There's a time and a place: temporal aspects of place-based stigma.

BUTLER-WARKE, A.

2021

There's a time and a place: temporal aspects of place-based stigma

Dr Alice Butler-Warke
Lecturer in Sociology
School of Applied Social Studies
Robert Gordon University
a.butler2@rgu.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of current debates and themes in literature relating to place-based stigma, including a reflection on terminology use. Generally, we rely on Loïc Wacquant's framing of territorial stigma as a feature of advanced marginality. In this paper, drawing on my own research in Toxteth, Liverpool, I offer a critique of the Wacquantian approach, highlighting the limits of the advanced marginality framing of place-based stigma. The paper considers the global reach of placed-based stigma and the temporal aspect of stigma that must be taken into consideration when we consider how stigma is currently applied to communities. A key feature of this paper is the foregrounding of the concepts of 'core' and 'event' stigma, which have generally been a feature of literature in business and management. I argue that our understanding of how communities become stigmatised can be enhanced by framing place-based stigma in this temporal sense. Understanding how stigma becomes adhered to particular spaces, places and landscapes is necessary if we want to comprehend how this stigma transfers to the communities inhabiting these geographies. This paper suggests that we must look to the past, and to the voices who shape the past, in order to understand the present and to plan for the future.

Key words: stigma; Wacquant; territorial stigma; place-based stigma; community; time; Liverpool

Introduction

> Any comparative sociology of the novel forms of urban poverty crystallizing in advanced societies at century's turn must begin with the *powerful stigma attached to residence in the bounded and segregated spaces,* the 'neighbourhoods of exile' to which the populations marginalized or condemned to redundancy by the post-Fordist reorganization of the economy and the post-Keynesian reconstruction of the welfare state are increasingly consigned (Wacquant, 2008, p. 169).

When we consider the stigma of place, we tend to rely heavily on the work of Loïc Wacquant, whose notion of 'territorial stigma' is intricately intertwined with the temporality of the later years of the 20th century and the emergence of the post-Fordist

economy. More recent literature (see Tyler and Slater, 2018; Loyd and Bonds, 2018) has begun to question this inextricable temporal tie and suggests that there is a need to look further back into the longer story of place-based stigma in order to fully understand the concept. This shift means accepting that Wacquant's 'novel forms of urban poverty' (2008, p. 169) may not be so novel after all and may, in fact, have their roots earlier in the 20th century.

While drawing on empirical examples from my own research, this paper serves three purposes. It provides an overview of the literature relating to stigma of place, with a focus on both the Wacquantian framing of this phenomenon and emerging literature. It suggests a key way in which we can think about categorising stigma into 'core' and 'event' stigma in order to allow for a deeper understanding of the adhesiveness of some forms of stigma. Crucially, and framing the entire paper, is the argument that we need to incorporate a temporal angle into our study of place-based stigma if we wish to fully understand where stigma comes from, how it adheres and affects residents, and how we can think ahead to mitigate against this malign force as we consider the needs of our communities going forward.

Accordingly, the paper begins with an overview of the Wacquantian framing of stigma, followed by a consideration of contemporary themes in place-based stigma. Next, I draw together a critique of Wacquant's approach in order to highlight key areas that require consideration and development. I then offer a potential solution to the question of adhesion and the missing temporal focus by discussing the concept of 'core' and 'event' stigma. I conclude by recognising the significant developments that the last decades have seen in relation to research on place-based stigma whilst simultaneously acknowledging some of the major issues that we face—and will continue to face—in the years to come.

Wacquantian framings of territorial stigma

The concept of territorial stigmatisation was first coined by French-American sociologist Loïc Wacquant. His concept bears a resemblance to concepts rooted in the works of Damer (1989), Gill (1977) and Tucker (1966), but it was in his 1993 article that Loïc Wacquant first named and introduced the theme of territorial stigmatisation.

His conception connects the work of Erving Goffman on stigma with Pierre Bourdieu's work on symbolic violence and group-making (Wacquant, 2008, p. 7), explaining that territorial stigmatisation becomes normalised as a result of the internalization of social and political power dynamics. Situating the study of territorial stigmatisation in the domains of space and place, de- and post-industrialisation, housing, economics, power, and politics, Wacquant describes territorial stigmatisation as:

> …the *powerful stigma attached to residence in the bounded and segregated spaces*, the 'neighbourhoods of exile' to which the populations marginalised or condemned redundant by the post-Fordist reorganisation of the economy and state are increasingly being relegated (1993, p. 369).

Central to Wacquant's understanding of territorial stigmatisation is a sense of temporal fixity in the post-war era of post-Fordist economies. The above definition notes that territorial stigmatisation, in Wacquant's framework, is linked to the post-Fordist era, which he terms the era of 'advanced marginality'. The term 'post-Fordist' refers to the changed economic system—and related political and social systems—from roughly 1975 onwards (Wacquant, 1996, p. 123).

