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Abstract

Migration is becoming a major political and social issue in a global context. However, while immigrants’ integration into the hosting society and cities has sparked research investigations, there have been few studies focusing on how their presence affects the urban fabric, especially their use of public open spaces and even less is known about how, and in what way, such spaces have an impact on the immigrants themselves. The scope of this research is to gain a better understanding of how immigrants use, perceive and experience public open spaces. The research focuses on the case study of public open spaces in Lisbon, the capital of Portugal. The thesis centres on the experience of first generation immigrants from the three largest immigrant communities living in Portugal, namely, from Brazil, Cape Verde and Ukraine. These immigrants not only represent different waves of migration but also communities from very different geographic origins and socio-cultural backgrounds.

David Canter’s ‘Theory of Place’ (Canter, 1977) is used as the theoretical framework for the study, whereby place is understood to be the locus for the juxtaposition of activities that people engage in, their perceptions of it and the physical attributes of space. The key research aim is to explore immigrants’ attitudes, preferences, perceptions, uses and ‘place attachment’ in relation to public open spaces in Lisbon.

A mixed-method approach is used to gather information from these three immigrant communities and to establish the relationship between them and public open spaces in the host country. The qualitative methods comprise focus-group discussions and ‘go-along’ interviews, while the quantitative methods include questionnaires.

The key findings from the analysis of the cross-cultural experiences show that ‘frequency of use’ is likely to be affected by immigrants’ national and cultural identity. The analysis also reveals the particular meaning that ‘being close to water’ has for the three immigrant groups, especially in terms of its connection with the sea and going to the beach, as well as the importance to them of music being played outdoors and their need for more places to have barbecues. The findings also highlight the importance of public open spaces to immigrants’ lives, particularly in terms of how they evoke different memories (childhood and adult) and how some immigrants have already developed memories in relation to certain places and features in Lisbon. ‘Place attachment’, thus, is shown to serve as an anchor for people and it creates links between the homeland and host country, giving a sense of continuity to immigrants’ lives.
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Preface

On a summer’s day in 2005, I said to Margarita, a Ukrainian volunteer at the NGO where I was working, what a beautiful day it was and I asked her whether she would like go with me to the beach. Margarita replied that she would like to, but she said this with no enthusiasm. Faced with this reaction, I asked Margarita again if she liked the beach. She replied, yes, she loved the beach but I sensed that perhaps she was feeling a little homesick and I suggested that to her. In response, she mentioned how she missed going to the forest, to pick berries with her friends and family, to swim in the river and have a picnic in the forest.

In my experience, a hot summer’s day at the beach is the perfect day outdoors, while for Margarita, in that moment, the perfect day would have been to spend it in the forest. This episode made me reflect on the theme of outdoor spaces and cultural differences, but especially how an individual’s engagement with a new environment, different from the one s/he is used to is not always linear and how difficult it must be to overcome strong cultural backgrounds and attachments.

After my conversation with Margarita, at the weekend I went to Expo Park in Lisbon and I started to notice how many users from different backgrounds were sharing that park. People from different ethnic groups were sitting on the same bench, contemplating the river, groups of people were practising ‘capoeira’ (a sport mostly unknown in Portugal until the arrival of the Brazilian immigrants) and an Indian family was having a picnic. These are some of the examples I can recall from that visit. I wondered whether, like Margarita, the people I saw that day had other notions of what a ‘perfect day outdoors’ was for them. What did they miss? Were they enjoying Lisbon’s public open spaces and nature? Were the spaces welcoming or did they feel that the differences in the landscapes contrasted so starkly with their home landscapes that they could not relax and so they did not like the spaces? As a landscape architect, who at the time was working in a practice in Lisbon, I became increasingly fascinated by this theme.

Besides my growing interest in the research and its theoretical aspects, the human side of the research was also a major inspiration and driver for me. Throughout the research, I met many immigrants who kindly shared their thoughts, memories and feelings with me. Sometimes, they even described very emotional stories and moments of their lives as immigrants, what they had left behind and what they had acquired in the host country.
However, this process was not one way; although I was ‘a researcher’, I also shared, sometimes, details of my own life, affecting, perhaps, my relationship with the participants, and vice versa. I had to reflect on how ‘positionality’ (how the participants saw me) (see Chapter 5) affected the dynamic between us and any likely influence it had on their responses to my questions. To ensure, therefore, that the research was not compromised, I had to be very self-aware, particularly of my role and I tried to remain reflexive. According to Guillemin and Gillam (2004, p. 275): “A reflexive researcher is one who is aware of all these potential influences and is able to step back and take a critical look at his or her own role in the research process.” Being aware of my subjectivity, however, strengthened my commitment to constructing high-quality research, meaning, that I had to be critical, not only when analysing the results, but also at earlier research stages, such as when recruiting and engaging with immigrants, collecting data (some of the methods used, involved close contact with the participants – see Chapter 8) and, finally, when writing up my thesis. With regard to the writing style, I have deliberately used the first person singular (the researcher’s voice) in parts of my thesis in order to emphasise my involvement in the research process.
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Part I
Chapter 1: Introduction

I will always be an immigrant
I walk like an immigrant, I speak like an immigrant
I'm an immigrant from head to toes
And this word 'immigrant', do you know its origins?
It emerged from the word 'migrate', firstly used to described what the birds do
And how free the birds are...
I'm an immigrant like the birds
(Unknown author)

1.1. Migration and its relationship with landscape

Migration fluxes are an expression of globalisation processes and they can occur at national or international levels, reflecting the different economic and social policies of each country. In Europe, in 2007, there were 18.5 million legal immigrants from outside the 27 European countries and nearly 9 million European citizens were living outside their home country (European Union, 2009). Particularly in the European context, immigrants’ presence in cities and suburban neighbourhoods has increased over the last decades. The arrival of new immigrants to a country continues to raise questions with regard to their integration into, and their impact on, the host society. Nevertheless, migration has contributed to a multicultural Europe and on the streets, new faces from different parts of the world are mixing with the native population, new clothes and colours are becoming part of shop-window displays, signs in different languages punctuate streetscape facades, foods with distinctive flavours and smells are available, new music is played and new languages can be heard.

Academic research in the humanities and social sciences has produced a broad range of studies on this topic, and several theories (see Chapter 2) on integration (Castles et al., 2002) and assimilation (Castles, 2003) have arisen. The settlement and impact of migration on host societies has been widely discussed too, mainly, in terms of social and economic impacts, rather than on landscape change. Nonetheless, historically, according to Greenwood and Hunt (2003, p. 3), urbanisation sparked the initial academic interest in migration processes. During the transition from the 19th to the 20th century, in both the US and in Western Europe, urbanisation spread, mainly due to populations moving from the countryside to the cities and also because of the large numbers of immigrants arriving in American cities. By the 1920s, migration was being studied as a social and demographic
phenomenon and the Great Depression in the 1930s was an incentive for economists to join other scholars in viewing migration as a topic worthy of research (Greenwood and Hunt, 2003). Recently, many scholars have been examining this phenomenon from different perspectives, such as sociology, anthropology, politics and economics, leading to a fragmented view of migration (Borkert et al., 2006). However, studies regarding the impact of migration in land-use change are very limited (Lopez et al., 2006), especially in the European context. Bell et al. (2010) reviewed the pressures on the landscape caused by migration, from the impact of international retirement migration to Spanish coastal areas, the deprived Cape Verdean neighbourhoods on Lisbon’s outskirts, and land abandonment in Latvia, to cite some examples of the changes Europe is experiencing. The authors also suggested that migration should be looked at in a dual way (as a ‘two-country model’), since changes in the landscape occur in both the host and ‘home’ countries (Bell et al., 2010, p. 42).

For migrants, once the political border has been crossed, many other problems remain, namely, in their daily life. As a result of their contact with a new culture, migrants go into an acculturation process that involves: learning a new language, culture, values, social, economic and political relations, and this process occurs in different ways, depending on the degree of difference between the new and previous culture (Miyares, 1997). In some cases, by trying to cope with their new life and in adapting to the environment, migrants do not always have a positive experience, and can feel confused and anxious, caused by the loss of familiar places, symbols and values (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). This experience is called ‘culture-shock’, a generic term which tries to express the unpleasant feeling of a journey to a new place (Furnham & Bochner, 1986).

Manzo (2005) supported the view that migrants’ background, such as their gender, ethnicity, race and sexuality, can influence their use and enjoyment of a place, thus influencing their behaviour. The field of landscape architecture, therefore, faces challenges in dealing with new and diverse cultural backgrounds. Since public spaces are one of the first contact platforms between immigrants and the host country, where social activities as well as leisure and recreation take place, planning and design become important tools for the integration of new migrants. As argued by Ward Thompson (2002), in democratic societies, it is important to include different needs at different levels, and public spaces such as parks need to be seen as a “salad bowl, where different cultures can find individual expression” (Ward Thompson, 2002, p. 60). Consequently, the inclusion and study of other cultural values and practices plays a significant role in the creation of an inclusive society.
Until recently, little attention was given to ethnic minority groups in landscape architecture, a subject of study which, traditionally, has been largely concerned with local geographic and social characteristics of places (Rishbeth, 2002). According to Rishbeth “There has been a severe lack of research questioning migrants’ perceptions and values regarding open space” (2004, p. 1) and as has been reinforced by Bell et al. (2008), issues such as ethnicity in relation to green spaces and quality of life have not received the attention they deserve. The same authors have pointed out that the methodologies used have not proven to be strong, therefore, there is need for future research to “be robust and taken seriously” (Bell, et al., 2008, p. 7). In addition, the links between research and design have not always been strong, and as has been pointed out by Bell (2004, p. 3): “Designers have been more concerned with creating attractive settings for people to live, work and play. Their work has been practical pragmatic and not always as deeply rooted as it might be in the theoretical and empirical work of academic researcher in philosophy or psychology, although this is now changing.”

1.1.1. The social and community values of outdoor spaces

For those communities living in deprived areas (e.g., where transportation links to urban hubs are poor; where local shops and facilities are inadequate; or where public spaces and infrastructure are not looked after), the message its residents get in relation to their environment is that “no one cares” (Ling Wong, 2007, p. 46). Several studies, however, have enhanced the importance of the environment in human-interactions, and thus have raised awareness of how spaces can be crucial to the development of social interaction and in creating a sense of community identity (Matsuoka & Kaplan, 2008).

In the literature on the contribution green/public spaces make to people’s quality of life, the terms ‘social cohesion’ (see Chapter 2) and ‘social inclusion are often used interchangeably, with clarity of meaning for each term not always being particularly well defined. As pointed out by Oxoby (2009, p. 1) generally, both terms refer to how societies integrate socially, economically and politically their members into the communities. For Oxoby (2009, p. 2), inclusion “has been used as a user-friendly term addressing the manner in which individuals can access resources and institutions to their benefit.” By working towards ‘social cohesion’ and/or ‘social inclusion’, policy makers try to ensure that individuals have access to key rights in the society and that they do not live apart from the majority of the population.

