

Dynamics and Neighbourhood Relationships in Local Multicultural Contexts in Spain: A Comparative Reflection

Francisco Torres Pérez
Universitat de València

E-mail: Francisco.Torres@uv.es

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1737-2321>

Paloma Gómez Crespo

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

E-mail: mariapaloma.gomez@uam.es

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6200-7257>



1. Introduction

For decades, the analysis of people of diverse origins living together in neighbourhoods and municipalities has garnered increasing attention from various perspectives. In Spain, this has been a widespread phenomenon (Iglesias et al., 2020) for several decades, which has given rise to type of a cohabitation and neighbourhood relationships that can generally be described as peaceful but distant coexistence (Giménez & Gómez-Crespo., 2015; Iglesias et al., 2020; Gómez-Crespo & Torres, 2020), albeit not without underlying tensions.

As occurred during the Great Recession (2008-2014), today we find “objective” social conditions that are worse for cohabitation. The COVID-19 pandemic, the dysfunctions of neoliberal globalization, the wars in Ukraine and Gaza, and an uncertain political and economic landscape are having a greater impact on the most precarious sectors and peripheral working-class neighbourhoods (FOESSA, 2022). Despite the “social safety net,” the most precarious third of the Spanish population is bearing the effects of two crises. Furthermore, one of the factors that explained the peaceful coexistence in the Spanish case (Rinken, 2017), the absence of anti-immigrant forces, has changed with the electoral success of the far-right, ending the consensus opposing anti-immigrant views in Spain.

This special issue, resulting from an open call made by the team of the PID2021-124346OB-I00 project, *ParticipaBarrio*, aims to capture the current state of cohabitation in the new social context, the dynamics of inclusion and tension, as well as the relevant actors at the local level. To this end, we present ten articles analysing a variety of local contexts undergoing different socio-urban processes, gentrification or relegation, which, as a whole, update our knowledge on neighbourhood dynamics in multicultural contexts in Spain, provide elements for public policies and establish, in several cases, new lines of research.

Although the contributions to this special issue represent a variety of perspectives from sociology, anthropology, social geography, political science, and social work, they share a series of analytical approaches. First, they analyse the social dynamics that interest us, focusing on

local contexts, whether a neighbourhood or municipality. There are factors influencing cohabitation that transcend this local framework, such as economic conditions, national social policies, and the political climate; at the same time, the impact of these factors on daily cohabitation is differentiated according to socio-urban conditions, the presence of associations, neighbourhood sociability, cohabitation dynamics, local history, etc.

These local contexts have undergone a variety of socio-urban processes (gentrification and precarization, among others) that are modifying their neighbourhoods, the lifestyle of their residents, and impacting cohabitation. This special issue includes studies of central working-class neighbourhoods undergoing complex processes of gentrification and touristification in Madrid, Valencia, and Bilbao, peripheral working-class neighbourhoods undergoing precarization and relegation in Madrid, Valencia, Zaragoza, Tenerife, Bilbao, and L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, as well as two agricultural municipalities, Carcaixent (Valencia) and Torre-Pacheco (Murcia). Additionally, several articles present comparative analyses between two or more neighbourhoods and/or municipalities. Beyond the specific characteristics of each local context, this wide range of typologies and urban processes—gentrification, relegation, and exclusion—enables us to grasp the general trends in cohabitation.

Secondly, there is a common approach to neighbourhood relationships and dynamics from various perspectives, ranging from discourses and imaginaries to everyday practices and participatory processes, across a variety of neighbourhood settings, from public spaces to local shopping areas. Thirdly, several articles present a diachronic analysis that compares the current situation with the recent past and notes its evolution.

2. The relevance of multicultural local contexts and their transformations in Spain

In recent decades, questions have been raised about the relevance of local contexts, neighbourhoods, or small towns as a meaningful space for everyday life. In mobility-driven societies like ours (Urry, 2007), the social role of the local context has been reduced for its residents (Grafmeyer, 2006; Humain-Lamoure, 2006). The ever-increasing use of social networks challenges sociability based on local cohabitation (Baringo, 2013; Authier & Cayouette-Remblière, 2021). Similarly, it is noted that changes in lifestyle, immigration, and the fragmentation of the labour market, among other factors, have diluted the neighbourhood homogeneity that was once assumed to characterize a neighbourhood or town.

Despite these transformations, local contexts have not lost their relevance as meaningful social spaces, although transformed. As shown by the various articles in this special issue, while a significant part of our urban lives and social networks extend beyond our neighbourhood or town, these still remain relevant social spaces for daily uses, practices, and tasks (Kearns & Parkinson, 2001; Authier & Cayouette-Remblière, 2021; Ariza, 2022). Mobility is not incompatible with rootedness. Unequally across different groups of residents, the local context holds an important element of “neighbourhood territory” (Grafmeyer, 2006) or “local community” (Giménez & Gómez-Crespo, 2015), both in psychosocial aspects, as a “lived space” (Di Méo, 1994), and through the provision of “wellbeing” and care (Navarro, 2014; Arbaci, 2019). All these aspects are articulated within the sociability of a neighbourhood, with a diversity of relationships that constitute an essential part of our daily lives.