Advanced marginality is a way for Wacquant to explain the 'return of the repressed' (1996, p. 123) that he notes as a feature of the post-Fordist age. For Wacquant, territorial stigmatisation exists as one of six features of this larger, more encompassing era of contemporary advanced marginality (Wacquant et al., 2014, p. 1272n) and, as such, is distinctly time-bound. I discuss and challenge this notion below, highlighting some of the critique that has been directed at Wacquant's framing.

In later work, Wacquant stresses that territorial stigmatisation has a 'distinctive weight and effects…as well as the insuperable political dilemmas posed by the material dispersion and symbolic splintering of the new urban poor' (2008, p. 7). Stigmatised locations are 'widely labelled as "no-go areas", fearsome redoubts rife with crime, lawlessness and moral degeneracy where only the rejects of society could bear to dwell' (2008, p. 29). From Wacquant's descriptions, it becomes apparent that territorial

stigmatisation has a distinctively discursive aspect: it is the 'labelling', the rumour, the reputation surrounding an area that enables and facilitates territorial stigmatisation. Language is being used 'as a form of social practice' (Fairclough, 1995, p. 7) that constructs and attaches reputations, stigmas, and stereotypes to certain geographies and those who live there.

This connects with Bourdieu's argument regarding capital in relation to space. Capital allows spatial domination but a lack thereof 'chains one to a place' (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 127). Those residing in a 'fashionable neighborhood' (1999, p. 129) have access to the collective capital (here Bourdieu refers less to financial capital and more to social, cultural and symbolic capital) that can further enhance and benefit their lot. Conversely, the weight of the symbolic stigma is shared by all of those living in a stigmatised location, grinding down both the physical space and the social space of the community, further adding to the popular mental construct of stigmatised space. For Wacquant, residence in such an area is highlighted by 'personal indignity…that colours interpersonal relations and negatively affects opportunities in social circles, school and the labour market' (Wacquant, 2008, p. 29). He adds that 'a *blemish of place* is thus super-imposed on the already existing stigmata traditionally associated with poverty and ethnic origin or postcolonial immigrant status' (Wacquant, 2007, p. 67, emphasis in original), suggesting that stigma of place latches onto other forms of social disgrace. Thus, Wacquant's later work substantiates his 1993 explanation of the problems that create territorial stigmatisation; these subsequent discussions add a suggestion of social construction, discourse and symbolism that combine to create problems that are acutely felt by those living in stigmatised locations and who carry additional 'blemishes'.

Tom Slater contributes to the literature through studies of territorial stigma in action and, crucially, offers a thorough review of extant literature and the themes into which the topics of the literature can be categorised (Slater, 2017). He notes that literature can be seen as falling into four distinct themes: work that discusses residents' strategies for managing territorial stigmatisation (see Butler et al., 2018; Maestri, 2017; August, 2014; Wacquant et al., 2014; Jensen and Christensen, 2012; Slater and Anderson, 2011; Keene and Padilla, 2010; Wacquant, 2007); studies that address the political activation of territorial stigma (see Kornberg, 2016; Gray and Mooney, 2011; Hancock and

Mooney, 2011); research that investigates neighbourhood investment and disinvestment (see Kallin and Slater, 2014; Sakizlioglu and Uitermark, 2014; Rhodes, 2012; Gray and Mooney, 2011; Smith, 1979); and work that addresses the production of territorial stigma (see Butler-Warke, 2020; Holt and Wilkins, 2015; Cohen, 2013; Rhodes, 2012; Slater and Anderson, 2012; Hancock, 2008; Hastings and Dean, 2003).

State of the art: current themes in place-based stigma

Since the publication of Slater's review (2017), further themes and nuance have emerged. Where territorial stigma has traditionally been the preserve of areas of cities that are characterized as 'no-go areas' (Wacquant, 2008: 29), we are now seeing an emerging concern for how the stigmatisation of place affects a diversity of spatial settings including rural areas in Europe (Batel, 2020; Rudolph and Kirkegaard, 2019; Pedersen and Gram, 2018; Sørensen and Pless, 2017), the Canadian prairies (Miller, 2014), and Hungarian manorial villages (Németh, 2019). Equally, the reach of studies has expanded with stigmatisation of place being recognised as a significant issue at a global scale. Where the 'traditional' sites of study have tended to focus on cities and districts in the United States, Europe and Australia, following Wacquant's framing of advanced marginality and attendant stigma as being a feature of 'the most advanced sectors of Western economies' (2008, p. 232), current literature has taken the story further. Recent work has considered the management and resistance of residential stigma in informal settlements in Dhaka, Bangladesh (Fattah and Walters, 2020), the enduring stigma in cemetery communities in Cairo, Egypt (Logan, 2020; Nedoroscik, 1997), the Old Naledi township in Botswana (Geiselhart, 2017), and demolished districts in Shanghai, China (Zhang, 2017). This highlights a growing recognition that we need to think beyond Wacquant's early description of advanced marginality's grip being acutely felt in what Wacquant dubiously terms 'First World cities' (Wacquant, 2008, p. 232). We see from the emerging literature, a global tendency to stigmatise place.