Dines et al. (2006) recognised the potential role of public spaces in contributing to community cohesion and social inclusion. The term ‘social inclusion’ is often used to mean
the opposite of ‘social exclusion’. As suggested by Seeland and Ballesteros (2004) and Seeland et al. (2009), urban green spaces often encourage a mix of various users from different social categories, ages and cultural backgrounds, potentially contributing to the social inclusion of different groups. Similarly, Madanipour (2004) referred to how high quality neighbourhoods and public spaces can be beneficial in increasing social cohesion. He cited examples from around Europe, where different initiatives in relation to outdoor spaces, have reduced tensions between different and disadvantaged communities. Uzzell et al. (2002) also argued that a positive bond between users and places can increase social cohesion and place identification. Ling Wong (2009, p. 216, cited in Ward Thompson et al, 2009, p. 20), has also suggested the need for minority groups to benefit from quality spaces: “(...) with the new agenda of social cohesion and inclusion comes the need to extend the agenda of the environmental movement, and realise the missing benefits as well as the vast missing contribution of those beyond the middle class. This is the challenge of our times.”

In summary, it is important to understand the role of respective cultural backgrounds in relation to immigrants’ integration into public spaces in the host country. This is achieved best by understanding their feelings about public open space, namely, what is involved for them in terms of the ‘loss’ they experience in relation to their previous cultural landmarks; and how they construct new ones.

1.2. Aims and objectives of the study

The thesis looks at the relationship between immigrants and public open spaces in Portugal, the host country of residence. Given the increasing cultural and social diversity in Portuguese society and the need for deeper and better civic relations among all groups, the research aims are: to contribute to the discussion and implementation of a framework to support awareness of these groups’ perceptions and uses of public open spaces; and, to demonstrate how research in landscape architecture can contribute, at a planning and design level, to immigrants’ quality of life and integration into the host country, by using an appropriate methodology (see Chapter 5). By contributing to the wider discussion, in a European context, of how public open spaces are being used by three migrant communities in Lisbon, Portugal, this research aims to make a contribution to this topic, an area which has previously not been much studied.

In detail, the research examines:

- the use (or lack) of public open spaces by immigrants in Lisbon;
- the immigrants’ leisure and recreational patterns – what they do and where they go;
- the immigrants’ preferences regarding the spaces – social and physical attributes of the space; and,
- the feelings and emotions of immigrants regarding the new public open spaces they experience and the extent to which previous experience of their countries of origin influence the way they behave and use the new spaces in the host country.

1.3. Concepts of migration

In discourses on migration, concepts of migrants (emigrants and immigrants), ethnic minorities, nationals and foreigners are often blurred, with little clarity of definition of each term, such that they become part of a ‘conceptual amalgam’ (Rosa et al., 2000, p.4). For this reason, it is important to define, beforehand, those terms (which are outside the field of landscape architecture) by presenting clear definitions of the concepts that this research adopts when talking about immigrants.

1.3.1. International immigrant

The definitions of ‘migration’ and ‘migrant’ can vary significantly between countries, and in national policy terms, these terms are not settled either, changing over different periods and often resulting in different policies (Samers, 1998). According to the International Organization for Migration (IOM, without date, pp. on-line), the term ‘migration’ is associated with the geographic perspective, where someone “moves from one geographical unit to another across an administrative or political border”. Migration is often divided into two types: ‘internal migration’ and ‘international migration’. ‘Internal migration’ occurs within the same country, from one administrative unit to another (e.g. region, province or municipality), while ‘international migration’ represents the crossing of one or more international borders (IOM, without date).

On the other hand, the concept ‘migrant’ is viewed from a human angle. Each country has its own definition of ‘migrant’ and few steps have been taken to achieve homogeneity regarding the concepts related to migration (UN, 2002). The term ‘migrant’ is a more general term than ‘immigrant’ or ‘emigrant’, since it does not specify the direction of movement (IOM, without date).
The term ‘immigrant’ is a complex one and different aspects such as citizenship, place of birth, residence, duration and purpose of stay can be used to define international migrants (Bilsborrow et al, 1997, cited in UN, 2002). As suggested by the United Nations, ‘international immigrants’ may be defined as “non-residents who enters the country with a view to establishing residence” (2002, p.10) and ‘international emigrants’, as those who live in another country, although the concept of ‘resident’ is far from having an agreed definition. In 1998, the UN recommended the introduction of the duration of at least a one-year stay in order to define ‘long-term migrants’ and less than a year to refer to ‘short-term migrants’ (UN, 2002, p.11). The European Union added another premise to the definition of migrants, the idea that people move to another country in order to have a ‘better life’ (European Commission, without date, p. on-line). This research follows the definition by Cunha et al. (2004), who suggested that an immigrant is someone who moves to a different country from where he/she was born or was living, regardless of his/her motive.

1.3.2. Relationship between the terms ‘immigrants’ and ‘ethnic minorities’

According to Brettell and Sargent (2006), migrants can belong to different categories, some of which are self-defined (their own identity) and others are defined for them by others/or the state (as ‘legal’ or ‘illegal’). As Blanc and Smith argued (1996, cited in Samers, 1998), the terms ‘immigrant’ and ‘ethnic minority’ are not opposites and ‘ethnic minorities’ can describe groups which have immigrant origins.

The term ‘minority’ is not agreed in international law. It has a numerical value, representing a group which is “numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state” in terms of ethnic, religious or linguistic values (IOM, 2004, p. 42). The term ‘ethnic’ has its origins in the Greek word ‘ethnos’ – race. ‘Ethnicity’ is linked to the exacerbation of the cultural differences which can be claimed by the group, attributed by others, or both (Paulston, 1976). According to Malheiros et al. (2007), the importance given to racial or ethnic differences is greater in, for example, Dutch or British societies, which have a stronger tendency to categorise ethnic minorities than southern European societies (Malheiros et al., 2007, p. 43). In the case of Portugal, some authors consider that the concept of ethnicity “is based on specific cultural elements of one group but it incorporates a component relative to the phenotype lines of those members, mainly when they translate visibility and differentiation in relation to the majority” (Malheiros et al., 2007, p. 21). In the British context, according to

---

1 In Portuguese law, there is no definition of “immigrant”. The last legislation passed on immigration (Law 23/2007), uses the term “foreigner citizens”. 
Rishbeth (2001), the term ‘ethnic minorities’ can refer to people born in Britain whose parents were born in another country or who have a different ethnic background. Since this research considers the Portuguese context, Malheiros et al.’s (2007) definition has been adopted.

Given the complexities associated with migration (in terms of definitions of terms and concepts), this research focuses only on first-generation immigrants and not ethnic minorities. It excludes also, on purpose, second- and third-generation immigrants. The reason for making this distinction is related to the relative novelty of the migration phenomenon in Portugal, since not all migrant groups have adult, second-generation members. By excluding later generations, it also narrows the research interest to the role of ‘movement’. It means the research question is: how does migrants’ movement from their home to the host country affect their experience of public open spaces? Furthermore, the research does not make any distinction between different types of immigrants such as ‘economic immigrants’, ‘asylum seekers’ and ‘refugees’, allowing the research to centre on cultural rather than legal/political aspects of migrant groups in Portugal. Although no queries as to participants’ status (whether ‘legal’ or ‘illegal’) were made during the fieldwork, some participants did voluntarily mention it during the fieldwork, and this informed some of the findings. At a European level, immigrants enter Europe clandestinely via land and/or sea, and some acquire false travel documents, often putting themselves into the hands of criminal organisations. In 2009 the number of illegal immigrants apprehended in Europe was estimated at 570,000 (European Commission: Human Affairs, 2011, p. on-line). The fight against illegal immigration has been a priority for the European Commission, which has reinforced its policy on human trafficking (European Commission: Human Affairs, 2011, p. on-line). Peixoto (2007) pointed out the different terminology used in international literature to describe the process of illegal immigration, such as ‘trafficking’ and ‘smuggling’. The former is generally associated with more vexatious phenomena such as violence, fraud and exploitation of immigrants, while the latter is linked with the assistance provided to immigrants in order for them to cross borders illegally.

---

2 The term ‘second and third generation’ refers to those migrants who were born in the host country. Besides the fact that the outcomes would likely be different for broader generational ranges, the inclusion of second- and third-generation immigrants could also present other complex variables, such as the concepts of ‘identity’ and ‘citizenship’ among these groups, which are not within the objectives of this research study. According to Brettell and Sargent (2006, p.3), the concept of identity is “a word much used but rarely defined”. In the context of migration and ethnic minorities, identity can be referred to as ‘ethnic identity’, which is a “dynamic process that involves individual subjectivity and agency and that is, at the same time, constrained by political, economic, and historical context” (Maira, 1996, p.2). Literature refers to the conflict and the inability to achieve full identity either with the host culture or the parents’ original culture (Sargent & Larchanché-Kim, 2006), which is referred to as “the second-generation’s ‘illegitimacy’ complex” (Sayad, 1991, cited in Sargent, 2006, p.24). It is presumed that the second generation will have a sense of membership and a degree of socialisation that “will facilitate the assumption of the obligations of citizenship” (Alba, 2005, p. 27).
1.4. The Portuguese panorama

Portugal has welcomed immigrants since its democratisation in the mid-1970s and, typically, it has experienced various phases of immigration (see Chapter 2), beginning with immigrants arriving from Portugal’s ex-African colonies. The 1980s and 1990s were marked by the arrival of Brazilians, and the early 21st century, by the vast wave of immigrants from Eastern Europe. Between 1998 and 2008, the number of immigrants in Portugal almost doubled (Fonseca & Silva, 2010), and the country experienced many societal changes, with greater diversity, new values, socio-cultural practices all being introduced. These changes have had a direct impact on the management of economic, social and cultural diversity, leading to "major challenges to the social sustainability of cities" (Fonseca, 2001, p. 2).

1.4.1. Immigrant communities

The latest official statistics from 2009 (SEFSTAT, 2009), revealed that the total number of immigrants in Portugal was 454,191 (234,412 men and 219,779 women) corresponding to 4.2% of the total population. Among those between 24 and 54 years old, first generation immigrants represent 10.5% of the total population, while second generation immigrants (those born already in Portugal) only represent 0.4% of the total population within this age group (eurostat, 2011).

Among immigrants, the three largest communities were from:

- Brazil - with 116,220 immigrants (52,061 men and 64,159 women) (representing 25.6% of the immigrant population);
- Ukraine, with 52,293 (29,500 men and 22,793 women) (representing 11.5% of the immigrant population);
- Cape Verde, with 48,845 (23,227 men and 25,618 women) (representing 10.7% of the immigrant population);

These statistics only include legal immigrants who have a residency visa. In 2005, the number of illegal immigrants was estimated to be 80,000 to 100,000 persons (Fonseca et al., 2005); however, this number could now potentially be much greater. According to Peixoto (2007), illegal immigration started to increase at the end of the 1990s, corresponding with the increased arrival of immigrants from Brazil and Eastern Europe. In association with the

---

3 Social sustainability is defined as “the successful maintenance of existing cultural ecosystems and cultural diversity” (Low et al., 2005, p.15).
organised networks of illegal immigration, Portugal faced the arrival of women, mainly from Brazil, linked with sex-trafficking (Peixoto, 2007).

In terms of gender division, traditionally, men used make up the higher numbers, but over the last few years, and mainly due to family reunions, the number of women has increased significantly (Fonseca & Silva, 2010), such that in some communities, the number of women is higher than that of men. The majority of the immigrant population follows the traditional age pyramid, with a large young active population and a small percentage of elderly people. The majority of these immigrants are either in semi- or un-skilled professions and due to the economic slowdown and depression, unemployment has also affected these communities (Fonseca & Silva, 2010).

