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Migration and identity

It is widely recognised that the process of migration may alter the identities of migrants just as it may alter dominant conceptions of national identity in the receiving country (Modood 1997). However, the ‘assimilationist’ model in which migrant identities evolved to accord more closely with dominant identities within their new national context has been widely challenged by multicultural and transnationalist perspectives (Castles 2002; Faist 2000; Koopmans and Statham 1999; Østergaard-Nielsen 2003; Portes et al 1999). While such arguments represent a valuable corrective to insufficiently nuanced understandings of the relationship between migration and identity, arguably they neglect an important dimension. While in one respect challenging ‘methodological nationalism’ (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003), the primary point of reference continues to be the state. It is states that are understood to be multicultural, and transnationalism in fact describes a situation where migrant interests and identities are divided between different state contexts.

What is underemphasised is the multi-national nature of many states and the significance that this has for questions relating to migration and identity. Migration need not entail the traversing of state boundaries for questions of identity – indeed national identity – to be significant. Although discussions of the relationship between migration, identity and citizenship are important and valuable (see, e.g. Castles 2002;
Nagel and Staeheli 2004) many migrants move within state boundaries but cross national borders, and thus retain their previous citizenship rights but nevertheless are required to (re-)negotiate their identities within a changed national context. In these instances, migrants may have a disrupted sense of belonging and identification, and formal citizenship is no guarantee against ‘informal and symbolic’ exclusion (Favell and Geddes 1999: 11; Nagel and Staeheli 2004).

We examine a specific instance of migration across national borders but within state boundaries: movement between England and Scotland. Our work contrasts with previous research on England-Scotland migration in that we focus on a somewhat under-researched group (graduates, specifically those who moved from England to study at a university in Scotland) and on those who, although not recent migrants to Scotland, were not long-term residents. An important aspect of the research was to explore what factors may be influential in encouraging long-term settlement among this group. Graduate migration is also examined within the context of Scotland’s contemporary demographic challenges, and the political response to these challenges. Scotland is facing a projected decline in population and highly skilled migrants are seen as an important means of addressing this decline. The research will therefore provide lessons for states and other territories which share a similar demographic status and ambitions. Our focus in this paper is on those findings which concern national identities and their potential influence upon migration and settlement. Specifically, we examine the significance of migrants’ understandings of their own identities, and of those identities which are imposed upon them by the majority population.
Scotland: demography, migration and identity

While an increasing number of states are marked by both substantial immigration and outmigration (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003), as a national ‘region’ of a larger state (the United Kingdom) Scotland is an interesting case of a territory which has a fairly long history of being so characterised, and net emigration has also been an historically consistent feature of its demography. It has also been noted that for countries which experience substantial outmigration, the most obviously negative aspect is the loss of the most educated individuals, sometimes described as a ‘brain drain’ (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003: 9). Although this designation is more often applied to movement from poor to rich countries (Castles 2002: 1151), outmigration from Scotland is also often characterised as a ‘brain drain’ involving the nation’s most talented and qualified individuals (Devine 1992; Lindsay 1991). At least some contemporary evidence exists which appears to support such perceptions. For example, in the 12 months prior to the 2001 UK Census, over 4,000 more degree-qualified people moved from Scotland to other parts of the UK than moved in the opposite direction.

Recently, Scotland’s population has begun to demonstrate a reversal of consistent net emigration, with the years 2004-2006 each showing a substantial positive net in-migration (GROS 2006). However, population projections continue to indicate substantial decline and ageing. While there is some debate about whether this represents a demographic crisis (Graham and Boyle 2003), there is little doubt that it has stimulated much political concern and activity, not least because the enactment of devolution in 1999 has endowed Scotland with a renewed and expanded political capacity. Politicians in Scotland from most parts of the political spectrum are united
in a desire to stimulate migration still further, particularly of highly-qualified migrants. While Scottish legislative competence in this area is limited, there have been some relevant and significant policy initiatives such as ‘Fresh Talent’ (Scottish Executive 2004), which primarily aimed to attract and retain highly skilled and qualified migrants. The initial badging of this initiative with the title ‘New Scots’ demonstrates the ambition to encourage long-term settlement rather than shorter term migration. This initiative also sits comfortably with a long-standing interpretation of Scottishness as a fundamentally ‘civic’ identity where it is possible to base ‘belonging’ upon residence and commitment rather than more inflexible attributes such as ancestry or birth (Kiely et al 2005a: 151).