Recent literature has considered, too, the importance of language and discourse in research around place-based stigma. We have seen work highlighting the use of specific terms such as 'sink estate' and 'shithole' (Watt, 2020; Slater, 2018; Butler et al 2018) and, moreover, a concern for *who* is perpetuating a discourse of place-based stigma through careful studies of media discourse (Batel, 2020; Butler-Warke, 2020;

Butler, 2019; Cairns, 2018; Arthurson et al., 2014; Devereux et al., 2011), political and institutional analysis (Hackworth, 2019; Butler, 2019; Kornberg, 2016; Larsen , 2014; Cohen, 2013), and through consideration of the everyday minoritarian voices that contribute to the discourse on place-based stigma (Butler et al, 2018).

Relatedly, we have seen a concern with the qualities of place-based stigma and, particularly, its 'stickiness' (Pinkster et al, 2020; Delica and Larsen, 2019) with Pinkster et al (2020) highlighting that stigma 'sticks' to residents in stigmatised locales in inconsistent ways with white, middle class residents of stigmatised areas able to 'shrug off' stigma unlike residents who experience an intersection of class, race and place. Keene and Padilla's work (2010) underscores the transportability of a perniciously adhesive stigma that accompanies black Chicagoans as they relocate to Iowa and, like Pinkster et al (2020), note that it is the intersection of class, race and place that contributes to the adhesive nature of territorial stigma. I discuss this uneven adhesiveness later in the paper where I suggest that we need a more nuanced temporal and situational model of place-based stigma that can allow us to fully understand why stigma sticks sometimes but not at others.

Critiquing Wacquant

> Place-based stigmatization is not a novel process; it is not unique to the era of advanced marginality. It *is* a feature of advanced marginality, but the era of advanced marginality is not its genesis. Not only can its traces be seen before "century's end," but it is imperative that we see these traces as the foundational elements of place-based stigma in order to understand the persistent attack on the spaces of the marginalized and oppressed (Butler-Warke, 2020, p. 141).

I use the term 'place-based stigma' throughout this paper instead of 'territorial stigma'; this ties both to the broader theme of this piece, and to a main critique of Wacquant's framing of stigma as being temporally-fixed. I argue that it is imperative to consider the temporal elements of stigma applied to place (Butler-Warke, 2020). Territorial stigma in the Wacquantian sense represents a 'strand' or a particular moment in a larger narrative of place-based stigma. As highlighted in the above quotation, there is a need for a revision of terminology in the field so that we differentiate between territorial

stigma, which is inseparable from the era of advanced marginality, and an atemporal structuring of the stigmatisation of place, which I refer to simply as 'place-based stigma'. There is a growing recognition that stigma cannot be seen as monolithic and emerging solely in the late 20th century (Tyler and Slater, 2018; Loyd and Bonds, 2018; Kornberg, 2016); by following a strictly Wacquantian temporal framing, we do a disservice to the communities we study, and we are omitting a crucial part of the story of the stigma of place. As such, for the remainder of this paper, 'territorial stigmatisation' refers solely to the process of place-based stigma that occurs 'at century's end'.

Building on the terminological and temporal limitations in Wacquant's framing of place-based stigma, we need also to consider that this is linked with an inherent flaw in his advanced marginality thesis. For Wacquant, 'territorial stigmatisation' is a feature of advanced marginality, which he describes as 'the novel regime of sociospatial relegation and exclusionary closure…that has crystallised in the post-Fordist city as a result of the uneven development of the capitalist economies and the recoiling of welfare states' (Wacquant, 2008, p. 2-3). This description highlights a specific temporality connected to advanced marginality; its temporal positioning as a feature of the late 20th century, thereby rendering it distinct from previous forms of marginality. Advanced marginality, by Wacquant's framing, is 'the result of the uneven, disarticulating development of the *most advanced sectors* of capitalist societies' (Wacquant, 2008, p. 25, emphasis in original) and it also implies an 'unravelling' of a 'certain model of labor relations and working-class politics and culture' since the Fordist era (Caldeira, 2009, p. 849).

Wacquant's framing of advanced marginality is not without critique (see Gilbert, 2010; Caldeira, 2009; Tissot, 2007; Small, 2007). As a distinctly temporal phenomenon, Wacquant's advanced marginality theory should logically focus on the present and future, given that he overtly states that the features of advanced marginality lie '*ahead of us*' (2008, p. 232, emphasis in original). However, the Parisian and Chicagoan case studies upon which his theorisation is based and, largely, continues to be based (Wacquant, 2008; Wacquant, 2007; Wacquant, 1993) date from between 1986 and 1991. Even his most recent contribution (Wacquant, 2020) focuses heavily on what he now describes as 'historical data' but remains wedded to the advanced marginality

thesis.

This fixity in the 1980s and 1990s fails to capture the events of the past two to three decades that have resulted in great changes to the spaces and groups he describes (Caldeira, 2009): the move from a 'black-white duality' (Small, 2007: 419), and the decline of ghetto discourse in France and, instead, the rise of the discourse of the European 'Muslim enclave' (Tissot, 2007, p. 366). Were Wacquant's research to be updated, brought forward to the 21st century, his central argument—that there has been no transatlantic convergence of ghettoization (Chatterton, 2007; Tissot, 2007)—could be nuanced in line with the decline of racial difference and separation, and the rise of a fear of cultural, religious and ethnic incompatibility. Yet, by writing in the present tense about research from several decades earlier, Wacquant presents a sense of current reality that does not match the lived reality (Caldeira, 2009).