Portugal has always had a strong asymmetry regarding its population distribution, with the majority living along the country’s coast and in the main economic centres, that is, the cities of Lisbon and Porto. Immigrants have also followed this pattern, and in 1991, 45% of immigrants were living in Lisbon (Lages et al., 2006). The number continued to grow and in 2008, nearly 55% of immigrants were living in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area (Fonseca & Silva, 2010).

For this research’s purpose, when examining migrants’ use of open spaces in Lisbon, the three largest migrant populations to Portugal were selected, to study how they relate to their new environment. These groups were:

- Brazilians: with strong historical and cultural links between Portugal and Brazil long established, the first wave of migration mainly consisted of highly skilled immigrants (dentists, IT, marketing people). During the 1980s and 1990s, the economic recession forced many Brazilians from all social backgrounds to migrate, not only to Portugal, but worldwide. Lisbon was the main region for settlement of this community, especially those from the ‘second wave’⁴. According to Malheiros (2007), the majority of immigrants arrived alone in the country, independent of their civil status, and they chose Portugal as their destination, not only to improve their economic wealth, but with the expectation of achieving a better integration and understanding of the language.

---

⁴ The second wave started in the late 1990s/beginning of the 2000s, and it was characterised by an increase in the number of low-skilled migrants (Gois et al., 2009)
- Ukrainians: the settlement process for this community was extremely fast. With no previous signs of migration or strong links between Portugal and Ukraine, the Ukrainian community became one of the largest communities in just three years (2000-03). Strong migration networks were created, and ‘travel agencies’ would sell to Ukrainians a package which offered transportation, documentation, the promise of work and accommodation (by sharing houses with other immigrants), to lower the cost of living (Góis & Marques, 2010). The majority of immigrants came from the western regions of the Ukraine\(^5\) which, according to Góis and Marques (2010), had greater historical links with the West, and had been less influenced by the Russian empire.

- Cape Verdeans: they have the oldest tradition of migration. They were among the first immigrants to arrive in Portugal during the fascist regime, in the 1960s, as guest workers. It was only with the ending of that regime that this community started its long-term migratory establishment. This community settled mostly in Lisbon and in the south of the country, where the presence of previous Cape Verdean migrants offered the expectation of support (housing and work) on arrival. However, the existence of limited housing led to subsequent purpose-built areas with poor living conditions, which, in the long term, created spatial segregation (Góis, 2008).

As described above, apart from the high number of immigrants, these three communities have little in common: they correspond to different periods of migration; they have different cultural backgrounds; and they come from three distinctive geographic areas (South America, Africa and Eastern Europe). All these characteristics enrich this research study, allowing cross-cultural comparisons to be made between such distinct and diverse groups.

1.4.2. Significance

Immigration has been a research topic in Portuguese political, academic and social fields since the beginning of the 1990s (Fonseca et al., 2005). The migration phenomenon has been studied by different academic disciplines in Portugal (i.e., anthropology, sociology, economics, law, political sciences and geography) which use different methodologies in order

\(^5\) Volyn, Rivne, Lviv, Ternopil, Ivano-Frakiusk, Zakarpattia, Chemivtsi
to understand the “complex and multidimensional reality” of this phenomenon (Góis, 2006, p.13). Research activity on this topic has increased since 2000 (Lages et al., 2006), and Portuguese scholars from the social sciences and particularly human geography, have begun to investigate the impact of immigrants on the cities. Most of these studies are, however, focused on issues of ethnic segregation and immigrants’ residential patterns (Malheiros, 2002; Malheiros & Vala, 2004) (see Chapter 3). There is, however, a lack of studies into migrants’ use of public spaces in Portugal and the main body of existing research focuses on architecture (Alves, 2003; Serdoura, 2006) and geography (Gonçalves, 2006).

When planning and designing spaces for a wider community, which includes users from a broad spectrum of different backgrounds, no landscape architecture study has yet examined how recent migrant communities have been using public open space. These user groups’ outdoor space preferences, therefore, remain unknown. Also, few landscape architecture studies have examined how green and public open spaces are used by the native population, apart from Ribeiro and Barão (2006) and Soares (2006). There is a gap in the literature, therefore, in broad terms, which is worthy of being addressed by further landscape architectural studies. While a small study, such as this one, examining the particular Portuguese context for three immigrant groups can help to expand this unstudied topic and it could be linked to further discussion of the global situation.

At a policy and a planning level, there are no signs of initiatives to promote the use of outdoor spaces by these immigrant communities, or projects where immigrants have been involved in the planning process. Although the government has defined seven main guidelines to promote the integration of immigrants into the society (equality, hospitality, citizenship, co-responsibility, participation, interculturality and consensus) (ACIME; without date), and has been working with different organisations in order to apply them, there is still a gap regarding the involvement of these groups in the planning process. Furthermore, the planning policies are still relatively new for Portugal. It was only in the 1990s that significant changes occurred at a planning level, which aimed to “to promote a sustainable development of the city, linking the city centre to the peripheral areas, increasing the quality of public open spaces(...)” (Serdoura and Silva, 2006). During this period many municipalities defined the strategic guidelines for their urban development. In 1992, Lisbon announced its major strategic master plan, where the main lines of expansion of the city and the crucial areas for housing, services and recreation were defined for the subsequent 10 years (Serdoura and Silva, 2006). The actual planning and maintenance policy of public open spaces is individual to each municipality. Other public open spaces such as the beaches are also the responsibility of the
municipality, but need to follow the plans and restrictions approved at a higher level by a governmental department (Administração da Região Hidrográfica – AHR). Places outside of the urban areas and national parks are managed by a public institute (Instituto da Conservação da natureza e Biodiversidade - ICNB), created in 1970 to protect natural areas and biodiversity. Public forests have a long tradition of being managed by a governmental institution, and today are managed by Autoridade Nacional para a Floresta (ANF).

1.5. Initial hypothesis and research question

Users’ experience of, and engagement with, the environment is likely to be influenced by their background, therefore, as suggested by Carmona et al. (2003, p. 222), the “expected and accepted behaviors and attitudes vary from culture to culture”. In the context of migration, the host country, which has its own traditions and norms, faces the arrival and integration of new users, who have their own embedded cultural values. Altman and Chemers (1984) have also suggested that ‘people’, ‘culture’ and the ‘physical environment’ are three integrated concepts, which should not been seen as separate entities. By acknowledging the role of culture, the hypothesis embedded in this research is that:

- Different cultures engage differently with the outdoor environment.

This research context, therefore, and with Portugal as its focus, asks the main research question:

- What is the relationship between immigrants and public open spaces in the host country?

By analysing immigrants, on the one hand, public spaces, on the other, it is also critical to understand attitudes, preferences and perceptions. In order to answer the research question and test the initial hypothesis, it is important to acknowledge that each element should not be studied individually. As Figure 1.1 represents, the relations between the three elements are dynamic, fluid and interrelated, therefore, multiple relations are considered.

---

6 In Portugal, the majority of forests are private.
7 The first public service to manage forests was created in 1824 - Administração Florestal das Matas do Reino
1.6. **Research structure**

The thesis is organised into three parts. Part I establishes the context for this research by presenting an examination of the literature. It consists of an introduction and three separate chapters related to the relevant literature review. Chapter 2 presents and critically analyses the theories behind migration; Chapter 3 focuses on the public spaces; and Chapter 4 describes the theoretical framework that brings together these two areas (people and space) and narrows the scope of this research by defining the research sub-questions. Part II opens with Chapter 5 which describes the methodology applied in this study and presents the findings from each of the three methods. Finally, Part III discusses and concludes with the main research findings, and their implications for policy, planning and design.
### Part I – theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 1 – Introduction</th>
<th>Setting the aims; identifying the gaps and the importance of this study; development of the research question;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- setting the context and the research question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 – Literature review on migration: key issues</td>
<td>Better understanding of the theories which explain the initiation and continuation of migration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- migration and its theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 – Literature review on public (open) spaces</td>
<td>Defining public open spaces; historical evolution, gentrification; immigrants and public spaces; and the gaps;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- notions related to public open spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 – Theoretical framework</td>
<td>Theoretical framework to understand place, and various theories within each component and what has been written in relation to immigrants and ethnic minorities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theory of place: activities + physical attributes + perceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Place attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research sub questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II – methods and findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5 – Methodology</th>
<th>Defining the best methodology; looking at other examples of the application of the methods and their application in this study;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Description of mixed method research: focus groups → questionnaires → ‘go-along’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collection and challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 – Focus groups interviews</td>
<td>Reporting the findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- understanding the relation between immigrants and public open spaces, past experiences, preferences, barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 – Questionnaires</td>
<td>Reporting the findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use of open spaces, theory of place, leisure and recreational activities, memories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 – ‘Go-along’ interviews</td>
<td>Reporting the findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- exploring the preferences for and attachments to favourite places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part III – discussion and conclusion

**Chapter 9 – Discussion and conclusion**
- gathering the results from the different methods and comparing them with the existent literature;
- Key conclusions;
- Areas for future research and limitations of the study;

**Discussion of the results by comparing the findings from each method with the literature and the other methods applied;**

**Conclusions based on the main findings and their implication for policies and also the need for future research;**

---

**Figure 1:2 - Thesis structure**
Chapter 2: Research on migration: key issues

2.1. Introduction

International migration became part of the political agenda in the 1990s, partly due to the ending of the Cold War. This chapter presents a survey of some of the existing literature on migration and its empirical findings and discusses its main theoretical concepts, covering a broad range of work from different academic disciplines. This examination of extant literature is made against a background discussion about the antecedents of contemporary migration phenomena, as well as existing key issues. This chapter, therefore, aims to map out previous and current research in order to establish an appropriate research background for the study. The literature review also aims to facilitate a discussion on the impact of the settlement of immigrants in the hosting society and its implication for landscape architecture.

The following questions guide this discussion:
1. When did migration start in modern history and what are its current trends?
2. Why do people migrate?
3. What is the influence of migration in society?
4. How can early international migration be explained?
5. What is the current situation of migration in Europe?

2.2. Migration history and new patterns

Almost every country in the world is affected by the movements of people (Papademetriou, 2001), and migration is not a new phenomenon in history. Flows of people, moving from one place to another, in a voluntary or a forced way, has always existed, and for a variety of reasons, for example, due to climate change, wars, demographic growth, and/or for economic reasons (Castles, 2000). The expression ‘ages of migration’ is used to cover different periods of migratory movement such as the establishment of the Greek colonies, the Roman conquests in Europe, the rise of empires such as the Byzantine, Ottoman, Asian and European colonisations (Papademetriou, 2005). Other authors view events such as the foundation of colonies by the great sea-faring countries in Europe of the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, and the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century led to intense periods of migration from home to host countries (Castles, 2000).

According to Massey (2003), in the modern history of migration it is possible to identify four different periods:
The mercantile period: (from, approximately, the 16th-19th centuries). In this period, migration was dominated by movements from Europe to the rest of the world and was predominantly characterised by colonisation and trade, settling areas in: America, Africa, Asia and Oceania (Thinker, 1995; Lucassen, 1995; Altman, 1995; Hefferman, 1995, cited in Massey, 2003). Traders, priests and farmers moved to these areas. Nonetheless, the main migration occurred out of Africa, with the forced migration of about 15 million slaves (Castles, 2000) to the Americas to work on the plantations.

