archetypal White city-worker. For Michael, this persona is imbued with the 'appropriate' linguistic, aesthetic, and cultural forms of 'social capital' (Bourdieu 1984) that is conducive to obtaining and benefiting from the professional and economic opportunities that the city offers.

In what follows, Michael describes the 'differences' between himself and his community, and the city worker persona (line 5). This permits Michael and Marcus to claim an identity that is the antithesis of the archetypal person who lives and works in the city. In doing so, Michael and Marcus align with an 'informal' self-presentation style – an identity which is deemed suitable for the

neighbourhood in which they reside. Here, this 'us' vs. 'them' categorisation (Banaś 2018) infers that the boys reject a monolithic 'Londoner' identity by aligning with a much more peripheral, localised identity: the working-class community in East London (cf. Cornips & de Rooij 2018).

Extract 2

1	Christian	do you go central London?
2	Josiah	I do not go central London, no way
3	Christian	why don't go you central London?
4	Josiah	central London, pigs everywhere, everywhere like--it's--it's basically like right next to what's her name, Theresa May's house

Similar themes are seen in extract 2. This excerpt is taken from a discussion of the map task with thirteen-year-old Josiah who is second generation African-Caribbean. In the discussion, I ask whether Josiah ever ventures into central London – a question to which he responds with an emphatic 'no way' (line 2). When I attempt to clarify the reasons for this assertion, Josiah claims that there's 'pigs [police] everywhere' before going on to suggest that the area is adjacent to former UK Prime Minister, Theresa May's residence. Of course, whilst this is factually accurate – Downing Street, the residence of the Prime Minister *is* located in Central London – it is perhaps notable that like Michael in extract 1, Josiah draws on an enregistered characterological figure (Agha 2003) to distance himself from the cultural habitus (Bourdieu 1990) that he associates with the city. In this extract, it is Theresa May who serves as the archetypal White, middle-class, 'formal', individual who works and/or resides in the city.

However, perhaps the most illuminating comment that reflects Josiah's alignment with an 'outsider' status is his comments regarding the prevalence of police ('pigs') in Central London. As I have argued earlier, it is necessary to examine 'place-making' from an intersectional perspective (see Yuval-Davis 2006; Christensen 2009). Here, I suggest that Josiah's comments in line 4 cannot be attributed

solely to his membership of a specific social class, but rather must be understood in relation to his experiences as a young Black man in London. As a member of a demographic is disproportionately targeted by the Metropolitan Police (e.g., 'stop and search' measures; Dodd 2019), it is highly likely that Josiah's concern – and his alignment away from Central London – reflects his awareness of the potential issues that he, and other Black individuals, experience in the city. Indeed, in other interviews, non-white participants expressed similar sentiments. As such, the 'outsider' status that they claim is reinforced by their racialised experiences with institutions that uphold the values of the city, in this case, the police force. Thus, we see that the (perceived) inaccessibility of the city that Josiah describes hinges not just on the differences in socio-economic class between those in the city and his community, but also his racialised identity in what is (perceived to be) a dominant 'White space' (Atkinson & Bridge 2005).[3]

To some degree, it is possible that these narratives are influenced by the status of Central London as the administrative and financial centre of the city. However, it is notable that areas geographically closer to the youth group are framed in comparative ways. Indeed, similar discourses emerge when the young people discuss the neighbourhood of Shoreditch – an area approximately one mile away from Lakeside that is often described as the poster child of gentrification (e.g., Anthony 2018). A case in point is found in extract 3. Sam is fifteen and is African-Caribbean British. Talisha is thirteen and Mixed-White British.

Extract 3

1	Sam	yeah Shoreditch is er--
2	Talisha	yeah
3	Sam	--kinda different to Hackney it's
4	Christian	how come?
5	Sam	it's not, it's--it's on the outskirts of Hackney and people like act and talk
6		differently in Shoreditch but it's--it's more

7	Talisha	yeah
8	Sam	posh actually

Initially, Sam describes Shoreditch as 'different' from his neighbourhood (line 3), in a similar respect to how Michael frames central London in extract 1. Sam's comment suggests that whilst the neighbourhood is administratively and geographically tied to the borough, he perceives the area to be culturally and socially distinct from what he knows to be 'Hackney'. This interpretation is supported by his use of spatial deixis ('outskirts' line 5) which allows Sam to distance himself not only from the physical geographic locale but also metaphorically by indirectly emphasising the conceptual distance between the dispositions and practices of his community and those reside in Shoreditch.

As Sam elaborates on these differences, we see that, like his peers in extract 1 and 2, he draws on the imagery of the 'archetypal resident' to emphasise the disparities between the two neighbourhoods. In lines 5 and 6, Sam relates these differences to the social ('act') and linguistic ('talk') qualities of his community and those who reside in Shoreditch. Like Marcus and Michael, Sam details some of the enregistered (Agha 2007) qualities of that person – in this case indirectly attributing the differences to social class distinctions, using the euphemism 'posh'. This descriptor not only alludes to the 'standard' and upper-class models of speaking (e.g., Rampton 2006; Preece 2009:1; Gates & Ilbury 2019) that he associates with gentrifiers, but also to the disparate economic realities of the two communities, in particular the luxurious and expensive commodities that index the middle-class. Thus, as is the effect in extracts 1 and 2 in relation to Central London, Sam indexes a distinction between 'us' – his community and 'them' – those residing in the neighbouring and gentrifying area of Shoreditch.