For Caldeira (2009), Wacquant's use of time has an additionally troubling aspect. She argues that in his advanced marginality framework Wacquant presents a forward-focused view that is, paradoxically, weighed down heavily by a sense of nostalgia and loss. By ignoring the present and overly focusing on a nostalgic view of the past, Wacquant fails to acknowledge any positive change and the voice that many of the 'marginal' populations and spaces now have (Caldeira, 2009). His formulation of marginal populations in stigmatised locations removes all sense of agency and self-determination (Jensen and Christensen, 2012; Gilbert, 2010) that is itself reminiscent of the neighbourhood effects research that Wacquant criticises (2020), which sees the individual's outcome in life entirely determined by where he or she resides, without any role for agency and self-determination.

Wacquant's theory of advanced marginality can be seen as a temporal framing of a set of contemporary poverty conditions and properties, but criticism points to Wacquant's own work on advanced marginality being based on outmoded data and imbued with nostalgia and notions of a lack of individual agency. His advanced marginality is not as temporally 'advanced' as he suggests and is, in fact, entirely fixed in the late 20th century, reflecting an historical vision of marginality rather than a contemporary view of poverty. As Wacquant's framing of advanced marginality is closely bound with his concept of territorial stigma, we must also question the role of the temporal in the

stigma of place and see the longer story and the role of time in this phenomenon.

Core and event stigma
Drawing on core and event stigma

Where much contemporary literature relating to the stigma of place considers the adhesiveness of stigma to residents (Pinkster et al, 2020; Delica and Larsen, 2019; Gertner and Kotler, 2004) thereby contributing to levels of stigma towards and social abjection of residents (Tyler, 2013), we must also consider the ways that places themselves are subjected to stigma such that the very mention of a particular district, region, town or city elicits disgust, fear or revulsion, a concept that has been termed 'spatial abjection' (Butler et al, 2018).

We need, I suggest, to consider the formation of stigma and understand how it comes to adhere to certain spaces and not to others and why it adheres in some places for a short period of time and yet maintains its adhesion for longer in other locales. I suggest that we can draw on Bryant Ashley Hudson's work (2008) on organizational stigma to understand this uneven process of adhesion.

Hudson divides stigma into 'core stigma' and 'event stigma', explaining that core stigma 'is due to the nature of an organization's core attributes—who it is, what it does, and whom it serves' (2008, p. 253). He notes examples including tobacco and gambling services, abortion providers, and strip clubs, all of which may attract 'stigma because of their very nature' (2008, p. 253). If we translate Hudson's definition to a non-organizational or management sphere, we can see that it refers to the background attributes that are seen to define the fundamental principles and characteristics of an entity or place. This reliance on the idea of core attributes feeds back into Erving Goffman's (1963, p. 13) observation that stigma refers to 'an attribute that is deeply discrediting' where these attributes are at odds with 'what a given type of individual should be'. Considered in Hudson's example, core attributes can be seen as key features that define an entity and that, upon their being made known, are the cause of stigma and a loss of status in society.

Event stigma, on the contrary, 'results from discrete, anomalous, episodic events' (2008, p. 253). Writing about stigma affecting organizations, Hudson notes that

examples of event-related stigma include industrial accidents, mass product defects, or bankruptcy (2008, p. 253). These can be seen as key, damaging moments. It is possible to find parallel moments in the stories of places including mass public disturbances, accidents or major crimes. Holt and Wilkins (2015) apply the idea of event stigma to the study of place in their study on the impact on the residents of Gloucester in relation to the killings committed by Fred and Rosemary West over a 20-year span between 1967 and 1987. Holt and Wilkins note that the legacy of an event can be long-lasting and, in the case of the extreme crimes of the Wests, residents of Gloucester felt that their home was tainted because of its connection with the murders.

Though Holt and Wilkins (2014) successfully incorporated the notion of event-based stigma in their work on the stigma of Gloucester felt by its residents, apart from their work, the idea of core and event stigma has not widely been incorporated into the sociology and geography literature on place. I suggest, however, that thinking about place-based stigma in such a way can be a helpful addition as we try to understand more about the type of stigma, its origins, and its 'stickiness'. We can also link the concept back to Goffman's understanding of stigma; core stigma relies on the 'attributes' that Goffman describes. He explains that these attributes, when relating to perceptions of a person, refer to 'a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak' (1963, p. 12). These attributes 'discredit' and 'reduce' the status of the individual in the minds of others. For Hudson, this core stigma hints at the very essence of the entity: 'who it is, what it does and whom it serves' (2008, p. 253).