Nevertheless, it is also important to recognise the existence of less inclusive attitudes to migrants and minorities in Scotland. Regardless of the predominant political agenda, if popular attitudes are substantially negative, then this is likely to have a limiting effect on the nation’s capacity to foster long-term settlement and encourage ‘New Scots’. Recent survey evidence indicates that a substantial minority of people in Scotland would not regard non-white people as fellow nationals, and that discriminatory attitudes towards Muslims in Scotland – who represent around half of the minority ethnic population – are also widespread (Bond 2006; Bond and Rosie 2006; Hussain and Miller 2006). Significantly, these studies also highlight substantial antipathy toward those born in England.

‘The English’ in Scotland

The 2001 Census indicated that eight per cent of the population of Scotland were born in England, and they can thus be regarded as Scotland’s largest ‘minority’ group.
Indeed Watson (2003) shows that the English\(^1\) in Scotland have for more than 50 years outnumbered all other migrant groups combined. They have in a sense been a ‘hidden’ minority in that they are citizens of the same state, have many historical and cultural features in common with, and speak the same language as, the overwhelming majority of Scottish people. They can, however, also be described as an ‘audible minority’, not in the sense that this term has been used in some other migration research (e.g. Colic-Peisker, 2005) to describe migrants who evidently do not speak the dominant language of their country of destination as a first language, but because their accent is often an indicator that they have migrated from a different national region of the same state. Moreover, while migrants from England are not faced with the same challenges of integration and assimilation as are many other migrant groups, they may still need to adjust their sense of identity and belonging as a result of living in a changed national context.

Their predominantly professional and managerial occupational profile (Findlay et al 2004), together with an historical background of established concerns about the ‘anglicisation’ of Scotland (McCrone 1992: 122-123) has meant that much research and discussion has focused on social environments in which ‘the English’ were perceived to wield a disproportionate influence in Scottish society (e.g. Jedrej and Nuttal 1996; Kiely et al 2001; Walker 1994). However, more recent research has explored the notion that the English in Scotland may be subject to certain dimensions of disadvantage experienced by other minorities (Bond 2006; Bond and Rosie 2006; Hussain and Miller 2006; McIntosh et al 2004a, 2004b; Watson 2003). Many of these studies, and not a few others (Findlay et al 2004; Kiely et al 2005a, 2005b) have also explored how the English in Scotland negotiate their national identities.
The study of English migrants in Scotland thus represents a valuable example of a body of work examining migration, and its relationship to identity, within a context where migrants cross national borders whilst remaining within state boundaries. Such migrants often enter a different normative context in which identity categories bearing the same label are understood and applied in quite different ways (Findlay et al 2004: 62). A key feature here is that a majority of people in Scotland prioritise their Scottish over their British identity, and a substantial minority attach negative political and historical connotations to the label ‘British’. Migrants from England are thus subject to majority assumptions that they will similarly self-identify as ‘English’ and many thus acquire an ‘English’ national identity not through their own agency, but because it is attributed to them by the majority Scottish population (Findlay et al 2004; Kiely et al 2005b, 2006; McIntosh et al 2004a). Similar processes have been identified among migrants from England living in Wales (Day et al 2006), and indeed the labelling as ‘Irish’ of Northern Irish Protestant migrants in England (Ni Laoire 2002).

In the face of this, some migrants may continue to emphasise their British identity as an (attempted) means of reconciling Scots and English differences, while others may instead assert an (English) regional identity (Findlay et al 2004). But, especially for relatively long-term migrants from England, a further option is that migrants may assume (at least partially) a Scottish identity. Such people may be referred to as ‘adopted’ Scots (Findlay et al 2004: 66-67) or ‘belonging’ Scots (Kiely et al 2006: 486). Kiely et al’s observation that a Scottish identity may be ‘… acquired through late rather than through early socialisation’ (2005a: 153) is particularly
valuable here. Once more, Day et al’s (2006) work in Wales similarly shows that some migrants from England come to adopt a Welsh identity. Such people are a particularly interesting category because they demonstrate the significance of ‘assimilation’, even when migration does not involve the traversing of state boundaries; because they indicate an evident potential among English migrants to identify with their new (Scottish) national context to the degree that they wish to ‘become’ Scottish; and because they highlight that this process of identification will encounter barriers in the shape of majority attitudes (Kiely et al 2005a). In research conducted by Findlay et al (2004: 76): ‘Many of the [English] interviewees wished to be assimilated into the wider Scottish population and were both surprised and frustrated at the obstacles to achieving this objective’. Kiely et al (2005a) similarly point out that only a small minority of the English migrants they researched attempted to claim a Scottish identity, and that many others emphasised the reasons why they could not make such claims, even though most had ‘settled’ in Scotland. Those who did make claims to Scottishness were invariably long-term residents of Scotland. These findings substantiate the quantitative research which has been done on identities in Scotland (see Bond 2006; Bond and Rosie 2006).