Extract 4

1	Christian	what part of Hoxton?
2	Josiah	what part? Hoxton, just off of Hoxton Market

3	Christian	Shoreditch, oh Hoxton Market
4	Josiah	yeah, Shoreditch-ish Shoreditch-ish. Basically you know where's St John's
5	Christian	yeah shak--
6	Josiah	yeah go straight down there where all the posh people live

A similar assessment of the encroaching gentrification of Hackney is offered in extract 4. In the excerpt, Josiah is describing a park where he would often hang out with his friends. The park is based in an area just north of Shoreditch – Hoxton – a neighbourhood that is undergoing regeneration. Struggling to ascertain the exact location of the park he is referring to, I ask whether it is near the highly gentrified neighbourhood of Shoreditch. This leads Josiah to distinguish between the two areas by referencing the disparate economic realities of the two communities (line 6). Like Sam in extract 3, Josiah associates this area with upwardly mobile and economically stable, i.e., middle-class, residents. He does this by referencing an enregistered quality of the stereotypical 'resident' by using the term 'posh' to distinguish himself from this social identification, delimiting a socio-spatial boundary between himself – and his experiences of Hackney – and those in the gentrifying district of Shoreditch. This allows Josiah to adopt an antithetical identity, aligning with those who are not deemed to part of the area 'where all the posh people live' – the working-class community in his neighbourhood.

Analysed collectively, these two extracts reveal that gentrification is framed by Sam and Josiah as a class-struggle, where regenerating neighbourhoods become perceived as 'exclusionary areas' (see also Trinch & Snajdr 2016:83). This bipartite distinction is reflective of what Robson and Butler (2001) refer to as 'tectonic' social relations, where interactions between middle-class and working-class residents are seen to operate in a 'parallel rather than integrative nature' (2001:78). In other words, what Sam and Josiah's comments reveal is that whilst these neighbours reside in the same physical locale, they conceptualise their attachment to place as distinct from the 'Other' – the 'posh' community. In taking this stance, they not only index their belonging with the local working-class community in

Hackney, but they also index their 'unbelonging' (Yuval-Davis 2006; Christensen 2009) of the newly

arrived gentrifying community in the area and their associated cultural and social values.

Similar themes of segregation and 'disbelonging' are also evident in those discussions that

centre on changes to the socio-cultural diversity of the local area. These narratives largely reflect

broader concerns that gentrification poses a threat to the distinct cultural genealogy of East London

(e.g., Anthony, 2018). In other areas, researchers have argued that whilst the ethnic, linguistic and

cultural diversity of the working-class neighbourhood is initially advertised to prospective residents

positively, offering middle-class residents an 'experiential lifestyle of exciting Otherness' (Erbacher

2011:2016), gentrification often leads to the loss of diversity as areas become more ethnically and

culturally homogeneous (Atkinson & Bridge 2005; Kohn 2013; Trinch & Snajdr 2016). In conversations

with the young people, an awareness of these discourses was evident. In interviews, many

acknowledged the changing identity of the local Highstreet, and several spoke of the loss of local

initiatives, such as youth-groups and community centres. A case in point is the following extract where

Sam elaborates on his earlier comments in extract 3.

Extract 5

1	Sam	Shoreditch there's a big difference in areas
2	Christian	but do you feel like it's changing here even so like?
3	Sam	yeah it's--it is
4	Talisha	yeah
5	Sam	cos they're just making council houses so they was all--they're trying to make it
6		all the same
7	Christian	what--what do you mean they're making council h--what do you mean?
8	Sam	like they're building flats like everywhere just to make everyone live in home so
9		they're all what's the word, erm they're all the same like --there's--they're maki–

10		different areas were different for good that were good for different things, but
11		now they're just making it all the same
12	Christian	mhm
13	Sam	like one big whole city but we're not

In the extract, Sam's assessment of the changing landscape of the area hinges on the homogenisation of

the local area and the displacement of working-class communities and their cultures – two main effects

of gentrification (Butler & Robson 2003; Lees et al. 2008; Kohn 2013). Sam first acknowledges the

displacement of his community by referencing the eradication of 'council houses' (line 5), i.e., social

housing that is primarily occupied by working-class or low-income residents. As he elaborates, Sam

argues that 'they're trying to make it all the same' (line 5 and 6), a comment that reflects his awareness

of the increasing cultural and homogenisation of his neighbourhood and the increasing number of so-

called 'identikit' developments (Kallin 2018) in the area.