Applying core and event stigma

My own research (Butler-Warke, 2020; Butler, 2019) has shown that this concept of 'core' and 'event' stigma is helpful for us as we try to understand the link between temporality and adhesiveness of place-based stigma, particularly in relation to the media's use of and reliance on certain discursive and stigmatising tropes. Through a critical discourse analysis of the elite voices that shaped the portrayal of Toxteth, Liverpool, I highlighted a distinct shift in the character of stigma attached to the district that can best be understood if we think about the type, intensity and temporality of stigma.

I show that there was a form of background or core stigma in Toxteth, in existence for decades prior to highly publicised uprisings that took place in the district in the 1980s, with the uprisings representing a form of 'event stigma' (Butler-Warke, 2020). Toxteth is an area in the south of the city of Liverpool, located on the north-west coast of England. It is situated in the Liverpool 8 (L8) postal district and is an area of great architectural, demographic, and socioeconomic diversity (Frost and Catney, 2019).

The stigma directed towards Toxteth in the early part of the 20th century was seen to be built first on core attributes (Butler-Warke, 2020). The era prior to the age of advanced marginality was defined by a core stigmatisation of Toxteth: a stigmatisation based on the area's attributes and perceived—and constructed—characteristics. Toxteth was shown, at its essence, to be defined by strife, turmoil, criminality, and substandard housing, with the press repeatedly alluding to these discrediting flaws (Butler-Warke, 2020). The gradual press construction of this image resulted in a low-level but enduring stigma that relied on these constructed attributes from which Toxteth cannot escape because of continual press attention. This core stigma creates a generally negative view of Toxteth in the public imagination, allowing later, more intense stigma to take hold.

Event stigma relies not on essential attributes but, rather, on the occurrence of 'discrete, anomalous, episodic events' that mark an entity out as being in some way flawed (Hudson, 2008: 253). Come 1981, the uprisings marked a shift from core to event stigma. Rather than defining Toxteth based on background attributes that gradually stigmatise, Toxteth was instead stigmatised in the British press for the occurrence of the disturbances that shone an unfavourable light on the area, resulting in a high-intensity of stigma for a short period of time (Butler, 2019). I argue that it was, in part, due to the existence of the earlier form of stigma based around core attributes that the stigma of the events of 1981 became so adhesive. The stigma of an event such as the uprisings latches on, in the case of Toxteth, to the existing core stigma in much the same way as Wacquant (2007) argues that territorial stigma in the era of advanced marginality latches onto existing forms of stigma such as those of race and class.

We can see this increased adhesion when we consider areas that experienced similar uprisings and 'event stigma' to Liverpool but whose stigma did not endure or, as

Hudson explains, event stigma is 'recoverable' (2008) meaning that it may be high-intensity for a short period but then recedes. Chapeltown in Leeds, for example, experienced uprisings during the 1970s and 1980s but did not experience the earlier press reliance on core stigmatising tropes. This appears to translate into a less adhesive stigma; a Google image search for Toxteth reveals photographs of derelict houses and images from the disturbances, suggesting that the stigma attached to Toxteth still lingers. A similar search for Chapeltown reveals photographs of noteworthy buildings and property for sale. This means that in the case of Toxteth, the stigma of the events of 1981 has endured. In the case of Chapeltown, this stigma based on the events of the 1970s and 1980s has passed. Crucially, Chapeltown had not been subject to the same intensity of core stigma in the years preceding the events, meaning that the event stigma had less onto which to latch.

Following the disturbances, the stigma surrounding Toxteth changed again. No other events bore the same magnitude as the disturbances of 1981, and the intensity of coverage petered out. The press stigmatisation of the area continued but, without the ferocity of the disturbances, the stigmatisation had to rely on core attributes once again. However, the press also transitioned the event stigma into core attributes through their coverage, continuing to reference the disturbances and creating a normalised discourse that saw Toxteth as persistently connected to the events of 1981, thereby converting event stigma into core stigma. The press also used Toxteth as a reference point and a temporal, geographical, and social marker. This contributed to the transformation of event stigma surrounding the events of 1981 which are distilled into background attributes.

Using core and event stigma allows us to categorise the type of stigma being applied to an area. Our lack of understanding of how place-based stigma forms, or 'the emergence gap' as Slater (2017) describes it, can be addressed through the use of Hudson's stigma types, as tracing the transition from one to another can help understand how stigma is developing and morphing over time. We can then understand how and why stigma attaches in some locations and not in others. The typology allows researchers a way of understanding whether a place is being stigmatised for perceived (or constructed) underlying attributes or for events. If we can understand why and how the stigma is being applied, we shall be able to better understand the origins of place-based stigma.

Past, present and future

As we consider the current 'state of the art' in relation to place-based stigma, there are areas that necessitate further study that will permit us to better understand the enduring questions relating to place-based stigma. My first suggestion for further research may seem somewhat counterintuitive: we need to study non-stigmatised areas. We have rightly invested time and resources in understanding why and how stigma adheres to areas with a negative reputation. This paper has highlighted some of the ways that we can, for example, trace the types of stigma that adhere to a place over time.