On the other hand, the neighbourhood or municipality is the framework and object of public policies and various forms of collective action, impacting sociability. On both sides of the Atlantic, *politique de ville* or *moving to opportunity* initiatives have focused on the neighbourhood (Neveu, 2006; Houard, 2011; Van Ham et al., 2012). In the Spanish case, regional policies in disadvantaged urban areas are articulated in the *Ley de Barrios*. All this makes the neighbourhood and municipality a unit of analysis for both social sciences and public management.

However, highlighting the relevance of the local context does not imply that our analysis should be limited to it. Factors that transcend the local level influence cohabitation, requiring a multi-level analysis. At the municipal level, various factors come into play, such as the neighbourhood's position within the socio-urban stratification of the city (centre or periphery) and its functionality. In Spain, good examples are the transformation of two neighbourhoods, Russafa and Lavapiés, into nightlife areas in Valencia and Madrid (Torres & Gómez, this special issue). Other factors are found at the national level, such as the dominant housing model, political changes like the institutional presence of the far-right political party VOX in Spain, or the shift of mainstream public opinion in the Netherlands and the United States toward a more nativist and Islamophobic direction, impacting neighbourhood relationships (Alba & Duyvendak, 2019). There is also a transnational level. For the immigrant neighbours, the socio assemblages promoting different forms of social wellbeing at the local level, particularly for women, are influenced by transnational care chains (Sassen, 2003), as shown in the article by Barañano et al. (this special issue).

The transformations taking place in multicultural local contexts are framed within and respond to deep societal trends in Spain. Since the Great Recession (2008-2014), the advance of neoliberal globalization and the fragmentation of the labour market, coupled with the “entrepreneurial” management of the city (Harvey, 1989), have increased socio-economic inequality, residential disparities, and urban polarization (Sorando & Leal, 2019; Mazorra, 2024). These trends were partially slowed by the “municipalities of change” (Janoschka & Mota, 2018; Blanco et al., 2018), only to accelerate again later. The current social crisis regarding access to housing is one manifestation of this. Moreover, since 2015, migratory flows, particularly from Latin America, have increased (Domingo & Bayona, 2024), though migrant profiles have become more heterogeneous, including middle-class migrants from the Global North.

This polarization and inequality manifest as gentrification in popular urban centres or marketable areas, and relegation and segregation in peripheral working-class neighbourhoods.

In central multicultural neighbourhoods, gentrification and touristification continue to advance, modifying their habitat and neighbourhood dynamics, with the incorporation of middle classes, both local and from the Global North. In this special issue, the neighbourhoods of Lavapiés (Madrid), Russafa (Valencia), and San Francisco (Bilbao) are presented from different perspectives, showcasing a range of gentrification processes.

We speak of a “range of gentrifications” (Chabrol et al., 2016) because, against the inevitability often attributed to this process, the cases presented in this special issue confirm its diversity, with different rhythms, scales, and consequences depending on the societies and local contexts, as highlighted by an increasing body of international literature (Maloutas, 2011; Janoschka et al., 2014; Lees & Phillips, 2019; Kern, 2022). In central Spanish neighbourhoods (see Torres & Gómez, this special issue), gentrification processes are slower, affect younger families more than the elderly, and involve the coexistence of different resident groups for

decades, among other factors due to high homeownership rates and lower residential mobility in Spain (Duque, 2016). The Russafa neighbourhood in Valencia is the most advanced in this process, as although it retains a significant number of older residents, its character has shifted, becoming more cosmopolitan due to the settlement of transnational gentrifiers and touristification. This situation contrasts with Lavapiés in Madrid, where a complex simultaneity of popular practices, immigrant centrality, and advancing gentrification and touristification continues (Torres & Gómez, this special issue). Meanwhile, the San Francisco neighbourhood in Bilbao maintains its popular, multicultural character as a first point of reception for immigrants, with significant precariousness and early-stage gentrification (Barba et al., this special issue). In general, gentrification and touristification coexist in central Spanish neighbourhoods. These are distinct processes, although both are rooted in the dynamics of neoliberal urbanism, with complex relationships. On the one hand, the tourist industry makes certain neighbourhoods fashionable and contributes to attracting transnational gentrifiers, as in the Gothic Quarter of Barcelona (Cocola-Gant & López-Gay, 2020); on the other hand, competitive dynamics arise, as touristification deteriorates the quality of a neighbourhood as a lived space and causes population displacement, including that of gentrifiers, as seen in the historic centre of Seville (Jover & Díaz-Parra, 2020) and in Lavapiés (Torres & Gómez, this special issue).