As the conversation progresses, I ask Sam to elaborate. In what follows, he provides a mature

and comprehensive account of the effects of gentrification, describing the homogenisation or 'cultural

cleansing' of the area (Lees et al. 2008; Anthony 2018). In line 8, Sam notes that 'they [the council] are

just building flats everywhere'. Here, Sam references the intensification of residential building-works in

the borough following a council initiative by that called for higher density developments in key wards

(Hackney 2019). This includes the neighbourhood in which he resides. Whilst densification initiatives

have often been justified as ways of addressing the lack of affordable housing in the city, these policies

often have negative consequences for residents already residing in the area (Hubbard & Lees 2018).

As the conversation progresses, Sam adds some support for his claims. In line 10, he views the

council's densification campaign as promoting a type of social cleansing, claiming that areas which were

once 'good' (i.e., distinctive) for certain reasons (line 10) are becoming more socially homogeneous (line

11). Finally, he concludes that he is concerned that the distinctive ethnic and cultural identity of the

neighbourhood will become obsolete as the neighbourhood becomes part of 'one whole big city' (line 13). Thus, like his peers, Sam rejects a centralised monolithic identity of the 'Londoner', instead aligning with the more peripheral identity that tied to the working-class histories and identities of the working-class community who reside in his neighbourhood

Of course, it is necessary to acknowledge that Sam's narrative – as with all of my participants – is articulated from the perspective of his lived experience. For Sam, his account of the effects of gentrification articulated from the gaze of a young Black man. Thus, these comments are racialised in the extent to which the homogenisation that he speaks of directly affects other individuals with migrant backgrounds. For Sam, these issues are perhaps more salient since urban regeneration in the area is likely to dramatically alter the racial composition and ethnic heritage of the local neighbourhood (Lees 2016). Indeed, the area surrounding Lakeside was home to a large Black African-Caribbean population and local shops were seen to cater specifically for this demographic, including restaurants specialising in Caribbean cuisine, and hair stylists that specialized in Afro-textured hair. Over the course of my time at the youth group, many of Sam's concerns in extract 5 became realities. Many of the local commodities that catered for his community closed, with craft beer stores and upmarket coffee shops opening in place of these venues. Whilst many of these venues catered primarily to the tastes and social habits of his parents' generation (e.g., restaurants and bars), and similar complaints were expressed by the adult youth workers, it is perhaps notable that Sam – at just fifteen – decries the loss of these commodities. This suggests that the homogenisation that Sam speaks of in extract 5 does not just reference the socio-spatial displacement of the working-class community, but also his awareness that urban regeneration poses a threat to the distinct cultural heritage of the area and his community.

Whilst there has been some research which suggests that there is ambivalence amongst working-class youth towards urban regeneration and gentrifiers (e.g., Butcher & Dickens 2016), this does not appear to be the case in this context. Whilst I explore only a limited set of examples here, the

themes that I describe in those extracts are indicative of a more general perception amongst the participants at Lakeside that urban regeneration is a threat to the cultural and social life of the local community. A potential explanation for this framing is that, whilst other neighbourhoods were seen to benefit from regeneration such as improved social housing, the estate where Lakeside is based remained heavily deprived. In fact, the only perceptible effects of gentrification in the estate were negative: Increasing living costs and the ensuing displacement of friends and family, the loss of cultural heritage, and the emergence of a middle-class who were seen to seldom interact with the local community.

However, whilst these narratives reveal how working-class young people conceptualise place in a rapidly gentrifying neighbourhood, it is unclear how this relates to the middle-class experience of the same area. To explore these questions, I now turn to an analysis of interactions between gentrifiers.

CONCEPTUALISING PLACE AS A GENTRIFIER

This section examines discourses of place and gentrification in the narratives of young London-based adults. Although this group do not bear the corporate social responsibility of urban regeneration (cf. Lees et al. 2008), these individuals are representative of some of the characterological stereotypes (Agha 2003) that the young people draw on in the previously analysed discussions. As such, this demographic represents an appropriate point of comparison.

First, however, it is necessary to acknowledge that, since this group of individuals have largely secured employment in the city, we do not see any comparable discourses regarding the inaccessibility of the professional, economic, or social opportunities that central London affords. Rather, these individuals already have access to the appropriate social habitus (Bourdieu 1990) to benefit from the economic and professional opportunities offered by the city – prospects which are deemed inaccessible by those at Lakeside. Nevertheless, there is still some prevalent discourses of gentrification in their discussions. However, unlike the young people in previous sections, when urban regeneration is

discussed amongst this group, these changes are generally characterised as 'positive' developments that 'improve' the area, as part of a broader legitimisation ideology that is imbued with colonial overtones (Atkinson & Bridge 2005).

Most often, these discourses are drawn on when gentrifiers discuss areas that were previously designated 'no-go zones' (Milani 2020) due to the area's historical association with crime and deprivation. In these instances, gentrification is framed as a 'transformative process' that restores areas once deemed 'off-limits' and turns them into attractive neighbourhoods that offer new exciting cultural and professional opportunities for this community.