If we embrace a comparative angle that compares a stigmatised area to a non-stigmatised area, we may be able to ascertain where their stories diverge and at what points stigma comes to adhere in the stigmatised location but not in the non-stigmatised area. Largely—and understandably—non-stigmatised locations are overlooked in place-based stigma studies (see Hastings and Dean, 2003 for a notable exception) but comparative studies that consider the levels of, for example, press coverage for a stigmatised locale in comparison to the coverage for a non-stigmatised area would be highly beneficial. Research by Permentier et al (2011) has taken a comparative approach in seeing how residents perceive their neighbourhoods and this could serve as a useful starting point, bringing together rich data from 'neighbourhood effects' literature that has largely been dismissed in place-based stigma research for failing to address the integral role that structural inequality plays in determining where people live (Slater, 2013).

There are key paradigmatic and epistemological differences between the approaches taken by scholars of neighbourhood effects and those who consider place-based stigma. Wacquant explains that 'to forget that urban space is a *historical and political construction* in the strong sense of the term is to risk (mis)taking for "neighbourhood effects" what is nothing more than the spatial retranslation of economic and social differences' (2008, p. 9). Here he highlights that without considering the temporal in relation to place, scholars of urban stigma, risk limiting themselves to neighbourhood effects-type theses; surely we must question whether the field of place-based stigma has also fallen into this trap and whether we have latched ourselves too rigidly to the 'slice-through-time' post-Fordist moment that forms the basis of Wacquant's theorisation.

We must also consider that always studying 'stigmatised' areas and labelling them such further perpetuates the stigmatising discourse surrounding these neighbourhoods; a comparative approach that allows us to consider process over place, may be beneficial. Current practice raises ethical considerations about the willingness of neighbourhoods to be scrutinised by academics from institutions that are perceived as bastions of privilege, elitism and whiteness (Bhopal, 2018). While we may champion emancipation and a desire to give voice to the voiceless, we must engage in significant introspection and reflection to ensure that our articulated values are aligned with our research.

Yet, the field of place-based stigma has considerable achievements, and these must not be overlooked. Since the publication of Wacquant's 1993 article that coined the term 'territorial stigma', we have seen an expansion of research in the area of place-based stigma that has allowed us to build a detailed picture of its manifestations; how residents manage, resist and, in some cases, embrace the stigma attached to their neighbourhoods (Butler et al, 2018; Wacquant et al, 2014; Jensen and Christensen, 2012; Slater and Anderson, 2012); and how stigma enters our discourse of place often for a political or economic motives (Kornberg, 2016; Kallin and Slater, 2014; Gray and Mooney, 2011; Hancock and Mooney, 2011). We know that elite voices dominate the discussion but that minoritarian voices also have an important story to tell (Butler et al, 2018). We know that place-based stigma can be adhesive and interlink with other stigmatising or 'discrediting attributes' (Keene and Padilla, 2010; Wacquant, 2007).

Crucially, we have started to see the interplay between place and time. As a field, we are beginning to interrogate the formative processes that pre-date territorial stigma in the era of advanced marginality (Butler-Warke, 2020; Cohen, 2013), and we are recognising that there are longer historical processes at play (Tyler and Slater, 2018; Loyd and Bonds, 2018). Considering the temporal in relation to the spatial will lead to a deeper understanding of the process of place-based stigmatisation.

We need to move beyond 'slice-through-time investigations' (Hassard, 1990) and, in line with our critical focus, consider that context has a distinctly temporal angle. So much of the Wacquantian framing of place-based stigma is based on findings and theorisations that are based on a 'slice-through-time' moment that is now 40 years old.

Undoubtedly, this was a decisive temporal moment, but we have to build an understanding of and theorisation of place-based stigma that is not temporally fixed. Spaces, the lives of people living in those spaces, the discourse surrounding those spaces, and the broader social, political and economic contexts are always in flux. We need to move beyond the temporal fixity that has defined our understanding of place-based stigma and move towards an understanding that sees place-based stigma on a temporal continuum where type and intensity of stigma may vary over time. If we can remove place-based stigma from a rigid temporal hold that limits us to understanding stigma of place as a function of the post Fordist era, we can see how time impacts our understanding of place and we can consider the needs of our communities and plan for a more equitable future for all spaces and their residents.

Bio

Alice Butler-Warke is a critical human geographer and lecturer in Sociology at Robert Gordon University in Scotland. Her research focuses on discourses and power, urban experience and marginality, the process of stigmatisation, and urban materiality.

References

Arthurson, K., Darcy, M. and Rogers, D., (2014) Televised territorial stigma: how social housing tenants experience the fictional media representation of estates in Australia. *Environment and planning A*, 46(6), pp.1334-1350.

August, M., (2014) Challenging the rhetoric of stigmatization: The benefits of concentrated poverty in Toronto's Regent Park. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(6), pp.1317-1333.

Batel, S., (2020) Re-presenting the rural in the UK press: An exploration of the construction, contestation and negotiation of media discourses on the rural within post-carbon energy transitions. *Energy Policy*, 138.

Bhopal, K., (2018) *White privilege: The myth of a post-racial society*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Bourdieu, P., (1999) 'Site Effects', in Bourdieu, P., ed. *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 123–129.