Meanwhile, peripheral working-class neighbourhoods, now multicultural, have seen their situation worsen. Musterd et al. (2006) and Blanco & Subirats (2011) address these neighbourhoods as spaces where market forces, public action, and sociability acquire specific characteristics, which they refer to as a “structure of territorial opportunities.” From this perspective, these neighbourhoods concentrate the *precariat*, accumulate the consequences of decades of relegation due to neoliberal urbanism and insufficient social spending, and have suffered greater social impacts during both the Great Recession and the post-pandemic period. All of this creates poor material conditions for cohabitation. It is no surprise that tensions have accumulated, both then and now, in these types of neighbourhoods (Gómez-Crespo & Torres, 2020). Among the articles in this special issue that address precarious working-class neighbourhoods, two aspects stand out. On the one hand, the responsibility of the public administrations. The Las Fuentes neighbourhood (Zaragoza) shows the dual nature of their actions: the co-presence in public services fosters negotiations and positive interactions between different groups, while the lack of measures to address housing deterioration fosters new tensions (Gimeno et al., this special issue). On the other hand, the relevance of the social fabric(s) of sociability is highlighted in several contributions. At times, neighbourhood sociability provides resources and opportunities that are inaccessible due to income, as is the case in the vulnerable neighbourhoods of Madrid studied by Barañano et al. (this special issue). Similarly, this sociability has been one of the foundations of community-building in San Matías, Tenerife (Zapata & Mesa, this special issue). However, depending on local dynamics and institutional mechanisms, that same sociability can create “good and bad” neighbours, as seen in L’Hospitalet de Llobregat (Rojas-Valenzuela et al., this special issue).

3. Cohabitation, neighbourhood relationships, and neighbourhood participation

The analysis of neighbourhood interaction in multicultural neighbourhoods and municipalities has been approached using a variety of concepts. In the Hispanic context, Giménez (2005) establishes three types of situations: hostility, coexistence, and *convivencia*, characterized by

the interrelationship between groups. However, in Spanish literature, it is also common to use the term *convivencia* in a broad sense to refer to the set of interaction dynamics resulting from residential co-presence. In the Anglo-Saxon context, terms such as *living together* (Pratsinakis et al., 2017), *cohabitation* (White and Germain, 2022), *conviviality* (Gilroy, 2008), or, in the Francophone context, *vivre ensemble* (Saillant, 2016) are used. When defined, these concepts are similar but respond to specific situations and social frameworks, each with its own emphasis. In the Anglo-Saxon debate, it has been pointed out that *conviviality* connotes interactions with the potential to be positive, as indicated by Gilroy (Wise & Noble, 2016), though this can be somewhat partial (White & Germain, 2022). Additionally, it is noted that studies on *conviviality* constitute a response to the populist backlash against growing diversity (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010). In this debate, various authors opt for *cohabitation*, which they identify with Giménez's conceptualization, as it allows for the consideration of a broad range of interactions, including negative, neutral, and positive ones (White & Germain, 2022).

Beyond the diversity of accents, situations, and national frameworks, there is a growing consensus that studies should attempt to capture all the complexities involved in shared everyday sociability, including the cohesion and conflict, the negotiations and accommodations. Furthermore, there are factors that transcend the neighbourhood which also impact this sociability. In neighbourhood dynamics, it is not only ethnocultural diversity that plays a role; social class, gender, immigration status, and the dynamics of racialization and ethnification are also involved, as highlighted both from the intersectionality perspective (Collins, 2015) and in debates around *superdiversity* (Foner et al., 2019). In the articles of this special issue, the terms cohabitation, coexistence, and conviviality are used. However, the various analyses are in line with the consensus we referred to earlier.

At the neighbourhood and municipal level, the dynamics that interest us develop and take root in the web of sociability constituted by neighbourhood relationships and neighbourhood participation in significant spaces of everyday life. Despite their transformations, neighbourhoods continue to be spaces for the construction of social relationships. In France, 70% of respondents consider neighbourhood relationships important, and 65-75% engage in meaningful practices such as performing small favours, inviting others to their homes, etc. (Authier & Cayouette-Remblière, 2021). In the case of immigration in Spain, 62% of immigrants belong to mixed social networks, many of them neighbourhood-based (Iglesias et al., 2020). Similarly, a previous study in 18 multicultural neighbourhoods in European cities showed that 33% of immigrant residents had strong interethnic neighbourhood relationships of friendship (Pratsinakis et al., 2017).