Extract 6

1	Monica	So I think I'm doing dinner on Sat with Laura but Aaron is up for going out after.
2		Only problem is he doesn't like Hackney...
3	Rachel	Okay , maybe another time we will see him 😂
4	Monica	when he stops being a wimp. Apparently he just doesn't like Hackney as he
5		thinks it's dodgy
6	Rachel	Wtf
7		Is that a joke
8		It's so gentrified
[…]		
9	Monica	I know but he doesn't know that because he's not been there
10	Rachel	Well if he can't get a grip , feel free to come without him

A case in point is extract 6. In the excerpt, Monica and Rachel are discussing organising a social event with friends Laura and Aaron. In line 1, Monica suggests going out after the meal, before noting a potential problem with her choice of location: that Aaron 'doesn't like Hackney' (line 2). As the

conversation progresses, it becomes clear that Aaron's reservations of going out in Hackney hinge on his

perception of the area as unsafe or 'dodgy' (line 5) – a stereotype reflective of the historically high levels

of crime and deprivation in the area. This assessment is swiftly quashed by Rachel in lines 6-8, where she

ridicules his assessment ('WTF', *what the fuck*) by ascertaining whether his comment was sincere ('Is

that a joke'). Finally, in line 8, Rachel further seeks to disprove Aaron's assessment by claiming that

Hackney's 'so gentrified' (line 8).

In this extract, we see how gentrification is framed as a 'transformative' process that 'revitalises'

the urban environment. This legitimizing ideology is drawn on directly by Rachel when she equates

gentrification with the reduction of criminality in the neighbourhood (cf. Brown-Saracino & Rumpf

2011). Suggestions that the area is unsafe, therefore, appear to be unfounded given the extent of the

regeneration, signalled by the intensifier 'so' (line 8). This framing is not only problematic, but it is also

unfounded. Whilst some research has shown gentrification can lead to better community provisions, in

some areas crime has risen following periods of urban regeneration (e.g., Van Wilsem, Wittebrood, &

Dirk De Graaf 2006).

Nevertheless, in the lines following, we see a similar legitimising strategy when Monica aligns

with Rachel's standpoint by suggesting that Aaron's misconception of Hackney is based on a lack of

awareness, noting that 'he hasn't been there' (line 11). Here, Monica's comment suggests that the

changes to a particular area can be 'experienced' by simply visiting an area. Thus, whether Hackney is

deemed to be a 'safe' or 'unsafe' area is judged a posteriori, based on first-hand experience of the

aesthetic and visual landscape of the neighbourhood, as opposed to empirical measures of crime and

deprivation. Thus, for Monica, it is the experience of the (linguistic) landscape that the 'positive' effects

of gentrification can be judged (Papen 2012; Tinch & Snajdr 2017).

Similar legitimising discourses are seen in extract 7. In this excerpt, a group of housemates are

discussing moving to a new house at the end of their tenancy agreement. This topic leads Lisa to ask

London native, Paul, which area he dislikes more – the South London neighbourhood of Elephant and

Castle or an area that borders Hackney in North London, Tottenham. Paul responds that it is Tottenham

that he dislikes more (line 3), before suggesting that he perceives Elephant and Castle to be moderately

better because it is becoming gentrified (line 3-4). Thus, for Paul, whether these traditionally working-

class areas are deemed habitable is dependent on the extent to which they have been regenerated.

As the conversation develops, we see the nature of these 'positive' effects, with gentrification

attributed as a 'solution' to issues of crime and deprivation. In line 5, this connection is made explicit

when Paul refers to Tottenham as the 'Mark Duggan area' – an individual who was murdered by the

Metropolitan Police in 2011 and whose death led to the notorious London Riots of that year.

Extract 7

1	Lisa	Paul which do you hate more
2		Tottenham or elephant and castle
3	Paul	Tottenham. My God. Elephant and Castle at least it's getting the gentrification
4		thing
5		Tottenham was the Mark Duggan area
6	Lisa	Hahaha agreed
7		Am I the only one in tonight?

 By introducing this high-profile incident, Paul not only characterises Tottenham as 'off-limits' but also,

he infers that that the area's high crime rates can be directly attributed to a lack of regeneration in the

area. For Paul, then, gentrification is perceived to be a 'positive' process that reduces criminality, and

ultimately, makes the area more habitable for him and his middle-class peers. This legitimisation

ideology not only asserts and justifies the expansion of 'White space' and privileges middle-class

preferences of urban living (Atkinson & Bridge 2005:2), but also validates those perceptions of the socio-

spatial segregation that emerged in the young people's interviews at Lakeside.

The appearance of these legitimisation ideologies can be understood in relation to the 'value' of urban regeneration in the area. Whilst young people at Lakeside face increasing constraints on their access to the city and the loss of their cultural heritage, for middle-class residents, the emergence of craft beer shops, luxury residential apartments, and artisan coffee shops that specifically cater to the tastes of the gentrifiers provides new social opportunities for this community. An appreciation of these commodities is seen in extract 8.