An imputed ‘English’ identity may also provoke discriminatory attitudes. While previous studies all tend to highlight the existence of anti-Englishness, they vary in the extent to which this is regarded as significantly antagonistic. Some emphasise the rarity of extreme discrimination and point out that antipathy tends to be directed toward ‘the English’ as a somewhat abstract group, rather than specific individuals (Kiely et al 2006; McIntosh et al 2004a; Watson 2003). Nevertheless, at least some of these researchers (McIntosh et al 2004a) also note that to be regarded as
‘English’ in Scotland also entails constant reminders of one’s (non-Scottish) national identity. In common with other studies (Findlay et al 2004; Kiely et al 2005a), accent is a particularly acute marker of difference in this sense, substantiating the notion that the ‘audible’ minority status of the English in Scotland is an important factor. In addition, other work (McIntosh et al 2004b) demonstrates that anti-Englishness can sometimes take the form of hostility toward individual migrants from England, and that the repeated experience of anti-English sentiment can have an insidious effect upon the actual or potential sense of ‘belonging’ that English migrants may develop in Scotland. McIntosh et al also highlight the existence of ‘degrees of Englishness’ (2004a: 50; 2004b: 5.2) such that having origins in the north as opposed to the south of England, and/or being from a working class background may attract less antipathy.

**Studying graduate migration**

A primary influence upon our decision to study graduate migration was the political aspiration to increase migration to Scotland substantially, particularly the migration of highly qualified individuals. Also significant is the fact that, within a UK context, there is a dearth of literature and data relating both to graduates’ migration and career patterns beyond the initial period following graduation, and their motivations for making migration decisions. Research concerned with the migration of highly skilled people (e.g. Findlay et al 2003; Koser and Salt 1997) is useful but does not specifically address graduates. Faggian et al (2006) highlight the need to understand graduate migration as a sequential process, potentially involving migration from the original home area to place of study and then further migration for employment. However, the detailed motivations which might underlie graduate migration are not addressed. Lindsay (1991) examined graduates’ migration motivations but only
among people from Scotland living overseas. Data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) details graduate locations approximately six months after graduation, but not their longer-term migration patterns or reasons for migration decisions. Purcell et al (2006) report research which surveys a cohort from five Scottish Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) four years after graduation, but in common with some other recent UK research on graduates (Elias and Purcell 2004; Furlong and Cartmel 2005) the primary focus is on employment, and although there are valuable data on migration patterns, motivations for migration are not addressed.

A further key reason for focusing on graduate migration is that HEIs in Scotland draw substantial numbers of students from other parts of the UK and overseas. In 2004-2005, 26 per cent of students at Scottish HEIs had a non-Scottish domicile (Scottish Executive 2006a). These individuals thus represent an obvious pool of potential highly qualified ‘migrants’ to Scotland, but they are also a relatively ‘unsettled’ group. While 91 per cent of 2004-05 Scottish-domiciled graduates who were in employment around six months after graduation were working in Scotland, this applied to only 38 per cent of those who had come to Scotland to study from other parts of the UK and 22 per cent from other EU countries (Scottish Executive 2006b). It is thus important that we learn more about the migration behaviour of the individuals who do not originate from Scotland and the factors underlying this behaviour.

By far the most highly represented sub-category are students who originate from England, who account for 76 per cent of all students from other parts of the UK and 36 per cent of all students who are not Scottish-domiciled (Scottish Executive
2006a). Studying this group can fill an important gap in our knowledge with respect to English migrants in Scotland and the significance of national identities in terms of their likely ‘belonging’ and settlement. The vast majority of the English-born research participants in the various studies discussed above tended to be quite long-term migrants, people who seemed unlikely to return to England, rather than relatively recent migrants to Scotland from England, for whom identity may prove to be a significant factor in determining whether or not they choose to make a long-term commitment.