Neighbourhood relationships, understood as those that take place within the neighbourhood, are significantly heterogeneous and display diverse geometries. For the dynamics we are interested in, these relationships can be either *in-group* or *out-group* depending on the participants, and can also be strong or weak, adapting Granovetter's (1973) concepts according to their intensity, relevance, and resources (Torres & Gómez-Crespo, 2022). Weak neighbourhood relationships, such as greetings, small gestures of recognition, and the sharing of public spaces and services, are often characterized as trivial. However, they acquire importance when they become part of the everyday routine (Henning & Lieberg, 1996; Rose & Séguin, 2006; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), covering psychosocial needs such as feeling comfortable, secure, and part of one's surroundings (Torres & Gómez-Crespo, 2022). It is the social proximity created by the web of both strong and weak neighbourhood ties that constitutes the neighbourhood

in its socio-anthropological sense (Kearns & Parkinson, 2001; Grafmeyer, 2006; Giménez & Gómez-Crespo, 2015).

Another dimension of neighbourhood sociability can be characterized as neighbourhood participation, when one takes part in and intervenes in an action or process alongside other neighbours, which involves practices and expresses opinions, has a specific goal, and is framed within a particular timeframe (Giménez, 2009). In this sense, participation refers to being part of neighbourhood life.

In a previous article, Torres and Gómez (2022) distinguished between informal and formal participation. Informal participation refers to actions carried out without the mediation of associations and other regulated structures, though this does not imply that they lack rules. It is often anchored in the everyday practices of living, and in many cases, it takes on a repetitive, recurring character over time. Daily use of public spaces in Russafa and Lavapiés (Torres & Gómez-Crespo, this issue) or frequenting neighbourhood or municipal shops (Gómez et al., this issue) are examples of this. In contrast, formal neighbourhood participation is initiated by the local associations, realized through participatory processes driven from “below” (local residents), or from “above” (municipal governments). In the French context, Bacqué and Biewener (2013) define participatory democracy as involving institutional participation, interpellation, and initiative.

Participation from below can take many forms, such as neighbourhood initiatives, activities, and advocacy campaigns for a neighbourhood goal, impacting neighbourhood relationships, as shown in the case of Russafa (Mompó et al., this issue) or Las Fuentes (Gimeno et al., this issue). Participation from above refers to actions and initiatives by municipal governments, which also vary widely: from urban planning projects to processes categorized as neighbourhood participation and governance (Subirats, 2019). This type of participation has elicited an ambivalent assessment. In some cases, its positive aspects are highlighted (Blanco & Ballester, 2011), while in others, the conditions and legitimization of public policies that it entails are emphasized (Letelier, 2018). This special issue presents a variety of participation processes. In San Matías (Tenerife), the keys to the positive impact of community projects implemented are based on active participation from the neighbourhood, an intercultural orientation, citizen science, and their continuity over time (Zapata & Mesa, this issue), which contrasts with the succession of renewal projects in El Cabanyal (Valencia), which are not inclusive of diversity and end up disappointing residents (Mompó et al.).

4. Living together. Perspectives on coexistence and its heterogeneity in Spain

This monograph is not a systematic study of how we live together in multicultural local contexts in Spain. However, the collection of articles does reveal various interesting elements.

In Spain, it remains common for natives and immigrants to reside in the same local contexts: 84% of immigrants live in neighbourhoods where half are natives or where natives constitute a large majority (Iglesias et al., 2020, p. 83), fostering relationships. Over the last two decades, the general tone of everyday coexistence between natives and immigrants has been one of peaceful coexistence but with distance (Giménez et al., 2015; Iglesias et al., 2020; Gómez-Crespo & Torres, 2020), with a slow progression towards greater interaction. In 2020, 57.5%

of the population claimed to have “some” immigrants in their circle of friends (Rinken, 2021). The articles in this monograph confirm these two aspects.

This peaceful coexistence, which continued even during the harshest years of the Great Recession, was termed the “Spanish exception.” Among the explanatory factors, one can highlight the socio-political consensus against anti-immigrant discourse, the subordinate position of most immigrants in the Spanish social structure, the universal action of the welfare state, the positive effects of years of peaceful co-presence, and the development of social relationships, etc. (Rinken, 2017; González-Enríquez, 2017). Some of these factors remain, others have weakened, and some have disappeared.

The rise of the far-right and the parliamentary presence of VOX has legitimized and fuelled anti-immigrant discourse (Mariscal de Gante & Rinken, 2022), with evident impacts on public opinion and, in particular, in certain local contexts, as shown by the article of Iglesias & Rodríguez-Calles (this special issue) on Torre-Pacheco (Murcia) and Arangoiti (Bilbao). Other factors have weakened. For example, a third of the Spanish population has not recovered from the accumulated impacts of the Great Recession and the post-pandemic period. The protective, universal action of a low-intensity welfare state like Spain's is insufficient to alleviate and reverse the precarization and exclusion, with clear social impacts, particularly in peripheral neighbourhoods (FOESSA, 2022).