Extract 8

1	Jal	Holy Shit guys
2	Jal	Just went to my mates flat in London fields
3	Jal	He lives in a converted warehouse
4	Jal	It is the coolest thing ever
5	Jal	We need to move to one hahaha
6	Lisa	Amazing!!!!
7	Laura	Yessss
8	Laura	Let's do it

The discussion starts when Jal returns from her friend's apartment – a warehouse conversion – in the Hackney neighbourhood of London Fields. Like many areas of Hackney, London Fields has seen considerable regeneration, with much of the industry in the area repurposed for residential use. As the discussion unfolders, Jal positively evaluates the 'urban cool' aesthetic of the conversion before flippantly encouraging the rest of the group to move to a similar residential unit.

In this extract, we not only see how urban regeneration results in an increase of commodities that cater to middle-class tastes, but also how the inevitable expansion of White space (Atkinson & Bridge 2005) eradicates the area's distinctive socio-cultural histories and traditions – a concern

expressed at Lakeside by Sam in extract 5. With these individuals expressing a desire for the 'edgy'

urban aesthetic of these developments (Erbacher 2011), we see how warehouses and factories that

once provided employment for the working-class community are redesigned for the residential

requirements of the middle-class. In this sense there is both a physical displacement, through the loss of

industry, and cultural erasure, through the appropriation of industrial symbols, histories, and

commodities, of the working-class.

Similar themes are observed in discussions which centre on the emergence of commodities

which cater to the enregistered (Agha 2007) class practices and dispositions of the newly arrived middle-

class. In extract 9 below, we see how the group participate in this enregistered habitus (Bourdieu 1990).

Prior to the excerpt, the group are discussing their plans for the evening, before Laura interjects with the

observation that there's a new 'cute' coffee shop in town (line 1). She juxtaposes this observation with

the location of the coffee shop, noting that it's attached to the 'butters' (i.e., ugly) City Central hotel – a

budget overnight accommodation that was in operation before the redevelopment of the area.

Extract 9

1	Laura	Guys there's a really cute little coffee shop and cafe attached to that butters city
2		central hotel
3		Gentrification ❤️❤️❤️
4	Lisa	Hahahah

In line 3, Laura – somewhat flippantly – associates the opening of the new coffee shop with the

gentrification in the area, signifying her positive evaluation of this development by using three love-

heart emojis. The relevance of the commodity ('coffee') in this extract is striking. Appreciation of coffee,

particularly artisan and high-grade coffee, is often considered stereotypical of middle-class tastes and

dispositions (Cotter & Valentinsson 2018). Indeed, the emergence of upscale coffee shops in an area is

often considered symptomatic of gentrification (e.g., Grier & Perry 2018). Thus, we see here how the celebration that Laura participates in, reflects a more general appreciation of emerging commodities that are intended to serve the tastes and dispositions of the middle-class community. It is therefore unsurprising that legitimisation ideologies that justify gentrification are so prevalent in gentrifiers narratives since, unlike the youth at Lakeside who experience increasing restrictions on their access to the city, regeneration results in greater socio-spatial access for middle-class residents.

Nevertheless, whilst the excerpts I analyse here may suggest a lack of ambivalence towards gentrification amongst this demographic, there was some awareness of the negative consequences of these changes. In ethnographic observations of the group outside of WhatsApp, the group demonstrated some self-reflexivity as gentrifiers in East London. For instance, some of the individuals who occupied a house share in the area, often mentioned that they felt uneasy about residing in a flat that was ex-social housing, whilst others acknowledged that the area was becoming 'too gentrified'. However, whilst these comments reflect some awareness of gentrification, this group were seldom seen to engage in any social action that could address these concerns. In the next section, I provide some suggestions as to how research conducted by members of this community could increase intercommunity engagement.

GENTRIFICATION RESEARCH AND INTERCOMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Before drawing this paper to a conclusion, I wish to suggest that the issues explored in this paper should not be purely deliberated, but rather should act as the impetus for increasing intercommunity engagement through academic research. Specifically, I suggest that urban research contexts such as the one described here, present researchers with opportunities to engage with marginalised communities beyond the scope of our research questions. As social researchers who occupy a privileged standpoint (Bucholtz 2001), we not only have a duty to represent the voices of the marginalised – such as those negatively affected by urban regeneration – but also, to help improve the conditions of those who we

27

learn from. In our fieldwork, we can make an active difference to our research population by supporting

community initiatives such as youth groups or local events, as well as leading outreach initiatives to

increase access to academic research. In doing so, we will not only be able to increase engagement in

sociolinguistic research (e.g., Wolfram 1993), but also work towards deconstructing perceptions of the

'Other' to improve intercommunity relations.