Our research was conducted in 2005/06 and was part of a wider research programme which was concerned with Scottish demography. The available resources were focused on one specific cohort: those who completed their first degree (i.e. excluding postgraduates) at the University of Edinburgh in the year 2000. The institution was chosen primarily because of the diversity of its students (it attracts almost equal numbers from within and outside Scotland, and from a wide range of social backgrounds). The year 2000 was selected to allow enough time to have passed since graduation so that the findings were more likely to reflect long-term employment and residence patterns, whilst also minimizing attrition related to loss of accurate contact details and memory-recall difficulties that would have been associated with earlier graduates.

In June 2005 a questionnaire concerning education, employment and migration was sent to all of the selected cohort for whom addresses were held (approximately 90 per cent of the cohort, amounting to 3,134 graduates). Excluding late returns, 1,362 completed questionnaires were received, a response rate of over 43
per cent. Methodological texts differ with regard to the level of response to surveys which is considered to be adequate, but a response rate to a postal survey exceeding 40 per cent would generally be thought to be satisfactory especially when, despite the best efforts of the University authorities, many graduates would no longer be living at the last address held for them. A series of follow-up semi-structured interviews were conducted to elicit more detailed accounts of migration behaviour and the social and economic circumstances by which it is influenced. A total of 80 graduates were interviewed, 20 each from four categories determined by pre-university origins (living in Scotland or not) and place of residence at the time of the survey (living in Scotland or not).

Our interview findings suggest that motivations for graduate migration can be understood in terms of three groups of factors: the opportunities that are perceived to exist in various geographical places (most clearly represented by the availability and quality of graduate level employment); the connections people have to such places (most significantly through relationships with partners, families, and friends); and the expectations they have for their future lives (most notably with specific respect to our respondents, whether or not they expect to remain in Scotland). We discuss the general findings from the survey and interviews in more detail elsewhere (see Bond et al 2008). However, our interviews also established the significance of connections based on affinity, identity and belonging and, in keeping with our primary focus in this paper, we now turn to examine the data which relate to these themes.

We are most concerned with those graduates who did not originate from Scotland (the vast majority of whom came from England) and the respects in which
issues of identity may be significant to their migration decisions. These data were derived from specific interview questions which explored respondents’ conceptions of ‘home’, their sense of belonging to particular places, their personal feelings of national identity, and whether or not they believed they had ever been treated differently on the basis of their national origins, as well as more general emergent data from the interviews. Our findings offer general insights regarding the significance of such factors for migrants who cross national borders within the same state, and, more specifically, may inform strategies to increase retention of non-Scots graduates. We begin by considering the factors which are likely to facilitate identification with Scotland, before going on to discuss the principal barriers to belonging which exist.

Identification with Scotland

The interviews conducted with those graduates who did not originate from Scotland, but who had remained in or returned to the country to live, demonstrated a degree of flexibility in respondents’ conceptions of ‘home’. Most reported feeling at home and identifying with Scotland to some degree at least. This was most evident among those who had family connections to Scotland and/or had lived in Scotland more or less constantly since beginning their studies – in Faggian et al’s terminology, ‘stickers’ (2006: 464). In contrast, the few who were more ambivalent in terms of their identification had spent less of the postgraduate period living in Scotland. The extent to which national identification and allegiance may shift as a result of extended residence is exemplified by this respondent:

‘I suppose, yeah … allegiance … when I was studying history, often you’d be looking at … lots of wars between England and Scotland … and you’d be looking at from the English side,
and the Scottish side. And I suppose that mainly when I first moved to Edinburgh, I would have looked at it in a blinkered fashion from the English point of view. But you kind of looking in reverse now, and you’re looking at in terms of Scottish perspective as well. So I suppose, I suppose my allegiance is mixed. As I said, I don’t really consider myself English or Scottish, I’m just from Scotland, and I’m British’ (NSIS 7)

Individuals’ national identities have been described as being derived from various ‘markers’ (Kiely et al 2001) or ‘resources’ (Bond and Rosie 2006) such as residence, birthplace and ancestry. Of course, as the quotation above indicates, feelings of affinity or identification with a nation such as Scotland need not imply a sense of national belonging in the sense of actually adopting a (Scottish) national identity. However, examining the various means by which such affinity is developed among interviewees illuminates the processes and resources with which identification comes to be constructed, both in a general sense and with respect to the specific Scottish/British context. For a group who commonly lack the resources of birthplace or ancestry, identification must be developed through other means. Although it is clear that childhood experience has a profound effect upon the development of identity, this process does not necessarily end with childhood. Our findings suggest that for those who have migrated to a new national context during late adolescence, identification may be developed through a kind of adult socialization, thus substantiating the findings of Kiely et al (2005a):