One of the indicators of this situation is the current social housing crisis in Spain, which is referenced in various articles. Moncusí et al. (this special issue) analyse this matter from the perspective of immigrants in Els Orriols (Valencia) and Usera (Madrid) and the relational practices in neighbourhood communities. In Las Fuentes (Zaragoza), the deterioration of more modest homes, where the most disadvantaged neighbourhood is concentrated, is a cause of tension, but also of joint initiatives for protest and demands. In the six vulnerable neighbourhoods of Madrid studied by Barañano et al. (this special issue), one of the most common fears is expulsion from the neighbourhood due to the spectacular rise of the real estate market and the loss of the “local wellbeing assemblage”. Expulsion affects not only vulnerable neighbourhoods but also popular neighbours, both natives and immigrants, in central areas undergoing gentrification and tourism development (Torres & Gómez-Crespo, this monograph).

In this situation, coexistence can follow a dual contradictory trend. On one hand, an increase in underlying tensions and pre-existing ethnic prejudices that mask real problems. On the other hand, the emergence or consolidation of neighbourhood cohesion dynamics based on shared interests as neighbours. General factors that transcend local contexts influence this, such as the political agenda and immigration, how this issue is presented in mass media, the social policies applied, and new economic difficulties. We are living in times of uncertainty.

At the neighbourhood level, three aspects may influence whether the “other” is included or excluded from cohabitation dynamics. First, how discomfort or conflict is constructed. If it is identified with the ethnocultural dimension, blaming the immigrant from the Global South, or if its social dimension is emphasized, which affects the entire neighbourhood. The discourses and imaginaries that fuel these constructions matter. Barba et al. (this special issue) analyse the discourses and alliances in the San Francisco neighbourhood (Bilbao) and how the presence of an anti-racist association network has helped contain xenophobic discourses, with dynamics that have generated different intergroup alliances.

Second, we would highlight the attitudes, practices, and actions of local actors: the neighbourhood, associations and collectives, professionals working in territory-based public ser-

vices, merchants, etc. Almost all the articles in this monograph highlight a variety of initiatives, campaigns, and participatory processes driven by diverse alliances of local actors in both central and peripheral neighbourhoods. In general, beyond the specific objective of the initiative, the results have been positive in terms of building bridges, fostering neighbourhood relationships, and creating an inclusive environment. Others, however, have not been successful. From the analysis of participatory processes in two neighbourhoods of Valencia, Mompó et al. (this special issue) point to four conditions: starting with the reality of the neighbourhood, ensuring that the objectives are relevant, maintaining a basic unity, and incorporating an intercultural practical approach. Other actors and forms of informal participation often go unnoticed but are also relevant. Gómez et al. (this special issue) highlight the importance of local commerce as hubs and facilitators of relationships.

A third factor, but no less important, is public policy. Several articles point out that the action, not always positive, or inaction of the local administration, is key in the development of neighbourhood cohabitation. Emphasizing the role of local actors cannot exempt local, regional, or state administrations from their responsibilities. We need public policies that reduce inequality, curb the spread of precariousness, and strengthen both public services and inclusive and cohesion-building dynamics that emerge from everyday life.

5. The articles that make up the monograph

The articles in this monograph offer a variety of perspectives on dynamics and neighbourhood relationships. This introduction first groups contributions that focus more on neighbourhood relationships in various local contexts, and later those articles that focus more on discourses, participatory processes, and community intervention.

The contribution by Albert Moncusí, Rocío Nicolás, and Carlos Peláez, *Immigrant status and housing: differential inclusion and neighbourhood ties in the buildings of Els Orriols (Valencia) and Usera (Madrid)*, examines housing issues from the perspective of immigrants and relationships within communities of residents in these two peripheral neighbourhoods. Their analysis focuses on daily interactions that foster personal and social recognition and practices of mutual support, which can help face situations of discrimination and, if sustained over time, can create strong neighbourhood ties.

The article by Chabier Gimeno, Elisa Esteban, and Sandra Romero, *“We are separating”: Effects of demographic and economic change on neighbour relationships in a working-class neighbourhood*, analyses the process of precarization in the peripheral neighbourhood of Las Fuentes (Zaragoza) and cohabitation. The article shows that the micro-spaces generated around public services and their actions foster conviviality. While the abandonment of public policies, particularly the renovation of dilapidated housing, leads to new tensions and the activation of prejudices against ethnic groups, although this is less prominent among the younger population.

The contribution by Margarita Barañano, Pedro Uceda, and Carlos Rivas-Mangas, *Local roots, assemblages wellbeing and care of immigrants in vulnerable neighbourhoods of Madrid*, analyses how the settlement and integration of immigrants in six Madrid neighbourhoods facilitates their participation in local wellbeing assemblages and vice versa. These wellbeing assemblages, which provide essential and social support, include family and friendship relationships, both in-group and out-group neighbourhood relationships, and ties formed

around local infrastructures, public spaces, and services (schools, places of worship, businesses, etc.). The feminization of these interactions and the impact of the internal diversity of the immigrant population are also considered.