CONCLUSION: A TALE OF TWO CITIES

In this article I have examined how working-class youth and middle-class young adults conceptualise

'place' in the context of gentrifying East London by exploring the 'tectonic' (Robson & Butler 2001:78)

relationship between the two communities. I have argued that, for the young people, place attachment

is localised in relation to the specific cultural and ethnic heritage of the immediate neighbourhood. For

these young people, urban regeneration and redevelopment are perceived to be threats to their ethnic

and social identities. Place-attachment is thus dependent on their alignment with the local community,

as opposed to the city.

For the gentrifiers, on the other hand, regeneration and urban redevelopment are

conceptualised positively, with these developments justified through a series of legitimising discourses

that emphasise the perceived positive social changes, such as the reduction in crime. The resulting

expansion of White space, I argue, results in a type of 'urban colonialism' (Atkinson & Bridge 2005),

where gentrifiers are afforded greater access to the city, including areas which were previously

designated by this community to be 'no-go zones' (Milani 2020). Thus, the working-class population are

not only socio-economically displaced in terms of the rising living costs associated with regenerated

areas, but are also culturally, and physically displaced (Lees et al. 2008) as the 'appropriate' areas for

this community to reside and socialise in become more restrictive. This socio-spatial segregation I argue

leads to a situation where, although the two communities physically reside in the same city (and indeed,

in some cases the same neighbourhood), they conceptualise 'place' in radically different ways, by

28

indexing a type of 'disbelonging' (Yuval-Davis 2006) from one other. Thus, whilst residents physically reside, work, and socialise side-by-side, they conceptually and metaphorically occupy different cities – essentially, a 'tale of two cities'.

Notes

[1] Special thanks to Jessi Grieser and Kellie Gonçalves for inviting me to contribute to a panel on 'Language and Gentrification' at Sociolinguistics Symposium 22, where I presented an earlier version of this paper. Thanks too to the audience of SS22 and at Research Seminars at Queen Mary University of London who provided invaluable feedback on this work. I am also extremely grateful to the reviewers and editors of Language and Society who provided detailed and incisive comments on earlier versions of this article. I alone am responsible for any remaining errors or shortcomings.

[2] In this context, Central London is used as a metonym for the City of London and the City of Westminster – the administrative, financial, and business centre of inner-London

[3] A possible counter argument is that, as adolescents, these individuals would see little need to visit central London, as the administrative and economic centre of the city. However, as Londoner who grew up in a largely White, middle-class suburban area of Greater London, I cannot say that this was not my own experience. Indeed, I would regularly visit 'central London' when I was a comparable age with friends and family, and I cannot say that I shared the same concerns expressed by Josiah.

Agha, Asif. 2003. The social life of cultural value. *Language and Communication*. 23 (3/4):231-273.

Agha, Asif. 2007. *Language and social relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anthony, Andrew. 2018. Shoreditch: is hipster heaven now falling prey to 'cultural cleansing'?. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/jul/22/shoreditch-east-end-london-art-hub-big-business-gentrification [accessed 17.08.2020].

Atkinson, Rowland and Gary Bridge. 2005. *Gentrification in a global context: The new urban colonialism*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Banaś, Anna. 2018. Analyzing belonging among Japanese immigrant women in The Netherlands. In Leonie Cornips and Vincent de Rooij (eds.), *The sociolinguistics of place and belonging: Perspectives from the margins*, 89–112. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Baro, Gilles. 2017. The Language of urban development in Johannesburg's inner city. *Multilingual Margins.* 4(1): 40-52.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard: Routledge and Kagan Paul Ltd.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bridge, Garry; Tim Butler and Loretta Lees. 2011. *Mixed communities: Gentrification by stealth?* Bristol: Policy Press.

Bridge, Gary. 1994. Gentrification, class, and residence: A reappraisal. *Journal of Society and Space*. 12(1): 31-51.

Britain, David. 2016. Sedentarism and nomadism in the sociolinguistics of dialect. In Nikolas Coupland (ed.). *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates,* 217-241. Cambridge: CUP.

Brown-Saracino, Japonica and Cesraea Rumpf. 2011. 'Diverse Imageries of Gentrification: Evidence from Newspaper Coverage in Major U.S. Cities, 1986 – 2006. *Journal of Urban Affairs*. 33(3): 289-315.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2001. Reflexivity and Critique in Discourse Analysis. *Critique of Anthropology*. 21 (2): 165-183.

Butcher, Melissa and Luke Dickens. 2016. Spatial dislocation and affective displacement: Youth perspectives on gentrification in London. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.* 40 (4): 800-816.

Butcher, Melissa and Mandy Thomas. 2003. *Ingenious: Emerging youth cultures in urban Australia*. Melbourne: Pluto Press.

Butler, Tim and Chris Hamnett. 2011. *Ethnicity, class and aspiration: Understanding East London's new East End.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Butler, Tim and Garry Robson. 2003. *London Calling: The middle classes and the remaking of inner London*. London: Bloomsbury.

Buttimer, Anne. 1976. Grasping the dynamism of lifeworld. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 66 (2): 277-92.