‘… I would say I felt more attached to Scotland in general than I did Yorkshire. Basically I’ve had most of my adult life here and I intend to stay here’ (NSIS 11)

‘I would say my own home is here in Edinburgh. Most of my adult life I’ve been in Edinburgh’ (NSIS 4)
In addition, we found that this may be paralleled with a kind of *institutional* belonging developed through the workplace. There is some resonance here with Kiely et al.’s claim that, for some migrants, ‘[t]he key markers for belonging claims are demonstrable forms of commitment and contribution to the country’ (2005a: 153).

‘No I do identify with Scotland. I do. I work for the [Scottish institution] so I’m quite involved in, […] well at a low level I suppose, but you know, on policy and all that kind of business. So I connect with the country in that way, through my work anyway’ (NSIS 12)

‘… part of it, the job that I now do working in [Scottish institution] and all that kind of stuff, it makes you think about Scotland and identify with Scotland I think’ (NSIS 20)

For others, the absence of birthplace as an identity resource need not mean that geographical origins are irrelevant to the construction of identification. Some expressed what can be described as a ‘North British’ affinity in which parallels are drawn between the attributes and qualities shared by those from the north of England and Scotland in contradistinction to those from the south of England.

‘INT: And what do you like and dislike about living in Scotland as opposed to England?
RES: I think there is a certain no nonsense attitude that I like, I mean, I think that applies to the North East [of England] as well, I mean I’m identifying with something that I grew up with but yeah, I think there is a certain sort of unwillingness to take nonsense which I appreciate. And just sort of straightforwardness I think is a sort of Northern virtue’ (NSIS 1)
This respondent also exemplifies the potential for people who were not born or brought up in Scotland to base identification on a more ‘ethnic’ invocation of family background, using ancestry as a marker of identity:

‘… my parents and their family are all from Scotland, and in fact, as far as I can tell from the people that have become interested in family trees and stuff, they’re all from Scotland as far back as you like to go’ (NSIS 1)

**Barriers to belonging: ‘claiming’ Scottishness?**

While the evidence thus far indicates a positive potential for turning (graduate) ‘migrants’ into ‘settlers’, our findings also suggest there are significant barriers to belonging which relate to the national identities of migrants. First, we consider the small number of interviewees who claimed, or at least implied that they would like to claim, a degree of Scottish national identity. The following examples offer an interesting contrast:

‘I always get annoyed when, not in this context obviously, but like when people accentuate the fact that you’re different you know, that you’re Norwegian, you’re not quite Scottish and it’s like, well I live here – that’s Scottish enough for me’

(NSIS 6)

‘… I never really strongly thought of myself as English, because both my parents were Scottish so obviously I was Scottish as well. That seemed fairly self-evident to me when I was little. Since I’ve come here I have modified that slightly just because I think, because of other people’s assumptions, because when you speak in an English accent then you’re English’ (NSIS 1)
The first respondent is distinctive among our interviewees in that she is one of a small number of non-Scots who were not from England. Nevertheless, her comment exemplifies the potential for those who have no connection to Scotland through birthplace or ancestry to make a ‘civic’ claim to Scottishness in which residence is itself a sufficient basis for national identity. The second respondent we have already encountered as someone who makes a more ‘ethnic’ claim in which parenthood is invoked as an identity resource, but his comment here also makes clear that his status as a member of an audible minority is an important determinant of his identity, as it is for the following respondent:

‘I’d love to call myself Scottish […] My parents are Scottish, my university was Scottish, I’ve been to Scotland every year of my life but with this [English] accent I can’t… it’s a bit distressing’ (NSIS 17)

Such accounts highlight that the responses of the ‘majority’ – or at least their anticipated responses – place limits upon individual claims to particular national identities. As another graduate living in Scotland remarked, ‘… I think part of the reason I would never really feel Scottish is because I don’t really think other people would ever really see me as Scottish …’ (NSIS 11). Such sentiments provide further support to some of the previous research described above (Findlay et al 2004; Kiely et al 2005a; Bond 2006; Bond and Rosie 2006), and also highlight the fact that imputed identity may prove a significant impediment to the sense of belonging and settlement of migrants to Scotland. Although migrants may of course become settlers without adopting a new national identity, where national origins are themselves the object of direct discrimination on the part of the ‘majority’ community, this is likely to
represent a barrier to belonging which will militate against attempts to encourage higher rates of in-migration and settlement.