The article by Paloma Gómez, Yaiza Pérez, and Francisco Torres, *Dynamics of sociability and commercial framework: A comparison between local multicultural contexts*, compares Russafa and Lavapiés, two central neighbourhoods in Valencia and Madrid undergoing gentrification and touristification, Caño Roto, a working-class neighbourhood of Madrid, and Carcaixent, a peri-urban town in Valencia. According to their findings, commerce strengthens neighbourhood sociability and facilitates neighbourhood ties when it is involved in daily life, participates in neighbourhood events, and is sustained over time. Conversely, it weakens neighbourhood sociability if the commerce is seen as alien to neighbourhood life.

The contribution by Francisco Torres and Paloma Gómez, *Neighbourhood relationships, gentrification and touristification in central multicultural neighbourhoods: Reflections from Russafa (Valencia) and Lavapiés (Madrid)*, comparatively addresses the transformations in these two neighbourhoods over the past twenty years. The main findings show the diversity of gentrification processes, more advanced in Russafa and less so in Lavapiés, within a complex situation where vulnerability, gentrification, and touristification combine. Over the years, a variety of neighbourhood relationships have consolidated, not without tensions, in which neighbours from different groups are integrated.

The article by Luis Rodríguez-Calles y Juan Iglesias, *Factors explaining a peaceful coexistence between immigrant and native population in Spanish popular neighbourhoods. The Arangoiti (Bilbao) and Torre Pacheco (Murcia) cases*, compares a working-class neighbourhood in Bilbao and an agro-exporting municipality in Murcia. The article confirms the hegemony of peaceful coexistence in Spain and its explanatory factors. However, it notes differences between Arangoiti, with daily co-presence and mixed social networks, and Torre Pacheco, with less intergroup contact and more ethnic prejudice. The authors highlight as causes the intense residential segregation in Torre Pacheco and the dependence of its economic activity on maintaining the subordinate, flexible, and precarious nature of immigrant labour.

The contribution by Mikel Barba, Amaia García-Azpuru, and Asier Arcos-Alonso, *Political participation, discourse coalitions, and intergroup relations in diverse spaces: The case of the San Francisco neighbourhood in Bilbao*, presents a central working-class neighbourhood where various forms of political participation and anti-racist associations generate discourse coalitions, facilitating the articulation of intergroup relationships, the deculturalization of conflicts, and the containment of xenophobic discourses. However, they warn of the limits of local participation if the labour market, housing market, and educational system continue to generate processes of segregation and discrimination.

The article *Participatory processes, neighbourhood relations and socio-cultural diversity: A critical analysis in two neighbourhoods of Valencia* by Eva Mompó, Francisco Torres, and Vicent Horcas, compares participatory processes in El Cabanyal, driven by the city council, and Russafa, initiated by local associations, exploring their effects on inclusion and exclusion dynamics within sociocultural diversity. From this perspective, the article examines the strengths and weaknesses of “top-down” and “bottom-up” participatory processes, highlighting factors that may help these processes promote more inclusive cohabitation in multicultural neighbourhoods.

The contribution by Tomás Rojas-Valenzuela, Alex Govers-López, and Jose Mansilla, *Ordering the city: Territorial dispositive and community interventions in L'Hospitalet de Llobregat*, presents a genealogy of the management of cohabitation in the 21st century in this city, with different urban and community reinforcement plans in the most degraded working-class neighbourhoods with the largest immigrant populations. Others organize cohabitation by regulating the use of public spaces through a variety of preventive and security policies. The logic of this regulation tends to obscure the structural conditions that determine cohabitation relationships and the different power and resource positions of the neighbourhood.

The article *Community construction in diversified immigration neighbourhoods: San Matías in the capital conurbation of Tenerife* by Vicente Zapata and Alexis Mesa, presents the evolution of this neighbourhood, founded three generations ago, from a peripheral and depopulated area to a diverse, yet cohesive, community. This process has been grounded in neighbourhood organization, solidarity, and a strong generational turnover. Social entities, mutual support networks, and a variety of community processes, based on a citizen science model, have played a key role in strengthening relationships, promoting the integration of the immigrant population, and improving community life.