Butler, A., (2019) Toxic Toxteth: Understanding press stigmatization of Toxteth during the 1981 uprising. *Journalism*, 21(4), pp.541-556.

Butler-Warke, A. (2020) Foundational stigma: Place-based stigma in the age before advanced marginality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 71(1), pp.140-152.

Butler, A., Schafran, A. and Carpenter, G., (2018) What does it mean when people call a place a shithole? Understanding a discourse of denigration in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 43(3), pp.496-510.

Cairns, K., (2018) Youth, temporality, and territorial stigma: Finding good in Camden, New Jersey. *Antipode*, 50(5), pp.1224-1243.

Caldeira, T.P., (2009) Marginality, again?!. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 33(3), pp.848-853.

Chatterton, P., (2007) Banlieues, the Hyperghetto and Advanced Marginality: A Symposium on Loïc Wacquant's Urban Outcasts: Introduction. *City*, 11(3), pp.357-363.

Cohen, N., (2013) Territorial stigma formation in the Israeli city of Bat Yam, 1950–1983: planning, people and practice. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 39, pp.113-124.

Damer, S., (1989) *From Moorepark to" Wine Alley": The rise and fall of a Glasgow housing scheme*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Delica, K.N. and Larsen, T.S., (2019) Territorial destigmatisation: Dealing with sticky stigma at the institutional level. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, pp.1-29.

Devereux, E., Haynes, A. and Power, M.J., (2011) At the edge: Media constructions of a stigmatised Irish housing estate. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 26(2), pp.123-142.

Fairclough, N., (1995) *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fattah, K.N. and Walters, P., (2020)"A Good Place for the Poor!" Counternarratives to Territorial Stigmatisation from Two Informal Settlements in Dhaka. *Social Inclusion*, 8(1), pp.55-65.

Frost, D. and Catney, G., (2019) Belonging and the intergenerational transmission of place identity: Reflections on a British inner-city neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*.

Geiselhart, K (2017) Call it by its proper name! Territory-ism and territorial stigmatisation as a dynamic model: The case of Old Naledi. In: Kirkness, P., Tijé-Dra, A. (eds) *Negative Neighbourhood Reputation and Place Attachment: The Production and Contestation of Territorial Stigma*. London: Routledge, pp.216–234.

Gertner, D. and Kotler, P., (2004) How can a place correct a negative image?. *Place branding*, 1(1), pp.50-57.

Gilbert, M.R., (2010) 'Place, space, and agency: Moving beyond the homogenous "ghetto"', *Urban Geography*, 31(2), pp. 148–152.

Gill, O., (1977) *Luke Street*. London: The Macmillan Press.

Goffman, E., (1963) *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Gray, N. and Mooney, G., (2011) Glasgow's new urban frontier: 'Civilising' the population of 'Glasgow East'. *City*, 15(1), pp.4-24.

Hackworth, J., (2019) *Manufacturing decline: How racism and the conservative movement crush the American Rust Belt*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hancock, L., (2008) The criminalisation of places: Lynn Hancock considers how certain localities become labelled as 'criminal areas'. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 74(1), pp.22-23.

Hancock, L. and Mooney, G., (2011) 'Saints and scroungers': constructing the poverty and crime myth: *Criminal Justice Matters*, 83(1), pp.26-27.

Hassard, J., (1990) Introduction: The sociological study of time. In: Hassard, J. (ed.) *The sociology of time*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.1-18.

Hastings, A. and Dean, J., (2003) Challenging images: tackling stigma through estate regeneration. *Policy & Politics*, 31(2), pp.171-184

Holt, A. and Wilkins, C., (2015) 'In some eyes it's still oooh, Gloucester, yeah Fred West': spatial stigma and the impact of a high-profile crime on community Identity. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 25(1), pp.82-94.

Hudson, B.A., (2008) Against all odds: A consideration of core-stigmatized organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), pp.252-266.

Jensen, S.Q. and Christensen, A.D., (2012) Territorial stigmatization and local belonging: A study of the Danish neighbourhood Aalborg East. *City*, 16(1-2), pp.74-92.

Kallin, H. and Slater, T., (2014) Activating territorial stigma: gentrifying marginality on Edinburgh's periphery. *Environment and planning A*, 46(6), pp.1351-1368.

Keene, D.E. and Padilla, M.B., (2010) Race, class and the stigma of place: Moving to "opportunity" in Eastern Iowa. *Health & place*, 16(6), pp.1216-1223.

Kornberg, D., (2016) The structural origins of territorial stigma: water and racial politics in metropolitan Detroit, 1950s–2010s. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40(2), pp.263-283.

Larsen, T.S., (2014) Copenhagen's West End a 'Paradise Lost': The political production of territorial stigmatization in Denmark. *Environment and Planning a*, 46(6), pp.1386-1402.