The industrial period: The early 19th century marks the beginning of the industrial period in Europe and with it, much social and economic transformation occurred. The industrial revolution led to landlessness and poverty (Castles, 2000), which stemmed the migration to industrialised countries of an average of 48 million European emigrants, especially from the UK, Norway, Portugal, Italy, Spain and Sweden. To receive these new migrants, countries such as the United States, Argentina, Australia, Canada and New Zealand became host countries (Massey, 1988). With economic growth in the USA and its establishment as a ‘new’ nation, about 30 million people migrated there between 1861 and 1920 (Castles, 2000), coming mainly from Ireland, Italy and Eastern Europe (Castles & Miller, 1993).

Period of limited migration: With the beginning of the First World War, emigration from Europe almost stopped. In the inter-war period, especially with the Great Depression\(^8\) of the 1930s, there was practically no migration movement due to stagnation and lack of political and economic confidence (Castles, 2000).

Post-industrial migration: This period began in the 1960s, and was characterised by a change in migration patterns. This led to new perspectives on the phenomenon. By the 1960s, Europe saw a vertiginous decrease in the number of emigrants and began to receive immigrants (Massey, 2003). Worldwide, the number of sending and host countries also increased, and receiving countries became more and more multicultural (Castles & Miller, 1993).

---

\(^8\) The Great Depression was marked by an economic crisis which led to a worldwide recession. In America, this depression was particularly severe and the numbers of immigrants from Europe fell significantly (Massey, 1995).
Although Massey (2003) considers only these four periods, in Castles’ view (2000), the Second World War marks the beginning of two new phases, which somewhat overlap with Massey’s theory. Castles (2000) thinks that the first phase, from 1945 until 1973, was characterised by an emigration boom to Western Europe, North America and Oceania. The “oil crises” stopped this flow of migration and by the mid-1970s, the world economy was “reshaped”, creating new hosting countries, particularly in southern Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Gulf oil countries (Castles, 2000). By the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, southern European countries such as Italy, Spain and Portugal, with long emigrant traditions, started to take in workers from Africa, Asia and the Middle East. Other countries, like Japan, also turned their attention to workers from poor countries in Asia and South America (Massey et al., 1993).

More recently, the collapse of the Soviet Union, for example, and the opening up of China, has increased the movement of people worldwide. According to Massey (2003), by the beginning of 2000, international population movements had developed into five different migration systems:

- The North American system – It is considered the biggest and oldest system. Nowadays, its main communities belong originally to Latin American, Caribbean and Asian countries which began their movement to the US during the 1970s (Massey, 1995). Although the first migrant communities were initially from Europe, they now constitute a small percentage of immigrants.

- The European system – As mentioned above, European migration patterns changed during the second half of the twentieth century. During the 1950s and 1970s, countries such as Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Sweden received workers from Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece, although by the 1970s, these latter countries also started to import migrant workers. Portugal, for instance, started to receive and recruit from its ex-colonies in Africa. There was a need for workers in Europe, and the main countries recruited ‘guestworkers’ - people who were ‘invited in’ but who were

---

9 According to Castles and Miller (1993), the movement of refugees from the Second World War; the return of former colonists to their home country after colonial independence and the mobility of high qualified personnel also occurred in this period. Since these movements did not lead directly to the emergence of ethnic minority groups, they are not referred to so often.


11 Massey (1995) describes the period between 1901 and 1930 as the ‘classic era’, characterised by the mass arrival of European immigrants.
supposed to return to their home countries once the demand for their labour was over (Massey, 2003). Nonetheless, this policy initiative failed and the ‘guestworkers’ became permanent residents. Immigrant communities continued to grow, turning those countries into multicultural and multi-ethnic societies. With the political changes that took place between 1989 and 1991, international migration to Europe grew significantly (Borkert et al., 2006). The main foreign communities in Europe were from the Middle East (Turkey and Lebanon) and Africa (Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco), but also from inside Europe such as Poland, other Eastern European countries, Russia and the rest of the former USSR countries (Massey, 2003).

- **The Gulf countries’ system** – As in Europe, countries from the Persian Gulf region have also hired temporary workers, mainly from their neighbouring Arab countries. In the 1980s, the political forces changed, and they started to recruit Asian workers from Pakistan, India and Bangladesh (Muslims), and later non-Muslims from Korea and Vietnam (Massey, 2003).

- **The Asian and Pacific system** – With the industrialisation and economic boom of the 1980s, the ‘Asian Tigers’ started to import labour workers. According to Massey (2003), what is different about this system, compared to the others, is its ‘multipolar’ aspect, characterised by the fact that the hosting countries are not adjacent to each other, geographically. Australia was the first receiving country followed by Japan during the 1970s, then by other countries such as Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand, during the 1990s.

- **The South American system** – In this area, Argentina is the best known country, with a large history of migration. Along with Brazil and Uruguay, these three countries formed a strong migration system receiving, mainly at the beginning of the 20th century, immigrants from Europe, especially from Italy, Portugal and Spain (Massey, 2003).

---

12 The ‘Asian Tigers’ include Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand.
13 Australia is well-known for its immigration history as one of the oldest receiving systems. Like other such countries, the number of immigrants from Europe to Australia has decreased and the new immigrant population comes mainly from developing countries, especially from Asia and the Pacific area.
2.3. Migration theories

As shown above, the patterns and history of migration change, according to certain events, mainly political and economic. The answers to the following questions, however, are not yet clear: Why do people move? What is their motivation? What are the structural forces for migration?

The history of migration theory is not linear and simple. Even though, as described above, migratory movements occur, migration, as a theme, was not acknowledged “(... by the classical authors of the principal social sciences, during the period these disciplines were being consolidated” (Peixoto, 2004, p.3). The first theoretical approach on migration movements was presented by Ravenstein in 1885, in his paper to the Journal of the Statistical Society in England (Corbett, no date). He created a series of ‘laws of migration’14 regarding the internal and international flows of people. His work was based on an empirical study undertaken using British census data from 1881 (Peixoto, 2004). It seems, however, that it was not until the 1930s that research into the impact of migration was addressed, seriously, as a subject per se, and one possible reason for this was the lack of statistical data associated with other unknown factors (Greenwood, 2003).

Greenwood (2003) conducted a historic overview on the subject of the early ages of migration research. In his paper, he pointed out that the first phenomenon that might have prompted ‘initial interest’ in the migration process by academics could have been urbanisation. From the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th, in the US and as well as in Western Europe, urbanisation was an ever-fast phenomenon, such that by the 1920s, migration was being studied as a social and demographic topic and the Great Depression of the 1930s was an incentive for economists to join other scholars in researching migration as a valid topic of research (Greenwood, 2003).

During the 20th century, however, migration studies remained dispersed among different disciplines (Peixoto, 2004). Today, with the diversity of concepts linked to migration,

14 According to Corbett (Corbett, no date) Ravenstein’s laws are:
1) Most migrants only proceed a short distance, and toward centers of absorption;
2) As migrants move toward absorption centers, they leave “gaps” that are filled up by migrants from more remote districts, creating migration flows that reach to “the most remote corner of the kingdom;
3) The process of dispersion is inverse to that of absorption;
4) Each main current of migration produces a compensating counter-current;
5) Migrants proceeding long distances generally go by preference to one of the great centers of commerce or industry;
6) The natives of towns are less migratory than those of rural parts of the country.
many scholars have tried to look at the subject from different perspectives, including: sociology, anthropology, politics and economics, leading to a fragmented view of migration (Borkert et al., 2006). Some theories examine the causes of the initiation of international migration, while others focus on the motives as to why such migration carries on over time. These diverse theories have different knowledge frameworks: some have economics and politics as their major contextual backgrounds, while others focus on the sociological context.

According to Peixoto (2004), the bibliography for migration theories shares approaches from multiple perspectives and disciplines and it is often described as the ‘sociology of migration’\(^{15}\). From a sociological perspective, the theories can be divided, according to the stage that generates migration, usually, at ‘macro’ and ‘micro’ levels. Peixoto (2004, p. 8) explains that ‘micro’ theories stem from a rational attitude towards migration based on the individual’s motivation and decisions. ‘Macro’ theories, on the other hand, refer to the ‘forces’ that impel migration, which are based on the collective, usually political, economic and cultural structures. Faist (2000, p. 30) includes another level, the ‘meso’ level, which is not so common in the literature, but which refers to the social and symbolic ties of the individual, usually his/her networks and it is concerned with the fact that the migrant can keep ties with the country left behind and create new ones.

According to Aranjo (2000), the theories built around migration tend to be different from each other, ‘unconnected’, instead of building knowledge in a cumulative way. This leads to a fragmented body of knowledge: “Indeed, there is no such thing as a general theory of migration” (Arango, 2000, p. 283).

Since the range of approaches is so wide, other classifications of the extant theories are valid. Massey et al. (1993) distinguish theoretical approaches of international migration as being in two groups (Figueiredo, 2005):

- theoretical approaches explaining the initiation of migration;
- theoretical approaches explaining the perpetuation of migration.

In terms of the aims of this review, the same distinction is followed.

\(^{15}\) ‘Sociology of migration’ is an umbrella term which can be described as a compilation of “references from different social sciences” (Peixoto, 2004, p. 8).
2.3.1. Theories that explain the beginning of international migration

The theories which explore the causes of international migration include:

- The neoclassic economic model;
- The new economics of migration theory;
- The dual labour market theory;
- The world systems theory.

2.3.1.1. The neoclassic economic model

This is considered to be the traditional model and it is used to explain the initiation of labour flows, based on economic models and concepts.

At a ‘macro’ level, international migration occurs because geographic differences regarding the supply of, and demand for, labour influences wages (Massey, 2003). This model is based on the assumption of disequilibrium between labour markets, which is translated into different wages and employment conditions (Akkyoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000). According to this theory, migration occurs by individuals moving from poor wage areas to higher ones, if the wages are high enough to cover the expense of moving and any related adjustments that are necessary to effect the transition (Massey, 1990a).

At a ‘micro’ level, neoclassic economic theory is based on the assumption that there are individual reasons why people migrate. Todaro (1976, cited in Massey, 2003) suggested that the migration process from rural to urban areas, even when unemployment rates are high in them, occurs when there is the expectation of a higher salary. Even knowing that the chances of getting a job are small, the higher wage prospect is reason enough to induce migration. According to Massey (1990), Sjastaad and Todaro included the cost of migration in the decision process. It means that, before moving, migrants reflect on the possible wage, the probability of getting employment and discount the costs associated with the change. These costs are material ones, such as travelling and maintenance while looking for a job, but they are also personal, including the efforts to adjust to the new culture, learn the language, and so on (Massey et al., 1993). If their cost-benefit calculations are positive, then migration takes place.

The same ideas of the neoclassic model are sometimes referred to as the ‘push-pull’ theory (Figueiredo, 2005). This theory perceives migration as a consequence of both ‘push’ factors which motivate people to move and leave their places of origin, and ‘pull’ factors that attract people (Portes, 1995). The ‘push factors’ include demographic growth, poverty, social
and ‘political hardship’\textsuperscript{16}, while the ‘pull factors’ are the economic, political and social prosperity of the receiving country (Portes, 1995; Portes & Böröcz, 1989, p. 607). This theory is based on two arguments: the first is that the poorest societies consist of people who are more likely to emigrate; and the second is based on the assumption that the sheer economic differences between places can be a reason for people movements (Portes & Böröcz, 1989).