Acknowledgement

This text is part of the project PID2021-124346OB-I00, "Participation, neighbourhood relationships and coexistence in multicultural neighbourhoods in pandemic. A comparative analysis" funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by ERDF A way of making Europe. <https://participabarrios.es>

References

- Alba, R., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2019). What about the mainstream? Assimilation in super-diverse times. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(1), 105-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406127>
- Arbaci, S. (2019). *Paradoxes of segregation: Housing systems, welfare regimes and ethnic residential change in Southern European cities*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118867365>
- Ariza, J. (2022). La segregación socioespacial en Madrid. Un enfoque desde la movilidad cotidiana. *Scripta Nova*, 26(3), 43-64. <https://doi.org/10.1344/sn2022.26.36769>
- Authier, J. Y., & Cayouette-Remblière, J. (dirs.) (2021). *Les formes contemporaines du voisinage. Espaces résidentiels et intégration sociale* [Rapport de recherche]. Centre Max Weber-Ined.
- Bacqué, M.-H., & Biewener, C. (2013). *L'empowerment, une pratique émancipatrice*. La Découverte.
- Baringo Ezquerro, D. (2013). ¿Tiene sentido hablar de barrio en la ciudad global? Reflexiones en torno a la relación entre sociología, comunidad urbana y lugar. *Revista Española de Sociología*, (19), 49-66. <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/res/article/view/65296>

- Blanco Fillola, I., Bianchi, I., & Salazar Marcano, Y. (2018). *El diagnóstico del “cambio” en Barcelona* [Working Paper Series WPCC-180003]. Contested Cities.
- Blanco, I., & Subirats, J. (2011). Exclusión social, territorio y políticas urbanas en España: una mirada comparada. In M. Iglesias (ed.), *Políticas urbanas en España. Grandes ciudades, actores y gobiernos locales* (pp. 335-362). Icaria.
- Blanco, I., & Ballester, M. (2011). ¿Participar para transformar? La experiencia de los presupuestos participativos en la provincia de Barcelona. *GAPP Revista Gestión y Análisis de Políticas Públicas*, 5, 117-144. <https://doi.org/10.24965/gapp.v0i5.448>
- Chabrol, M., Collet, A., Giroud, M., Launay, L., Rousseau, M., & Minassian, H. T. (2016). *Gentrifications*. Éditions Amsterdam.
- Cocola-Gant, A., & López-Gay, A. (2020). Transnational gentrification, tourism and the formation of “foreign only” enclaves in Barcelona. *Urban Studies*, 57(15), 3025-3043. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020916111>
- Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality’s Definitional Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142>
- Di Méo, G. (1994). Épistémologie des approches géographiques et socio-anthropologiques du quartier urbain. *Annales de géographie*, 577, 255-275.
- Domingo, A., & Bayona-i-Carrasco, J. (2024). Second Latin American migratory boom in Spain: From recovery to COVID-19. *Migration Studies*, 12(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnad039>
- Duque, R. (2016). *Procesos de gentrificación en cascos antiguos: el Albaicín de Granada*. CIS.
- FOESSA. (2022). *Evolución de la cohesión social y consecuencias de la COVID-19 en España*. Fundación FOESSA.
- Foner, N., Duyvendak, J. W., & Kasinitz, Ph. (2019). Introduction: super-diversity in everyday life. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406969>
- Gilroy, P. (2008). *Después del imperio*. Tusquets.
- Giménez, C. (2005). Convivencia: conceptualización y sugerencias para la praxis. *Puntos de Vista*, 1, 7-31.
- Giménez, C., & Gómez-Crespo, P. (coords.) (2015). *Análisis, prevención y transformación de conflictos en contextos de inmigración*. UAM Ediciones. <https://doi.org/10.15366/conf.inmigracion2015>
- Gómez-Crespo, P., & Torres Pérez, F. (2020). Convivencia y barrios multiculturales: conflicto y cohesión en contextos de crisis. *Cuadernos Fundación Manuel Giménez Abad*, 7, 28-44.
- González-Enríquez, C. (2017). *La excepción española: el fracaso de los grupos de derecha populista frente al paro, la desigualdad y la inmigración*. Real Instituto Elcano.