Logan, L., (2020) *The City of the Dead as a place to live: unpacking the narratives about tomb communities*. MRCP thesis. Kansas State University. Available at: https://krex.k-state.edu/dspace/handle/2097/40618 (Accessed: 20 June 2020)

Loyd, J.M. and Bonds, A., (2018) Where do Black lives matter? Race, stigma, and place in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *The Sociological Review*, 66(4), pp.898-918.

Maestri, G., (2017) Extensive territorial stigma and ways of coping with it. In: Kirkness, P. and Tijé-Dra, A. eds. *Negative neighbourhood reputation and place attachment: The production and contestation of territorial stigma*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.42-59.

Miller, A.C., (2014) *Territorial Stigma on the Canadian Prairies: Representations of North Central, Regina* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Regina).

Nedoroscik, J.A., (1997) *The city of the dead: A history of Cairo's cemetery communities*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Németh, K., (2019) Trapped in the past? The reproduction of poverty and marginality in a Hungarian manorial village. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(3), pp.419-446.

Pedersen, H.D. and Gram, M., (2018) 'The brainy ones are leaving': the subtlety of (un) cool places through the eyes of rural youth. *Journal of youth studies*, 21(5), pp.620-635.

Permentier, M., Bolt, G. and Van Ham, M., (2011) Determinants of neighbourhood satisfaction and perception of neighbourhood reputation. *Urban studies*, 48(5), pp.977-996.

Pinkster, F.M., Ferier, M.S. and Hoekstra, M.S., (2020) On the stickiness of territorial stigma: Diverging experiences in Amsterdam's most notorious neighbourhood. *Antipode*, 52(2), pp.522-541.

Rhodes, J., (2012) Stigmatization, space, and boundaries in de-industrial Burnley. *Ethnic and Racial studies*, 35(4), pp.684-703.

Rudolph, D. and Kirkegaard, J.K., (2019)Making space for wind farms: Practices of territorial stigmatisation in rural Denmark. *Antipode*, 51(2), pp.642-663.

Sakizlioglu, N.B. and Uitermark, J., (2014) The symbolic politics of gentrification: the restructuring of stigmatized neighborhoods in Amsterdam and Istanbul. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(6), pp.1369-1385.

Slater, T., (2013) Your life chances affect where you live: A critique of the 'cottage industry' of neighbourhood effects research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), pp.367-387.

Slater, T., (2017) 'Territorial Stigmatization: Symbolic Defamation and the Contemporary Metropolis', in Hannigan, J. and Richards, G., eds. *The Handbook of New Urban Studies*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 111-125

Slater, T., (2018) The invention of the 'sink estate': Consequential categorisation and the UK housing crisis. *The Sociological Review*, 66(4), pp.877-897.

Slater, T. and Anderson, N., (2012) The reputational ghetto: territorial stigmatisation in St Paul's, Bristol. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(4), pp.530-546.

Small, M.L., (2007) Is there such a thing as 'The Ghetto'? The perils of assuming that the South Side of Chicago represents poor black neighborhoods. *City*, 11(3), pp.413-421.

Smith, N., (1979) Toward a theory of gentrification a back to the city movement by capital, not people. *Journal of the American planning association*, 45(4), pp.538-548.

Sørensen, N.U. and Pless, M., (2017) Living on the periphery of youth: Young people's narratives of youth life in rural areas. *Young*, *25*(4_suppl), pp.1S-17S.

Tissot, S., (2007) The role of race and class in urban marginality: Discussing Loïc Wacquant's comparison between the USA and France. *City*, 11(3), pp.364-369.

Tucker, J., (1966) *Honourable Estates*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.

Tyler, D.I., (2013) *Revolting subjects: Social abjection and resistance in neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed Books Ltd..

Tyler, I. and Slater, T., (2018) Rethinking the sociology of stigma. *The Sociological Review*, 66(4), pp. 721-743.

Wacquant, L.J., (1993) Urban outcasts: stigma and division in the black American ghetto and the French urban periphery. *International journal of urban and regional research*, *17*(3), pp.366-383.

Wacquant, L., (1996) 'The rise of advanced marginality: notes on its nature and implications', *Acta Sociologica*, 39, pp. 121-139.

Wacquant, L., (2007) 'Territorial Stigmatization in the age of advanced marginality', *Thesis Eleven*, 91(1), pp. 66–77.

Wacquant, L., (2008) *Urban outcasts: A comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wacquant, L., (2020) Revisiting Territories of Relegation: Class, Ethnicity and State in the Making of Advanced Marginality. In: Rachwał, T. and Hepp, R. (eds). *Precarious Places* . Wiesbaden: Springer, pp.149-164.

Wacquant, L., Slater, T. and Pereira, V.B., (2014) 'Territorial stigmatization in action', *Environment and Planning A*, 46(6), pp. 1270–1280.

Watt, P., (2020) Territorial stigmatisation and poor housing at a London 'Sink Estate'. *Social Inclusion*, 8(1), pp.20-33.

Zhang, Y., (2017) 'This is my "Wo 1"': Making home in Shanghai's Lower Quarter. In: Kirkness, P. and Tijé-Dra, A. eds. *Negative neighbourhood reputation and place attachment: The production and contestation of territorial stigma*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.138-157.