Under these neoclassic assumptions, it is also important to refer to ‘human capital theory’. According to Figueiredo (2005), it can be considered as a new theory, quite different from neoclassic ideas. Considered as a restrictive approach (Kubursi, 2006), ‘human capital theory’ refers to workers’ estimation of the value of the opportunities available to them in moving abroad, and it is influenced by individual characteristics. According to this model, the key variables are: “age, education, occupation, employment status, sex, race, marital status, and family size” (Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000, p.7). Massey et al. (1993) argued that immigration can be seen as a form of investment in human capital, since people move to places where they can valorise their skills.

2.3.2. The new economics of migration theory

The previous theory has been used, largely, to explain the migration process. It is based, at a macro level, on a labour market disequilibrium that is translated into different wages between countries, and on a micro level, into the will of the individual to move, when faced with the gap between wages. However, according to the new economics, the decision to migrate is not taken just by the individual, but by the people with whom s/he is surrounded directly, such as the family or the household\textsuperscript{17} (Massey et al., 1993). In their study regarding family and individual migration in the Philippines, Stark and Lauby (1988), suggested that families send a member abroad when they expect to earn a higher income in the host country and if the opportunity cost associated with the move is low. It is a decision taken by family members, which, on the one hand, they see as a way to try to maximise the family’s income, and on the other, to minimise the risks, in case of a market collapse (Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000; Massey et al., 1993). Another strategy used by households to diversify their income sources is to send different family members to different locations (Oishi, 2002).

\textsuperscript{16} Although Portes & Böröcz, (1989, p. 607) do not detail exactly what they mean by the term ‘political hardship’, in the literature it is possible to find multiple references to refugees, asylum seekers.

\textsuperscript{17} “Persons living together with communal arrangements on subsistence and other necessities of life plus those who are presently residing elsewhere but whose principal commitments and obligations are to that household with expectation of return or join” (Groenewold, 2005, without page).
At a macro level, Massey (2003) listed a number of factors as being responsible for increasing migration: the transformation of agriculture (from subsistence to commercial), the shift to a market economy, the risk of crop failure, the absence of insurance, the volatility of agriculture, all these factors affect families’ incomes in rural areas. These families are more exposed to the frailty of the markets and the emigration of one family member of the family is seen as a way to avoid the side-effects of economic failure. On the other hand, in more developed countries, the risks of crop failure are minimised by access to insurance, or even the use of credit to apply new technologies to increase levels of productivity. This means that in these countries, household income is more stable (Massey et al., 1993).

In this theory, government programmes, saving institutions, the private insurance markets, access to credit solutions, all play an important role in the economic situation of many families. Poor access to these resources plays a fundamental role in migration at a macroeconomic level.

Contrary to the neoclassic model, the new economics of migration assumes that wage differentials are not the only reason for migration to occur. According to Stark (1991), one of the main authors of this theory, (cited in Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000, p.7) migration can be a ‘risk-sharing behaviour’, where a household tries to diversify its sources of income.

2.3.2.1. The dual labour market theory

In his book, *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies* (1979), Michael J. Piore contested the idea that only the push factors were responsible for migration (Massey et al., 1993). Contrary to the push and pull theory, Piore argued that migration was based on the pull factors of industrial societies in the hosting developed countries, since these countries have a permanent need for immigrant workers (cited in Massey et al., 1993, p. 440). This raises the question: why do employers hire immigrant workers? (Figueiredo, 2005).

As pointed out by Matos (1993), according to ‘economic dualism’, developed by Doeringer and Piore, labour markets are characterised by the existence of two principal segments, the ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ sectors. The first is regarded as a stable sector, with high salaries and good possibilities to progress in a career. The ‘secondary sector’ consists of low salaries, low-skilled jobs and fragile labour security (Peixoto, 2004). The instability of the ‘secondary sector’ does not attract native workers, and employers resort to immigrant workers who are willing to accept this kind of work (Massey et al., 1993). Also, according to the concept of ‘structural inflation’, societies see the value of wages as a mirror of each person’s position in the social hierarchy (Massey et al., 1993, p. 441). The lowest salaries are
associated with less-skilled jobs and the higher ones, with a high status in the society. Since there is a link between wages and hierarchical position, any rise in the lowest wages will have repercussions on the rest of the chain. For this reason, when there is a poor labour supply, instead of attracting native workers with high salaries, employers use migrant workers, who are willing to have a job, even if the wages are low, because this is seen as an opportunity to join the labour market (Figueiredo, 2005).

This phenomenon, however, raises another question: why do immigrants accept work which the indigenous people refuse? (Matos, 1993)

Massey et al. (1993) claimed that workers seek to have, not only an income, but also social status. At the bottom of the social hierarchy, there is no reason for people to be motivated by status since there is none to be maintained. Immigrants accept these less-skilled jobs not with a view to the status that the hosting society will give them, but mainly because they want to save money for their families at home. Also, they do not see themselves as part of the host community, but as part of the home one (Figueiredo, 2005). For this reason, they still have a prestige status in the sending community, since being an immigrant is seen as an honour.

This dual labour market theory does not undermine previous theories which explore the idea that migration is caused by wage differentials, linked to personal reasons to risk a higher salary or a household decision to minimise the risk to their income. Rather, it can be seen as complementary to both (Kubursi, 2006).

2.3.2.2. World-systems theory

Immanuel Wallerstein (1976) was the key exponent of world-systems theory. He said the lasting division of labour in the world in ‘core’\(^\text{18}\), ‘semi-periphery’ and ‘periphery’ countries is an inherent feature of the world-system. This theory is characterised by fundamental differences in civilisational development, the accumulation of political power and capital. As defined by Wallerstein, then, the world system perspective emphasises the asymmetrical, political and economic exchange between a highly developed core and a lesser developed periphery. The core is highly developed, both economically and politically, controlling the flow

\(^{18}\) This classification of countries is based on their degree of independence and capitalist power. The ‘core nations’ are considered to be those which have this concept well developed; the ‘peripheral’, are considered to be dependent and have not achieved these factors; and the ‘semi-peripheral’, are those which already have some independence and their power is increasing (Massey et al., 2006).
of goods between the centre and the periphery. The latter provides a flow of staple goods and raw materials to the former, in exchange for value-added or finished commodities.

Based on Wallerstein’s ideas, some authors such as Petras (1981) and Sassen (1991) (cited in Massey et al., 1993) have developed explanations for the occurrence of migration. With capitalist development, companies enter poor and peripheral countries looking for cheap land, raw material and labour (Massey et al., 1993). The introduction of capital, in countries where agriculture is the main way of subsistence for many families, has a perverse effect, since it allows labour saving instead of labour creation (Massey, 1988, 1990a). The use of raw materials in the global market also affects traditional ways of production, changing them to mechanised and industrial methods. When capitalist companies establish factories in these poor areas, they take advantage of low wages and women are recruited to work in the factories (Massey et al., 2006). This has an immediate impact on the society and its economic market, since it weakens the traditional markets by taking labour away from it, sets up competition with the traditional products and it introduces women into a labour work which is in contact with modern consumption (Massey et al., 1993). People become detached from their rural communities and are prone to migrate (Massey, 1988; Massey et al., 1993). There are also cultural links between the core, peripheral and semi-peripheral countries which must be considered. Some links are associated with past colonial experiences, such as the use of language (e.g. Portuguese is the official language in its former colonies in Africa). However, in other nations without a colonial past, for example, in Mexico and the US, economic influences, the diffusion of cultural patterns and the lifestyles of core countries (the US, in this case) in the peripheral regions (Mexico) can also be very strong.

By establishing factories in peripheral and semi-peripheral countries, core countries create routes and ways of transportation between the countries where business is being developed\textsuperscript{19}. This allows them to maximise their business by reducing the costs of the movement of goods, products, and information.

Following the cultural shifts, modern lifestyles and consumption of the richer countries, what happens is that international migration uses the paths created by the companies, although, in opposite directions to the flow of capital and goods (Massey et al., 1993; Massey et al., 2006).

\textsuperscript{19} Some of these routes may have been created already through past colonial links.
When talking about concepts such as ‘globalisation’, it is crucial to refer to the concept of ‘global cities’ developed by Sassen in 1991, where the author considered that in cities such as New York, Los Angeles, London, Paris and Tokyo, high-tech industries and services create a high demand for low-wage workers and service industry employees (Massey et. al., 1993). Sassen (2000, p. 22) considers that global cities: “Rather than becoming obsolete because of the dispersal made possible by information technologies, cities instead, concentrate command function.” Immigrants are employed to fulfil the needs of the higher sector markets and there is an increase of what Sassen (2001, p. 322) described as the ‘serving class’ in all global cities around the world, made up, largely, of immigrant men and women.

World system theory is based on macro-level factors only, and is neglectful of the micro-level individual and household decision-making. It is based on macro-economic global processes, such as the penetration of companies by rich and powerful countries into poor and peripheral countries, affecting local economies and social structures (Groenewold, 2005).

2.3.3. Theories that explain the perpetuation of migration

The theories that explain the continuation of migration as a phenomenon include:

- Network theory;
- Institutional theory;
- The theory of cumulative causation;
- Migration system theory.

As discussed above, migration occurs for various reasons, mainly, wage differentials, market penetration, which can be seen as ‘pull factors’, but, according to the literature, there are other reasons that work in an independent way, also contributing to migration to continue over time. These reasons are often used to explain why migration continues, even when the wage differentials are nullified, or when countries have hard, restrictive policies to avoid mass migration.

2.3.3.1. Network theory

Network theory is based on the assumption that kinship and friendship ties are constructed between new, former immigrants and non-migrants in the host and sending countries (Boyd, 1989; Massey, 1990a; Massey et al., 1993; Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000). There is a tendency to use the term ‘social networks’, although, in fact, the networks can be considered ‘personal’ - when based on direct contact, such as friendship, family or even with
the support of the community - or ‘social’ networks - when social ties exist on a distant or organisational basis, “such as those associated with ‘intermediaries’” (Boyd, 1989, p.639).

Social networks connect people across space and they can vary in size and density (Portes, 1995). They can be developed on a family, friendship or a community basis (Boyd, 1989). Regardless of on which basis links are made, networks provide necessary information regarding the migration process (Portes, 1995), the choices available, and the support to the movement. A social link to someone in a host country with prior experience of migration can be a strong incentive for an individual back home to seriously consider moving there, since established social connections decrease the cost of migration, minimise the risks and consequently, increase the benefits of migrating (Massey et al., 1993).

Network theory supports the idea that migration is not only based on wage differentials or economic politics. According to Portes and Böröcz (1989), migration is mainly a social phenomenon, and examples of continuing migration patterns from Mexico to the USA provide evidence that there are more than economic reasons behind migration (Portes & Böröcz, 1989). Akkoyunlu and Vickerman (2000) say that there is evidence that some migration flows occur between certain countries in more pronounced ways than between others, for example, the preference migrants have for some specific cities in the receiving countries.

Once these networks have been created, they provide support to the next wave of migrants, and when they reach a certain level, the migration process becomes ‘self-sustaining’ (Portes, 1995, p.22) and ‘self-perpetuating’ (Massey, 1990a, p.69).

Some authors consider that ‘household and family migration’ is another theory (Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000), although this research views it as a subdivision of network theory since it is based on the same assumptions.