**Barriers to Belonging: direct discrimination?**

Experiences of anti-English sentiment and behaviour were widespread among our own respondents, accounting for a majority of non-Scots respondents who were no longer living in Scotland in 2005, and a substantial minority of those who were living in Scotland. It should be highlighted that anti-Englishness is seldom severe. One respondent reported a friend being subjected to an attempted assault because of his nationality and others had heard accounts of similar instances but none had directly experienced physical violence. Another interviewee had instigated an employment tribunal as a result of perceived anti-Englishness, but once more such employment-based discrimination was not typical. In most cases, such experiences will not represent the primary reason for graduates to leave (or consider leaving) Scotland. They need to be considered alongside other important factors, most notably those related to employment opportunities and personal relationships. Nevertheless, the breadth and nature of our evidence on this issue highlights the potential for such experiences to affect identification with Scotland, and thus weaken capacity to retain highly skilled graduates who originated from south of the border. This is illustrated by the following:

‘Well I don’t think you’re going to, as far as English students go, I don’t think you’re going to hold anybody if this kind of treatment and attitude towards the English prevails. I don’t think particularly that I have had a bad—I have had a bad experience, but I don’t think I’m particularly unique’ (NSIS5)
'I used to live down in Leith\textsuperscript{7} as well at one point and that was obviously, you know, it’s a bit more a bastion of Scottishness and again, it was just that sort of, you felt that barrier came down and it didn’t matter who you were and what you did, that was it. They’ve made their minds up about you. And it wasn’t just not acknowledging you but it’s just being deliberately rude to you […] But I didn’t feel as if it was a place, Scotland didn’t seem to be a place that opened its arms and kind of said, “listen we really want you to come here”. I kind of muscled in and I kind of made it my home because I kind of wanted it to but I could easily have been quite excluded from that’ (NSNIS 17)

Others contrasted their own relatively benign experiences with the more negative accounts of those close to them, such as this respondent’s partner’s experience of working in a restaurant:

‘… she would come back in tears. On more than one occasion just be incredibly rude. Customers telling her, you know ‘piss off back to England’ (NSNIS10).

However, while prevalent, accounts of anti-Englishness reveal a similar complexity among (relatively) recent graduate migrants as was evident in the previous research discussed above which was concerned for the most part with more long-term settled migrants from England. Some had not experienced any problems with anti-Englishness or considered any such experiences to be mild or insignificant. The accounts of others provided a (familiar) illustration of how anti-Englishness may be mediated by regional origins and social class:

‘That’s the one thing that slightly holds me back from feeling completely at home in Edinburgh, and that I would seriously think about if I was going to move up there. Because I did feel like, not with everyone at all obviously, but quite often actually there was a slight antagonism towards English people. And it might be partly because I’ve got quite a posh
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English accent, I don’t know. I think friends of mine who were from Northern England didn’t have such difficult times’ (NSNIS 8)

‘INT: So did you ever get treated differently because you were English?

RES: Once or twice, but I found, I noticed a difference, I had some friends at University from down south in London areas, the fact that I came from Newcastle made a special kind of English, it was kind of you are not as bad as them. If you ever got it… occasionally you would get it in pub or something like that… it was actually, I said it to people yeah but I am from Newcastle, that’s not the same, oh no it’s not, right you’re fine… I don’t know if that made a difference just being a bit further north …’ (NSIS 20)

An interesting feature of the first of these quotations is the interviewee’s conflation of social class and regional origins. There is an assumption that those from the north of England are not ‘posh’. To the degree that they are able to distinguish between different English accents, this is an assumption that may be shared by those in the majority Scottish community who are the source of anti-English sentiment. The second quote shows how some people from England might deliberately highlight their geographical and social origins in appealing to the ‘North British’ affinity noted above. Hence it is not necessarily the holding of ‘an’ English national identity which straightforwardly invites discrimination: while the English in Scotland may be described as an audible minority, they are also a differentiated audible minority. There are different understandings of different kinds of Englishness which will be based substantially upon accent; in McIntosh et al’s terms there are ‘degrees of Englishness’ (2004a: 50). Such variations in ‘English’ identities – both self-conceived and imputed – may also have a substantial effect on migrants’ decisions regarding settlement or return. Our survey evidence showed that graduates who attended state rather than
private schools, and those who came to Scotland from the north of England as opposed to the south, were more likely to stay in (or return to) Scotland.