Campkin, Ben. 2013. *Remaking London: Decline and regeneration in urban culture*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Cheshire, Jenny; Sue Fox; Paul Kerswill and Eivind Torgersen. 2008. Ethnicity, friendship network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: linguistic innovation in London. In Ulrich Ammon and Klaus J. Mattheier (eds), *Sociolinguistica: International yearbook of European sociolinguistics*, vol. 22, 1-23. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Christensen, Ann-Dorte. 2009. Belonging and unbelonging from an intersectional perspective. *Journal of Gender, Technology and Development.* 13 (1): 21-41.

Cornips and de Rooij, 2018. Introduction: Belonging through linguistic place-making in centre-periphery constellations. In Leonie Cornips and Vincent de Rooij (eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of place and belonging: Perspectives from the margins*, 1-16. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Cotter, William M. and Mary-Caitlyn Valentinsson. 2018. Bivalent class indexing in the sociolinguistics of specialty coffee talk. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 22(5): 489-515.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2010. The authentic speaker and the speech community. In Llamas, Carmen and Dominic Watts (eds.). *Language and identities,* 99-112. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davidson, Mark and Loretta Lees. 2005. New-build `gentrification' and London's riverside renaissance. *Environment and Planning*. 37:1165-1190.

Dodd, Vikram. 2019. Met police 'disproportionately' use stop and search powers on black people. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/law/2019/jan/26/met-police-disproportionately-use-stop-and-search-powers-on-black-people. [Accessed 17.08.2020].

Duszak, Anna. 2002. *Us and others: Social identities across languages, discourses and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Erbacher, E. C. 2011. (Re-)Constructing the Ethnic Neighborhood: Gentrification in the United States and the Longing for a Unique Identity', in Olaf Kaltmeier (ed.), *Selling ethniCity: Urban cultural politics in the americas,* 245–260. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Fischwick, Carmen. 2013. London school bans pupils from using 'innit', 'like', and 'bare'. https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/oct/15/london-school-bans-pupils-slang-innit. [accessed 17.08.2020].

Fox, Susan. 2015. *The new Cockney: New ethnicities and adolescent speech in the traditional East End of London.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gates, Shivonne and Christian Ilbury. 2019. Standard Language Ideology and the Non-Standard adolescent speaker. In Clare Wright, Lou Harvey and James Simpson (eds.), *Voices and practices in applied Linguistics: Diversifying a discipline*. York: White Rose University Press*.

Glass, Ruth. 1964. *London: Aspects of change.* London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Goncalves, Kellie. 2018. The Semiotic Paradox of Gentrification: The commodification of place and linguistic fetishization of Bushwick's graffscapes. In Amiena Peck, Christopher Stroud and Quentin Williams (eds.), *Making sense of people and place in linguistic landscapes*, 141-160. London: Bloomsbury.

Greater London Authority (GLA). 2020. Excel Mapping Template for London Boroughs and Wards. Available at: https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/excel-mapping-template-for-london-boroughs-and-wards. [accessed 20.08.2020].

Grier, Sonya A. and Vanessa G. Perry. 2018. Dog parks and coffee Shops: Faux diversity and consumption in gentrifying neighborhoods. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing.* 37(1): 23-38.

Hackney, 2016. A Profile of Hackney, its People and Place. https://www.hackney.gov.uk/media/2665/Hackney-profile/pdf/Hackney- Profile. [accessed 17.08.2020].

Hackney, 2019. Third Implementation plan (2019-2022). https://consultation.hackney.gov.uk/streetscene/lip/results/lbh-thirdlocalimplementationplan2019-2022.pdf. [accessed 17.08.2020].

Hegelund, Allan. 2005. Objectivity and Subjectivity in the Ethnographic Method. *Qualitative Health Research*. 15 (5): 647-668.

Howarth, Caroline. 2002. `So, you're from Brixton?': The struggle for recognition and esteem in a stigmatized community. *Journal of Ethnicities*. 2 (2):237-260.

Hubbard, Phil and Loretta Lees. 2018. The right to community? Legal geographies of resistance on London's gentrification frontiers. *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action.* 22 (1): 8-25.

Hwang, Jackelyn. 2015. Gentrification in changing cities: Immigration, new diversity, and racial inequality in neighbourhood renewal. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 660 (1): 319-340.

Ilbury, Christian. 2020. Beyond the Offline: Social Media and the Social Meaning of Variation in East London. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Queen Mary University of London.

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). 2007. *Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government*. https://data.gov.uk/dataset/5ceb7e93-bc1a-48cf-80fd-fbdd15909640/index-of-multiple-deprivation-score-2007 [accessed 17.08.2020].

Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). 2015. *Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government*. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015 [accessed 17.08.2020].

Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities*, 35-84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Jackson, Emma and Tim Butler. 2015. Revisiting 'social tectonics': The middle classes and social mix in gentrifying neighbourhoods. *Journal of Urban Studies.* 52(13): 2349-2365.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2004. Place, globalization, and linguistic variation. In Carmen Fought (ed.), *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections*, 65-83. Oxford: OUP.