The domestic unit is a key element of ‘network theory’ and it can be made up by family members or the household (which may contain non-family members) (Boyd, 1989). Family and household migration patterns vary according to the pressure to migrate, the household’s resource levels, previous experience of moving/migration (Root & Jong, 1991),

---

20 Massey (1990b) refers to the fact that these costs include: the costs of the trip, of finding a new job, and the psychological costs of being in an unfamiliar environment.
21 Some reports show that even undocumented emigrants are able to find a job in a few days, thanks to the help of a network (Portes & Böröcz, 1989).
family size, the number of working members, the age and gender of the members and the ‘stage of family cycle’ (Boyd, 1989, p.642; Akkoyunlu & Vickerman, 2000).

This kind of migration is predominant in many countries. Family reunification was seen as a right in many receiving countries, but some countries tried to avoid it, by excluding it from working contracts (Castles, 2005). In Europe, for instance, family and household migration is an example of migration perpetuation. Although it was unauthorised, many families during the 1970s and thereafter joined their men-folk after the men came to work in host countries that operated ‘guestwork’ policies (Boyd, 1989).

2.3.3.2. **Institutional theory**

Institutions of different kinds play an active role in the perpetuation of migration (Peixoto, 2004). For example, many voluntary organisations are established in host countries to campaign for the rights of immigrants, legal or undocumented, and also to provide support to migrants who are victims of illegal migration markets. These organisations help immigrants by offering counselling services, advising how to obtain legal papers, food, shelter, and so on (Massey et al., 1993).

On the other hand, services provided by for-profit organisations, in exchange for money, are well-known. They support illegal networks by arranging marriages, forging passports and visas, and illegally transporting migrants across borders (Massey et al., 1993).

This theory is based on macro-level acceptance, and the individual will is neglected in this process (Groenewold, 2005).

2.3.3.3. **Theory of cumulative causation**

The cumulative causation model illustrates how migration continues over time among those who remain in the original communities (Curran et al., 2003), by changing their social and economic structures (Massey, 1990a). Massey et al. (1993) think that each act of migration has consequences for the next movement, such as the construction of networks and supporting organisations which allow migration to continue, making new movements more likely (Groenewold, 2005).

Massey et al. (1993) have revisited Myrdal’s notion and have identified several mechanisms and factors that are responsible for the self-perpetuation of migration (Arango, 22 The first approach to this theory was espoused by Myrdal in 1957, where he used the concept of ‘circular and cumulative causation’ (Massey, 1990a).
These authors have identified six socioeconomic factors, from the social science literature, which “...are potentially affected by migration in this cumulative fashion: the distribution of income, the distribution of land, the organization of agriculture, the regional distribution of human capital, and the social meaning of work.” (Massey et al., 1993, p. 451).

For instance, – as stated earlier – migration is a process that can improve a household and family’s income. If a family from a lower-income community starts to have a higher income due to the emigration of one member, other families from the same community will start to see migration as a way to improve their lives also (Massey et al., 1993).

Some families, especially from rural areas, use their income to buy agricultural land, although their land, in many cases, remains uncultivated, since the earning potential to be gained from labouring for others is greater than that to be gained from working their own land. At the same time, non-use of land affects non-migrants in the community because it halts the demand for labour and consequently, increases the pressure for out-migration. In addition, when migrant families use their wages to buy land back home, they invest in the latest agrotechnology, which accelerates the demise of traditional ways of organising labour and people’s earning potential and thus creates more pressure to migrate (Massey et al., 1993).

2.3.3.4. **Migration system theory**

This theory also emphasises the continuity of migration over space and time as a sequence of interlinked events (Boyd, 1989) but it introduces one new idea, namely, that migration varies across countries. The key idea is to identify and examine stable migration flows between core receiving regions, receiving immigrants from specific sending countries (Groenewold, 2005). It is characterised by the flow of capital, goods and people between certain countries and the lack of exchange between others (Massey et al., 1993). In 1992, Kritz and Zlotnik suggested that each migration system is unique, and countries in a migration system are connected by other types of linkages, besides the human side of migration, such as historical, cultural, colonial and technological linkages (Peixoto, 2004).

Massey et al. (1993) draw some hypotheses and propositions from this theory, namely, that due to historical and technological linkages, countries (sending and receiving) in the same migration system do not need to be geographically close. Countries may belong to
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23 This notion of migration systems was initially developed in the 1960s by Mabogunje, who first applied this theory to rural/urban migration. This theory, however, was only used 20 years after Mabogunje’s paper (Peixoto, 2004).
more than one migration system; countries may join or drop one migration system, according to the political and economic changes that occur in that system (Massey et al., 1993).

This theory can be considered as a main approach to the other theories described above. Network and institutional theories are also part of this theory.

2.4. Social aspects of migration

Alejandro Portes is the main author who has explored the notion of ‘economic sociology’\textsuperscript{24} and ‘migration’ and he has done so prompted by the lack of answers obtained from the disciplines of economics and its poor articulation with sociology (Peixoto, 2004). Portes (1995) drew attention to the fact that the economist's model is too narrow because it ignores the social aspects of economic action, since social relationships are part of economic actions “…from the selection of economic goals to the organization of relevant means” (Portes, 1995, p.3). The strength in using ‘economic sociology’ in terms of migration is that it combines concepts and perspectives from the neoclassic economic model with a holistic view of sociology, and it keeps in mind the influence of social structures (Peixoto, 2004).

2.4.1. Sociological terms

Portes’ new approach to migration introduced sociological concepts such as ‘embeddedness’, ‘social capital’ and ‘social cohesion’ to the literature. A closer look at these terms helps to reveal their meaning.

2.4.1.1. Embeddedness

In 1985 and 1992, Mark Granovette introduced the term ‘embeddedness’\textsuperscript{25}, which he used to describe how social expectations change and shape economic actions, since any economic action is embedded in social relations (Portes, 1995). The author emphasised how economic action has a social context and cannot be described simply by individual motives, since such actions are made not only by single actors but are embedded in networks of personal relationships (Vertovec, 2003). Uzzi (2000) says that when social ties are not considered in relation to economic behaviour, this can lead to a severe reduction in efficiency. According to Portes and Sensenbremer (1993), this concept is a good point of departure to criticise the economic models, but on a deeper level, it is also quite vague. The same is considered by Uzzi, who argues that “(...) although the concept of embeddedness is useful for

\textsuperscript{24} Other authors who have written extensively about economic sociology include: Marx, Weber, Granovetter, Swedberg (Peixoto, 2004).

\textsuperscript{25} This term was first used by Karl Polanyi to refer to the capitalist aspect of the markets (Portes, 1995).
understanding the sociological failings of standard neoclassical schemes, it does not explain concretely how social ties affect economic outcomes” (2000, p.4).

2.4.1.2. Social capital

Another concept, even broader but sometimes confused with ‘embeddedness’, is ‘social capital’. It can be summarised as the “social connections or networks and the trust and reciprocity that strengthen them” (Franklin, 2007, p.3). This concept was introduced by Pierre Bourdieu in 1986 and was later developed by James Coleman (in Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). For Bourdieu26, the concept of social capital refers to the resources that someone can get, as a result of being a member, or having a connection with a certain group, a network27 of persons (Cheong et al., 2007). On the other hand, Coleman defined social capital as a multiplicity of entities which comprise social structures and the actions done in those structures which are more likely to happen (in Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). Portes (1995) defined resources as economic concrete factors, ‘discounts and interest-free loans’, or economic intangible factors, such as important information, employment tips and ‘goodwill market transactions’ (Portes, 1995, p.12). He also stated that all these resources, in the community or network, are seen as ‘gifts’, and for that reason, people do not expect to make a profit and transactions do not have deadlines by which they have to be repaid. Nevertheless, donors expect reciprocity at a certain point in the future (Portes, 1995). People tend to develop reciprocity at different levels of the networks: with individuals that they directly know (friends, family), but also on a larger scale, with larger groups and the community (Sander, 2002). For each individual, the social capital varies, according to the number and size of the networks (Castro, 2006). Robert Putnam (2004) reinforces the importance of networks and refers to the core idea of social capital by saying that: “Social networks have value. They have value to the people in the networks—‘networking’ is demonstrably a good career strategy, for example. But they also have ‘externalities’, that is, effects on bystanders. Dense social networks in a neighborhood—barbecues or neighborhood associations or whatever—can deter crime, for example, even benefiting neighbors who don’t go to the barbecues or belong to the association” (Putnam, 2004, p. 2). Putnam is particularly well-known among scholars due to the emphasis he gave to the role of ‘bridging’ and ‘bonding’ social capital to explain how the different forms of social capital can have an impact on individual and social life (Franklin, 2004).

26 Coleman has also established other forms of capital, besides social capital, namely: economic, cultural and symbolic capital (Marginson, 2004).
27 Network theory has been explained above. It is sociological in character and it is difficult to define the boundaries of knowledge and where to situate each theory.
‘Bridging social capital’ is based on common interests which link people from heterogeneous groups, and “bonding social capital” creates social ties among individuals, relatively homogeneous, usually around family, close friends and near kin (Cheong et al., 2007; Franklin, 2007).

This idea of reciprocity in communities and the reinforcement of networks are particularly valuable for the study of migration. The use of social capital decreases the costs and risks associated with the act of migrating and as referred to in some economic models of migration, social capital will allow migrants to use the networks they are familiar with as a way to increase the returns on their investments in human capital (Spittel, 1998). Massey et al. (2006) consider ‘social capital theory’ as one which includes migrant networks and migrant-supporting institutions, since all its principles are in accordance.

2.4.1.3. Social cohesion

According to Franklin (2007), Putman gave emphasis to the concepts of trust, values and reciprocity as the basis for developing sustained links among individuals, and he saw ‘social capital’ as a way to achieve ‘social cohesion’. The term ‘social cohesion’ is used to refer to the common values of a society, including solidarity for people from different backgrounds. With the arrival of immigrants to the hosting societies, ethnic diversity increases which may represent a possible danger to social cohesion (Cheong et al., 2007). Social cohesion is a key concern in societies, especially at a government level. In Europe, for instance, the Council of Europe adopted ‘Recommendation 1355’ on ‘Fighting against social exclusion and strengthening social cohesion in Europe’ (Zetter et al., 2006).

Since social cohesion is, apparently, influenced by the settlement of ethnic communities, at this point it is important to understand the concepts behind the constitution of new communities in the hosting countries.

2.4.2. The constitution of communities: The new (old) members

Migration processes have led to the flourishing of ethnic diversity in receiving countries (Castles & Miller, 1993). According to Castles and Miller (1993), in some countries, it is possible to find ‘ethnic communities’, where immigrants are seen as part of a multicultural society. If, on the contrary, the host country has excluded immigrants by keeping them on the fringes of society, then ‘ethnic minorities’ emerge. The next section explores the social and economic consequences of migration, especially in new societies, and the new ethnic minorities in such societies.
2.4.2.1. **Types of migration**

Migration processes are not homogeneous, and different kinds of migration must be considered in the study of this phenomenon. People migrate for different reasons, but in the last half of the 20th century, it was possible to identify three main types of migration: permanent migrations, labour and temporary migrations and movements of refugees (Castles, 2005):

- **Highly skilled labour** – It represents only a small percentage of migrations (Peixoto, 2001). It is the type of migration hosting countries most want, and they develop particular incentives to attract highly skilled labour (Castles, 2005). Such labour produces an accumulation of human capital in the hosting countries, with few costs, particularly educational ones (Figueiredo, 2005). However, the loss of skilled labour and human capital, a phenomenon known colloquially as a ‘brain-drain’, has consequences for the sending countries. Nevertheless, it can be seen as an alternative solution to problems of unemployment and as a way to increase economic income (Kubursi, 2006). Since the 1980s, the USA, Canada and Australia have had particular policies to attract skilled labour. Such policies have been followed, more recently, by some European countries and Asia (Castles, 2005).