- Grafmeyer, Y. (2006). Le quartier des sociologues. In J. Y. Authier, M^a-H. Bacqué & F. Guérin-Pace (dirs.), *Le quartier* (pp. 21-32). La Découverte. <https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.bacqu.2007.01.0021>
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1361-1380. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>
- Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04353684.1989.11879583>
- Henning, C., & Lieberg, M. (1996). Strong ties or weak ties? Neighbourhood networks in a new perspective. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research*, 13(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02815739608730394>
- Houard, N. (2011). Des effets de quartier à la politique de ville. Perspectives internationales. *Note d'analyse du Centre d'Analyse Stratégique 24*. Secrétariat d'État chargé à la prospective.
- Humain-Lamoure, A. L. (2006). Le quartier comme objet en géographie. In J. Y. Authier, M^a-H. Bacqué & F. Guérin-Pace (dirs.), *Le quartier* (pp. 41-51). La Découverte. <https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.bacqu.2007.01.0041>
- Iglesias, J., Rúa, A., & Ares, A. (2020). *Un arraigo sobre el alambre. La integración de la población de origen inmigrante en España*. Fundación FOESSA.
- Janoschka, M., & Mota Consejero, F. (2018). *De la protesta a la propuesta. Un diagnóstico de los Ayuntamientos "del cambio"* [Working Paper Series WPCC-180001]. Contested Cities.
- Janoschka, M., Sequera, J., & Salinas, L. (2014). Gentrification in Spain and Latin America: a critical dialogue. *Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1234-1265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12030>
- Jover, J., & Díaz-Parra, I. (2020). Gentrification, transnational gentrification and touristification in Seville, Spain. *Urban Studies*, 57(15), 3044-3059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019857585>
- Kearns, A., & Parkinson, M. (2001). The significance of Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 38(12), 2103-2110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120087063>
- Kern, L. (2022). *La gentrificación es inevitable y otras mentiras*. Bellaterra Edicions.
- Lees, L., & Phillips, M. (2019). *Handbook of gentrification studies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Letelier, L. (2018). El barrio en cuestión: fragmentación y despolitización de lo vecinal en la era neoliberal. *Scripta Nova*, 22, 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.1344/sn2018.22.21518>
- Maloutas, T. (2011). Contextual diversity in gentrification research. *Critical Sociology*, 38(1), 33-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920510380950>
- Gante, Á., & Rinken, S. (2022). "No es culpa de ellos". Discursos sobre la inmigración tras la irrupción de la derecha radical en el sistema político español. *Migraciones*, (55), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.14422/mig.2022.011>

- Mazorra Rodríguez, A. (2024). Social inequality and residential segregation trends in Spanish global cities. A comparative analysis of Madrid, Barcelona, and Valencia (2001-2021). *Cities*, 149, 104935. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.104935>
- Musterd, S., Murie, A., & Kesteloot, C. (eds.) (2006). *Neighbourhoods of poverty. Urban social exclusion and integration in Europe*. Palgrave. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-27275-0>
- Navarro, C. (2014). Regímenes locales de bienestar: Rasgos principales y algunos efectos. *Cuadernos de Derecho local*, (34), 216-228. <http://repositorio.gobiernolocal.es/xmlui/handle/10873/1535>
- Neveu, C. (2006). Le quartier des politistes. In J. Y. Authier, M^a-H. Bacqué & F. Guérin-Pace (dirs.), *Le quartier* (pp. 32-40). La Découverte. <https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.bacqu.2007.01.0032>
- Pettigrew, Th., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751-783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Pratsinakis, M., Hatziprokopiou, P., Labrianidis, L., & Vogiatzis, N. (2017). Living together in multi-ethnic cities: People of migrant background, their interethnic friendships and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 54(1), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098015615756>
- Rinken, S. (2017). Actitudes sosegadas ante la inmigración y los inmigrantes en tiempos de crisis: ¿cómo explicar la excepcionalidad española? In D. Godenau & D. Buraschi (eds.), *Migraciones, desigualdad e integración en tiempos de crisis* (pp. 39-67). Cabildo de Tenerife.
- Rinken, S. (2021, september 16). *Las actitudes ante la inmigración y los inmigrantes en España: Datos recientes y necesidades de conocimiento*. Seminario del Observatorio Español del Racismo y la Xenofobia, OBERAXE.
- Rose, D., & Séguin, A.-M. (2006). Les débats sur les effets de quartier : que nous apprennent les approches centrées sur les réseaux sociaux et le capital social ? In J. Y. Authier, M^a-H. Bacqué & F. Guérin-Pace (dirs.), *Le quartier* (pp. 217-228) La Découverte.
- Saillant, F. (2016). *Pluralité et vivre ensemble*. Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Sassen, S. (2003). *Contrageografías de la globalización. Género y ciudadanía en los circuitos transfronterizos*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- Sorando, D., & Leal, J. (2019). Distantes y desiguales: el declive de la mezcla social en Barcelona y Madrid. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, (167), 125-148. <https://doi.org/10.5477/CIS/REIS.167.125>
- Subirats, J. (2019). Movimientos sociales y esfera local. La proximidad como espacio de protección y emancipación. *Desacatos, Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 61, 162-169.
- Torres Pérez, F., & Gómez-Crespo, P. (2022). Relaciones vecinales, participación y convivencia en barrios multiculturales. Una mirada desde el vecindario inmigrante. *Scripta*

ta Nova. Revista Electrónica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales, 26(4), 143-163. <https://doi.org/10.1344/sn2022.26.40137>

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Polity Press.

Van Ham, M., Manley, D., Bailey, N., Simpson, L., & MacLennan, D. (2012). *Neighbourhood effects research: new perspectives*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2309-2>

Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (2010). *The multiculturalism backlash. European discourses, policies and practices*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203867549>

White, W. W., & Germain, A. (2022). Methods for the Study of Everyday Cohabitation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 43(2), 167-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2022.2047274>

Wise, A., & Noble, G. (2016). Convivialities: An Orientation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 37(5), 423-431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2016.1213786>