Johnstone, Barbara. 2013. *Speaking Pittsburghese: The story of a dialect.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kallin, Hamish. 2018. The state of gentrification has always been extra-economic. In Abel Albet and Núria Benach (eds). *Gentrification as a global strategy: Neil Smith and Beyond,* 43-53*.* London: Routledge.

Kelly, Sinéad. 2014. Taking liberties: Gentrification as neoliberal urban policy in Dublin. In Andrew MacLaran and Sinéad Kelly (eds.), *Neoliberal urban policy and the transformation of the city: Reshaping Dublin*, 174-188. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kohn, Mary. 2013. What is wrong with gentrification? *Journal of Urban Research and Practice.* 6 (3): 297-310.

Krzyzanowski, Michal and Ruth Wodak. 2011. *The politics of exclusion: Debating migration in Austria*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Labov, William. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *WORD*. 19 (5):273-30.

Lees, Loretta. 2016. Gentrification, race, and ethnicity: Towards a global research agenda? *City and Community.* 15(3): 208-214.

Lees, Loretta; Tom Slater and Elvin K. Wyly. 2008. *Gentrification*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Mendick, Robert and Andrew Johnson. 2002. Eight men shot dead in two years. Welcome to Britain's Murder Mile. The Independent. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/this-britain/eight-men-shot-dead-intwo-years-welcome-to-britains-murder-mile-662314.html. [accessed 17.08.2020]

Milani, Tommaso. 2020. No-go zones in Sweden: The infectious communicability of evil. *Language, Culture and Society*. 2(1): 7-39.

Montgomery, Chris and Emma Moore. 2017. *Language and a sense of place: Studies in language and region.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Munt, I. 1987. Economic Restructuring, culture, and gentrification: A case study in Battersea, London. *Journal of Economy and Space.* 19(9): 1175-1197.

Palen, J. John and Bruce London. 1984. *Gentrification, displacement, and neighborhood revitalization.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Papen, Uta. 2012. Commercial discourses, gentrification and citizens' protest: The linguistic landscape of Prenzlauer Berg, Berlin. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 16(1): 56-80.

Pratt, Andy C. 2018. Gentrification, artists and the cultural economy. In Loretta Lees and Martin Philips (Eds.). *Handbook of gentrification studies*, 346-362. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Preece, Siân. 2009. *Posh talk: Language and identity in higher education*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rampton, Ben. 2006. *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: CUP.

Rayner, Alex. 2018. Gentrification's ground zero: the rise and fall of Hoxton Square. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/mar/14/hoxton-square-london-shoreditch-aviva-gentrification-yba-damien-hirst. [accessed 17.08.2020].

Relph, Edward. 1976. *Place and placelessness.* London: Pion.

Ribbens-Klein, Yolandi. 2017. Locality, belonging and the social meanings of Afrikaans rhotic variation in the South Cape: from patterns of frequency towards moments of meaning. *Multilingual Margins*. 4(1): 7-26.

Robson, Garry and Tim Butler. 2001. Coming to terms with London: middle-class communities in a global city. *Journal of Urban Studies.* 38 (12): 70-86.

Saumarez Smith, Charles. 2017. *East London.* London: Thames and Hudson Limited.

Smith, Neil. 2002. New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy. *Journal of Antipode.* 34 (3): 427-450.

Tedlock, Barbara. 1991. From participant observation to the observation of participation: the emergence of narrative ethnography. *Journal of Anthropological Research*. 47(1): 69–94.

Trimaille, Cyril and Médéric Gasquet-Cyrus. 2013. Sociolinguistic change in the city: gentrification and its linguistic correlates in Marseille. In Mari C. Jones and David Hornsby (eds.), *Language and social structure in urban France,* 133-150. Abingdon: Legenda.

Trinch, Shonna and Edward Snajdr. 2016. What the signs say: Gentrification and the disappearance of capitalism without distinction in Brooklyn. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 21 (1): 64-89.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1991. Language and the making of place: A narrative-descriptive approach. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers.* 81 (4): 684-696.

van Weesep, Jan. 1994. Gentrification as a research frontier. *Progress in Human Geography*. 18 (1):74-83.

Van Wilsem, Johan; Karin Wittebrood and Nan Dirk De Graaf. 2006. Socioeconomic dynamics of neighborhoods and the risk of crime victimization: A multilevel study of improving, declining, and stable areas in the Netherlands. *Journal of Social Problems.* 53 (2): 226–247.

Vandenbroucke, Mieke. 2018. Multilingualism, urban change and gentrification in the landscape of a Brussels neighbourhood. *Multilingua.* 37 (1): 25–52.

Watt, Paul. 2013. 'It's not for us': Regeneration, the 2012 Olympics and the gentrification of East London. *City*. 17 (1):99–118

Wolfram, Walt. 1993. Ethical considerations in language awareness programs. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. 4 (2): 225-255.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*. 40 (3):197- 214.