Those who occupy different territories of the UK may have different understandings of the ‘imagined’ national community (Anderson 1991; Kiely et al 2005b, 2006). For respondents of English origin the choice of university was made within a predominantly British frame of reference. Only a few (all of whom had family connections to Scotland) chose to study in Scotland with the knowledge that they would be moving to a quite distinct national context which appealed to them. Most did not perceive that studying and living in Scotland would be a qualitatively different experience to studying in England in any but the most minor or obvious of details (such as the four-year Scottish degree). Interviewees were most likely to base their choice of university on the appeal of the city, the quality of the university, or the desire to move a substantial distance from their parental home. The fact that those who migrate to Scotland to study may not perceive that they are crossing any significant national boundaries may mean that the experience of anti-English sentiment is largely unanticipated. The first quote below, relating to a common area of anti-Englishness (sport) provides an example, while the second highlights the potential for such experiences to influence the degree of identification with Scotland which migrants may develop:

‘… don’t know if I was prepared for as much of it. I mean, the anti-Englishness was quite novel because in England you don’t really have anti-Scottishness, it’s not really a big thing, you don’t really notice it. And of course now I think, how naive was I! But I think, I remember the ’98 World Cup being quite, there was a few hairy moments, people being quite aggressive and anti-English and that was quite a shock’ (NSIS 11)
‘Any kind of allegiance to Scotland has been kind of killed by the anti-English feeling of the Scots […] I will cheer for the other team that are playing Scotland. Not quite as fervently as they do for the [team playing England], but, you know’ (NSIS 2)

The first of these quotations also suggests that there is no parallel anti-Scottishness in England. This perception accords with the (limited) previous research in this area (see McCarthy 2005), and it is further substantiated by the accounts of our interviewees who had originated from Scotland but were living in England. In contrast to the existence of anti-Englishness in Scotland, being Scottish in England seems, if anything, to be an asset rather than a drawback:

‘INT: And have you found you’ve ever been treated differently down here because you’re Scottish? Either positively or negatively?
RES: Yeah I think people see it as a positive thing in my experience. […] they sort of mock the Scottish but in a good way. It’s kind of just teasing the accent and all those things but people generally seem to see it as a positive thing …’ (SNIS 19)

‘I am more aware, people really say that you’re Scottish, and I’ve been told that it’s an asset in England, in the legal profession, because clients love a Scottish accent’ (SNIS 8)

It should be stressed that even when people reported a significant experience of anti-Englishness, this did not necessarily undermine their connection to Scotland to the extent that they took the decision to leave. Similarly, many non-Scots respondents who did report at least some negative experiences of discrimination while living in Scotland and had since left often reported strong feelings of attachment to Scotland.
On the other hand, some who had left Scotland reflected on anti-Englishness as a factor in that decision:

‘… I can see that if you are English you might think “actually I don’t need to be somewhere where taxi drivers think I’m a tosser when they hear me speak”. I don’t, I don’t really need to do that.

INT: Yeah.

RES: And that, yeah I think that was, that was the off-putting bit. That didn’t feel like, it was an, there was a place to stay and to, like you know, here where we live [in London], everyone speaks differently and looks different. But it doesn’t feel like, they were, I mean you always get people here like, you know, racists and whatever. But in Scotland it was just odd to have English tagged on you’ (NSNIS 9)

Not only does this last comment demonstrate the potential for anti-Englishness to have a negative impact upon migrants’ decisions concerning whether to settle in or leave Scotland, it also provides a further illustration of the fact that discrimination can be closely related to imputed (‘odd to have English tagged on you’) rather than self-conceived national identities, and that this imputation is often based on accent.

However, anti-Englishness is an issue where we must also take into account the particular geographical context of our research. From one perspective, one might argue that the presence of a relatively high number of affluent southern English students at the University of Edinburgh creates conditions for anti-Englishness to flourish to some degree at least, given how its incidence is related to regional origins and social class. But, equally, the fact that Edinburgh’s population is more nationally diverse than other parts of Scotland generates a perception among some people that, if
anything, anti-Englishness is likely to be more severe in more working class districts and in other regions of the country.