- **Unskilled, low wage labour and illegal migrants** – As mentioned previously, after 1945, unskilled low wage labour was the main type of migration which played a very important role in the economic growth of industrialised countries. In her analysis of global cities, Saskia Sassen referred to the dual economy that uses low skilled labour as a primary source for low wage jobs (industries and construction) (in Castles, 2005). This constitutes the larger percentage of economic migration and it is the process that attracts more attention from the media and social organisations (Kubursi, 2006). Unskilled, low wage labour is usually linked to illegal migrants who clandestinely enter the hosting country. It is the type of migration most vulnerable to unjust exploitation and human rights violations, because workers have an illegal status (Kubursi, 2006).
- **Forced migration** - This type of migration includes not only refugees and asylum seekers but also people displaced from their homes by projects such as dams and roads, or even natural disasters (Castles, 2003, 2005). Castles (2003) has also referred to another type of forced migration, which is related to the trafficking of people, with a particular emphasis on women and children for the sex industry.

- **Female migration** - Although it has not been referred to as a different type of migration, it is equally important to consider at this point the question of gender as a single type of migration, due to its own characteristics. During the 1970s, feminist historians of migration criticised the fact that the literature on migration was treating all immigrants as men (Sinke, 2006). In fact, according to Oishi (2002), in the post-war period, the percentage of women in migrant populations increased, putting women in first place in terms of international migration. Women’s migration is not a new phenomenon. According to Sinke (2006), a closer examination of Ravenstein’s article from 1885 revealed that he pointed out that women’s migration was related to short distance movements, compared to men. Not many studies have been undertaken to examine the cross-national patterns of women’s international migration (Oishi, 2002). Studies developed by feminist geographers have contributed to our understanding of spatial mobility as a social and political process for women, thereby contesting the neoclassicist point of view, which assumed gender was not a factor (Silvey, 2004). For many years, women’s migration was associated with family reunion, with women following their husbands and parents, but little is known about the job patterns of these women in the hosting societies after such family reunions (Kofman, 1999, cited in Kofman, 2000). Stark and Lauby (1988), in their study of migration in the Philippines, argued that women were more likely to migrate alone, exemplified, in Filippino families, by daughters, rather than sons, being sent to urban areas

---

28 According to the Geneva Convention on refugees, ‘refugee’ is defined, among other things, as: “As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country”; (UN, 1950). In 1966 refugee status was changed and expanded to everyone who was being persecuted, by omitting the words: “As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and...” and “…as a result of such events” (UN, 1966).
to increase the family and household income. Women tend to migrate, having in mind their own capacities as particular types of workers, for example, as: “housemaids, entertainers, nurses, and factory workers” (Oishi, 2002, p.1). However, women’s migration is not only represented by the lowest-status jobs. Kofman, in her paper (2000), explored the invisibility of skilled migrant women in Europe, arguing that the notion of women as offering only unskilled labour is deeply rooted because their job as housemaids is seen as unskilled and by the fact that women are underrepresented in more highly skilled labour market positions. Castles et al. (2002, p.8) referred to the fact that women are especially ‘vulnerable’ to different forms of discrimination, and cases of abuse and exploitation have increased (Oishi, 2002), for example, many women are recruited, via illegal migration channels, to support prostitution networks. In Europe, many women from Romania, the Ukraine, Moldavia and Albany are entrapped in this business (Hily, 2003). Because of these cases, female migration is becoming a more common issue which has to be addressed by international organisations (Oishi, 2002).

During the last few years, globally, there has been a diversification of migration types. It is now much more difficult, therefore, to individualise the new types of migration. Castles (2002) considered the existence of the following types of migration:

- **Astronaut phenomenon**: characterised by the movement of families to countries such as Australia or Canada for safety or lifestyle reasons, while the main income earner works at home;

- **Return migrations**: with the boost of mobility, migration is becoming a temporary phenomenon, and many migrants return to their home countries;

- **International retired migration (IRM)** has become a phenomenon among retired people in northern countries such as Germany, the UK and the Nordic countries, and it is characterised by the residential mobility of retired people who have the economic power to buy properties abroad, particularly in Southern Europe (Rodríguez, Fernández-Mayoralas, & Rojo, 1998). Retirement is the main ‘push factor’ to initiate this migration process (King, Warnes, & Williams, 1998). As a ‘pull factor’, a pleasant climate, characterised by warmer temperatures, the landscape, a quality lifestyle associated with a healthier and slower pace of life, and also the availability of
information about the countries as well as previous holiday experiences, are all elements that attract immigrants to Southern European countries (King et al., 1998; Petrov & Lavalle, 2006; Rodríguez et al., 1998);
- **Posthumous migration**: Tribalat, in 1995, explored the cultural complexity of migration, and reported that many immigrants want to be buried in their home countries.

### 2.4.2.2. Immigrants and the politics of belonging - modes of incorporation

The arrival and incorporation of immigrants in a new society is a complex process and each government has its own set of regulations to address this (Castles, 2003; Fonseca, 2003). These processes are dynamic, reflecting the economic, political, social and institutional aspects of the hosting country, and they can vary over time.

The state plays a crucial role in the relationship with immigrants since it represents the “legal and political organization, with the power to require obedience and loyalty from its citizens” (Seton-Watson, 1977, p.1 cited in Castles and Miller, 1993, p.35). There are various ways to address migration and other issues such as nationality and citizenship, depending on different ideologies, links to other cultures, political and economic factors, and different academic points of view (Borkert et al., 2006).

- **Assimilation**

  Castles (2003) describes ‘assimilation’ as a process hosting societies expect to occur over a long time. It is a process whereby immigrants are expected to settle down permanently and cut their links and bonds with their culture and country of origin by adopting the new rules of the hosting society and learning the language. Assimilation theory argues for: “a gradual adaptation of immigrants not only socio-economically but also culturally and behaviourally” (Faist, 2000, p.272). This theory is often associated with the Chicago School. During the 1920s and 1930s, sociologists at the University of Chicago were concerned with matters such as poverty, crime and housing problems, which had been made acute by Chicago becoming an industrial city with a high rate of European immigrants (Gingrich, 1998). Robert Park, one of the most significant scholars of this School, whose work focused on society and urban processes, argued that ethnic and racial groups should be assimilated into mainstream American culture and society. He believed that immigrants, regardless of their origin, would like to accept the freedom and benefits of being American citizens, by abandoning their
original culture (Gingrich, 1998). Park’s concept of assimilation has been questioned by scholars from a pluralist perspective\(^{29}\) (Castles, 2005) and during the 1960s and 1970s, it was considered racist and discriminatory (Massey, 2004). Although, more recently, American scholars such as Alba and Nee\(^{30}\) (2003, cited in Portes, 2005) have upheld the Chicago School’s theories which, “…in their view, has been largely forgotten or distorted”. They consider “that assimilation did not mean Americanization or Anglo conformity” but a mixture of values, social and lifestyle patterns that could permit the ‘co-existence’ of different cultures (Portes, 2005, p.2). These authors reviewed the Chicago School’s concepts in the context of more recent viewpoints and produced a new model of immigration incorporation, where assimilation is considered to be a “by-product of immigration” (Massey, 2004, p.409). In American migration history, these attempts to obliterate cultural differences are often referred to as the ‘Melting Pot’ (Fredrickson, 1999), where America is seen as the pot wherein all immigrants adopt American culture. In fact, the presence of many different nationalities in America is easy to see and feel. During 1901 and 1930, nearly 19 million immigrants, mainly from Europe\(^{31}\), arrived in the US (Massey, 1995). After 1930, European migration started to decline and new immigrant nationalities emerged, mainly from Latin-America\(^{32}\). Yet assimilation theory did not accomplish its aims and the bonds between immigrants became stronger, leading to ethnic ghettos (Castles & Miller, 1993).

Assimilation was not only an American concept. Other countries used its underlying ideas. In Australia\(^{33}\), the post-Second World War period was characterised by the high number of overseas-born immigrants, particularly from non-English-speaking countries\(^{34}\). The assimilation processes expected of immigrants assumed that they would immerse themselves in Anglo-Australian culture by learning the language and adopting existing cultural norms and

\(^{29}\) “Pluralism is the theory that a multitude of groups, not the people as a whole, govern the United States” (Reynolds, 1998).

\(^{30}\) Authors of Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration (2003).

\(^{31}\) The main European countries to allow immigration were: Germany, Italy, Poland, Ireland, and Britain. Although not a European country, around one million Russian-Jewish people arrived in the first decade of the 20th century (Massey, 1995).

\(^{32}\) The Mexican community is the largest, followed by the Cuban, Dominican and Colombian communities (Massey, 1995).

\(^{33}\) In historical terms, migration to Australia began in 1788 with the establishment of the ‘penal colonies’ and the arrival of free settlers (DIMIA, 2003, p.23). The Australian Government began an immigration programme, in the post-war period, to increase the population and support development of the country’s industry (Castles & Miller, 1993).

\(^{34}\) In 1954, the major source countries included Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland and the then Yugoslavia (DIMIA, cited in DIMIA, 2003) but initially, Britain provided most migrants for historic reasons (Castles & Miller, 1993).
they would “become indistinguishable from the Australian-born population as rapidly as possible” (DIMIA, 2003, p.2).

France is the perfect example of a nation-state that “sees itself as universalist and egalitarian” (Kastoryano, 2003, p.5). Between 1947 and 1974, France was the only country in Europe to encourage permanent immigration (Guiraudon, 2002). Portugal, Spain, Algeria and the rest of Maghreb were the main suppliers of migrant workers to work in the reconstruction of the country. The “integration à la Française” (Amiraux & Simon, 2006, p.2) aimed to suppress other people’s cultural beliefs, and assimilation was the price paid by immigrants to have rights and citizenship (Castles & Miller, 1993), based on republican individualism (Kastoryano, 2003). This model of incorporation aimed to transform the newcomers and their descendants into French citizens, giving them the right to become full citizens with equal obligations and equal rights (ESF, 2004). Immigrants and their descendants were taught French in school and the expression of religion and cultural beliefs was not allowed (Kastoryano, 1991).

Not all countries saw assimilation as a process to follow, contributing to the differentiation of immigrants by their race and social and cultural origins (Castles, 2002). Germany is a classic example of ‘differential exclusion’ (Castles, 2002, p.1155), viewing immigrants as a labour supply source. Immigrants were chosen from nearby countries, given fixed labour contracts, and recruited as temporary workers, ‘guestworkers’. Germany wanted immigrants to keep their bonds with their home country, and encouraged them to return. Family reunion was not allowed. In Germany, the main ethnic minority was made up of immigrants from Turkey, since the German government celebrated bilateral agreements with other governments to import provisional labour workers (Kastoryano, 1991). As a result of the ‘guestwork’ policy, immigrants lived in houses provided by their employers, near to their work place, with no room for families, to avoid family reunion (Kastoryano, 1991). With no links to family and living close to each other, the Turkish ghettos flourished, as did the feeling of community among different immigrant groups. Another measure to avoid the settlement of immigrants was the creation of special classes for children who were taught in their first language (Kastoryano, 1991).