Overall then, anti-English discrimination is a complex issue and it is important not to rush to any facile conclusions regarding its incidence and importance. Rather than being systematic, severe and universal, there is considerable evidence that the worst examples of such discrimination are most likely to arise where certain factors (such as social and regional origins) overlap; that many other incidences are mild and/or only arise in specific contexts (e.g. in relation to sporting rivalry); and that, for many, the experience of discrimination does not form a substantial obstacle to living in Scotland and/or feeling attached to the country. Day et al’s (2006) work in Wales presents similarly contrasting evidence of the experience of anti-Englishness. However, general awareness or experience of anti-Englishness was a widespread feature of our interviews with non-Scottish respondents, and for some at least this experience was a significant factor in their migration decisions. In contrast, Scottish graduates who were living in England had not experienced a parallel anti-Scottishness. This highlights the need for Scotland’s political classes further to address attitudes to migrants and minorities if they are to meet their demographic objectives by attracting and retaining talented people. At the same time, we would reiterate that the degree of identification with Scotland which was evident among many of our non-Scottish graduates demonstrates that there are also positive experiences and sentiments which might be built upon to encourage more of these people to remain in or return to Scotland.
Conclusion

The existence of incongruity between formal citizenship and belonging may be a significant feature not only for those who migrate between states, but also for migrants who cross national borders within the same state. Such individuals may experience exclusion related to their national origins and identities (both self-conceived and imputed), and this in turn may influence their future migration decisions. While new forms of national identification may be constructed through socialization and civic participation within the new national community, evident barriers to belonging exist. The degree to which national identities are voluntaristic and thus may be adapted to accord with changed territorial contexts will be limited by migrants’ understandings of the identity resources that are necessary for such an adaptation. While feelings of belonging and identification as the basis for long-term settlement in a new national context need not extend to a fundamental shift in self-conceived national identity, where national origins and imputed national identities give rise to direct discrimination this may encourage migrants to return (or move on) to other national territories. For intra-state migrants, accent (rather than language *per se*) as an indicator of audible minority status is an important factor both in terms of barriers to belonging and more direct discrimination.

As well as addressing the (relatively) neglected issue of migration which is inter-national but intra-state, our work has also illuminated the experiences of a group which has not been addressed adequately by previous research: graduates, most of whom were aged under thirty and were migrants of less than ten years standing. The ‘capture’ of young, well-qualified migrants is an important issue not only for Scotland
but for other territories with similar political, economic and demographic ambitions. Such ambitions may be thwarted, to a degree at least, if the negotiation of identity represents a significant obstacle to the settlement of such people, particularly those from neighbouring national territories which represent the most substantial source of migration.

In closing, we recognise that our findings should be qualified by the specific nature of our respondents, drawn as they were from one particular institution. It is also possible that graduates more generally are more likely to be subject to identity-based discrimination, especially given what we have established about the importance of the articulation of national origins and social class. That said, we might also argue that those who occupy a predominantly middle-class milieu would be less likely to experience intolerance. It is also evident that migration will be substantially influenced by economic and social factors which may supersede feelings of belonging, national or otherwise, but our research suggests that the latter remains an important factor among migrants who cross national borders, even when they do so within the same state.
Notes

1 We use this as convenient shorthand for people born in England, but the label ‘English’ is itself problematic, as will be explored below.

2 The principal source of these data is the HESA, who define ‘domicile’ in terms of students’ or graduates’ primary place of residence during the three years prior to the commencement of their studies.

3 Scotland’s Demography Research Programme, co-funded by the ESRC and the Scottish Executive (now Scottish Government). Scottish Graduate Migration and Retention: ESRC grant number RES-342-25-0005.

4 The questionnaire and the resulting data are available through the UK Data Archive, study number SN 5456.

5 We define ‘Scots’ and ‘non-Scots’ on the basis of domicile prior to attending university, while recognising that this will not represent an accurate reflection of national origins and identity for all respondents.

6 All quoted interviewees are identified by a code which indicates to which of our four categories of respondent they belong. So, for example, NSIS stands for ‘Not Scottish in Scotland’ and indicates someone whose pre-university origins were not in Scotland but who was resident in Scotland at the time of the survey in 2005. NSNIS and SNIS represent non-Scots and Scots respectively who were not living in Scotland at the time of the survey.

7 Leith is a predominantly working-class district of Edinburgh.

8 Day et al’s (2006) research in Wales demonstrates a similar lack of appreciation of crossing significant national boundaries among many migrants from England.
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