As history shows, despite the incorporation mode adopted by ‘assimilation’ or ‘differential exclusion’, the development of ethnic communities/minorities took place. On the

---

Migration from Algeria and the rest of Maghreb took place because of the colonial link between France and these regions (Alba, 2005).
one hand, democratic states that adopted the second measure were not able to deport immigrants and were afraid of social conflict. They gave some social rights to immigrants and allowed family reunions to occur, which led to the emergence of stronger ethnic minorities. On the other hand, the assimilation process was not strong enough to eliminate different languages, cultural patterns, beliefs and values and these elements perpetuated into second and third generations of ethnic communities in the hosting countries (Castles, 2002).

**Integration**

Integration is a word often found in migration literature, nonetheless, its meaning is not clear and its interpretation varies, according to different authors. Integration is seen by some as a ‘one-way process’ (Castles et al., 2002, p.113) and it is very close to assimilation, although many authors consider integration to be a “two-way process: it requires adaptation on the part of the newcomer but also by the host society” (Castles et al., 2002, p.113). The cultural differences are not eradicated, but immigrants need to accept the country's laws.

Some governments, which had tended originally to see migration from a rigid point of view, started to apply more flexible policies to immigrants by accepting their cultural differences. Canada (in 1971), Australia (in 1973) and Sweden established ‘multicultural’ policies, meaning that nations should not be based on monocultures but on the recognition of multiple cultures and the right to produce ethnic communities (Castles, 2005; Castles & Miller, 1993). For instance, in Canada, the two main objectives of this policy were to maintain the language and culture of minorities and fight racism (Castles & Miller, 1993). Great-Britain’s policy was one of promoting the establishment of “ethnic communities in the public sphere” (Kastoryano, 1991, p.6). Castles and Miller (1993, p.33) argued that Britain was the first European country to experience ‘large-scale labour immigration’, Ireland being the main supplier at the beginning of the 19th century; later (1875-1914), a massive wave of Jewish people arrived from Russia. Both communities had the same labour rights as British workers.

Between 1945 and 1950, British migration was characterised by colonial links to the new Commonwealth countries which permitted the entry of immigrant workers. In 1962, this ceased, due to restrictive laws but the migration chain continued through family reunion (Castles & Miller, 1993). Most of the immigrants had British citizenship, but were in low status positions, with unskilled labour jobs. Spatial segregation was notable (Castles & Miller, 1993). In 1980, the government adopted the multicultural policy of ‘helping’ immigrants to “adapt to British Ways – learning English, political customs and so forth.” (Small & Solomos, 2006, p.
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*Commonwealth countries: former British colonies in the Caribbean, India and Africa.*
London, the UK’s capital, exemplifies multiculturalism in Britain – it is culturally diverse, and different races, religions, languages, cultures and foods coexist in the one city.

- ‘Transnationalism’

By the 21st century, ‘transnationalism’, as opposed to ‘multiculturalism’, was the new concept (Castles, 2005) and it was introduced by anthropologists who highlighted “the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement” (Basch et al., 1994, p. 7, cited in Viruell-Fuentes, 2006, p.362). Many theories have treated migrants as individuals who only departed (emigrants) or arrived (immigrants). They did not consider that in a global world, migrants can have multiple attachments (Levitt & Nyberg-Sørensen, 2004). Castles (2005) argued that some scholars consider that transnational communities can lead to new forms of migration, resulting in successful assimilation in the hosting countries. Portes (1997, p. 812) defined transnational communities as “dense networks across political boundaries created by immigrants in their quest for economic advancement and social recognition”. Portes (1997) thinks that transnational immigrant communities are a result of a globalisation process whereby people are caught in the new web of technology and they take maximum advantage of it. In the new societies, it is common to find people who belong, live and move between more than one country. This concept of ‘transnationalism’ can be associated also with the new migratory tendencies as highlighted by Castles (2002), especially the ‘astronaut phenomenon’. For some authors, this concept has been linked to the concept of ‘diaspora’ (Castles & Miller, 1993), but according to Vertovec, ‘diaspora’ is the concept of being attached to the people, culture and traditions of the home country and also to migrants of the same origin in their countries, whereas ‘transnationalism’ is the practice of the exchange of resources, including people, across the borders of nation states (ESF, 2004).

If we look at the free circulation of people and goods in European countries, transnational networks are constructed among different countries and people are mobile in their attachments. As Levitt and Nyberg-Sørensen (2004, p.3) discussed, scholars should redirect their focus “from place to mobility, and from “place of origin” and place of destination” to the movements involved in sustaining cross-border livelihoods”.
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37 Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton (1992), Kearney (1991), and Rouse (1991) were the first to disseminate the concept (Viruell-Fuentes, 2006)

38 Since 1 January 1992, the citizens of any European Union country or in the European Economic Area have been able to work in any member state.
According to Alba (2005, p.78), academics are beginning to focus on new movements, which were once considered as fixed, and are now paying attention to “flow and fluids”. ‘Flow’ and ‘liquidity’ or ‘fluidity’ are metaphors used in relation to social movements (Sheller, 2000). Sheller (2000) used the concept of ‘flow’ to illustrate a new way of theorising how social movements actually occur and “fluidity” to demonstrate that boundaries can move, be flexible and fluid. Mobility allows the movement of millions of people every day, migrants, tourist or workers. The fluidity of boundaries and frontiers does not just apply to physical ones (a region, a country); it refers also to invisible ones, such as individual, ethnic and cultural, allowing for a mix of people, goods and cultures. The societies are no longer closed within their boundaries (Hily, 2003).

2.5. Current migration patterns in Europe

As described above, in the 19th century, Europe was characterised by the flow of emigrants to the United States, Canada and Australia. However, in the second half of the 20th century, there was a reversal when Europe became a hosting region. According to Boswell (2005), after 1973-74, Europe followed the same worldwide tendency. Due to oil crises (Castles, 2000), it decreased its migration recruitment but immigration flows continued in the form of family reunion, refugee flows and labour migration. In the 1980s and 1990s, migration levels increased, reaching particularly high levels (Castles, 2000; Boswell, 2005) thanks to economic growth, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Soviet Union (Godoy, 2002) - western European (Austria, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, UK) and the Nordic European countries are examples of this trend. In 2001, net immigration was 3.0 per 1,000 inhabitants (OECD, 2004, cited in Boswell, 2005) and the OECD described the main source countries’ flows into the European receiving countries as follows: “Moroccans in Belgium; Iraqis and Afghans in Denmark; Russians in Finland; Moroccans and Algerians in France; Poles and Turks in Germany; Romanians and Ukrainians in Hungary; Albanians, Romanians and Moroccans in Italy; Angolans and Cape Verde nationals in Portugal; Iraqis in Sweden; and Indians in the UK” (Boswell, 2005, p.3).

The European Union has been making efforts to unify the member states’ immigration policies, by elaborating policies that regulate the migration movements of legal people but also refugees. If, on the one hand, European citizens are free to circulate, live and work in other European member countries, national policies are becoming increasingly restrictive regarding non-European migrants. ‘Fortress Europe’ is the metaphor that reflects the European policy of keeping non-Europeans outside its frontiers (Bolesta, 2004).
2.5.1. Migration in the Mediterranean area

In the last thirty years, Southern European countries, such as Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece, have undergone a transition from being sending, to becoming host countries. According to King and Rybaczuk (1993), this transition occurred in Portugal in 1971, in Italy in 1972 and in Spain and Greece, in 1975 (cited in Pérez, 2005). The 1980s were seen as a period of economic growth and prosperity for these countries, which accentuated inflow (Boswell, 2005). Portuguese and Spanish people went mainly to France, Greek migrants went to West Germany, along with Yugoslavian and Turkish people, and Italians went to France, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, North America and Australia (King, 2001). Pérez (2005), referencing the work of King39, describes some factors which the latter identified as responsible for migration inflows to Mediterranean countries. Firstly, with the northern countries’ restrictions on migration, southern European countries became like “waiting rooms” (Pérez, 2005, p.81), where immigrants would wait until they could be guaranteed access to wealthier countries. This phenomenon is known as the ‘diversion effect’40 (King, 2001, p.4). Secondly, countries that face the Mediterranean Sea have difficulty in controlling their borders. Thirdly, tourism is a legal way to allow immigrant entry; it reinforces existing European migration networks and those in Latin-America and Africa. Fourthly, historic, colonial links sometimes translated into agreements between countries that facilitated the movement of people. Finally, economic growth and differences in salary levels in the north and south constituted another factor, as well as labour demands in the tourism and services industries.

No exact figures exist for the number of immigrants to European countries, mainly because immigrants use ‘illegal’ channels to get there. Portugal and Spain have taken regulatory action, periodically, but they are far from eliminating this type of migration. The worst scenario occurs in Greece, where most immigrants are undocumented (King, 2001). In terms of immigrant nationalities, in Italy and Spain, the main nationality is Moroccan, however, both countries have communities from other parts of the world. In Spain, the presence of Latin-American communities shows its colonial links and the same is true for Portugal and its African communities. The main immigrant community in Greece is from Albania, but other

40 In 1973, the main receiving European countries imposed strict immigration laws in order to control illegal immigrants. In parallel, southern European countries started to receive waves of immigrants and consequently, some illegal immigrants from the main receiving countries were “diverted” to the new hosting countries in Europe (Anthias & Lazaridis, 2000, p. 105).
communities from Poland, Bulgaria and Egypt reflect the historical and geographic position of Greece (King, 2001).

Gender differences among immigrants in Southern European countries were briefly mentioned by Peréz (2005). The author suggested that male immigrants come especially from Morocco, Senegal and Turkey, and female immigrants from Colombia and Philippines, and each is linked to a specific economic sector.

Since immigration is a recent phenomenon in these countries, their migration policies are very recent too and not totally worked out (Pérez, 2005). For instance, Greece is the least innovative country in terms of implementing immigration policies due to its 'laissez-faire policy' (Ribas-Mateos, 2001). Ribas-Mateos (2001) argues that Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal share one common characteristic in terms of immigration policy, a ‘rudimentary character’, combined with Catholic ideology and the value these countries place on traditional family structures.

2.5.2. Portugal

As mentioned above, Portugal was, historically, an emigrant country. Immigration to Portugal only became an academically and politically relevant subject from the 1980s (Marques & Góis, 2007).

Portuguese emigration began with overseas exploration in the 15th century. Between 1850 and the late 1950s, almost two million Portuguese left Europe to live in Brazil and the United States, (Malheiros, 2002). Baganha (2003), in her analysis of Portuguese migration history during *Estado Novo*41 (New State), pointed out, the ‘imbalances’ of the country’s economic structure, due to the fascist regime, and the difference in wages between Portugal and other countries. She also argued that these factors explain the massive migration after the Second World War, with France being the main hosting country. The number of Portuguese immigrants in France reached 10,000 in 1961; increased to 255,000 in 1970, and 218,000 in 1971, joined by Italian and Spanish workers (Baganha, 2003). During the ‘Estado Novo period’, approximately 1.98 million Portuguese left the country and one third of these immigrants used illegal channels, with France, and Germany as the main destinations (Baganha, 2003). There, these immigrants took the low-wage jobs (Malheiros, 2002). During the 1970s, Portuguese emigration slowed due to the oil crises which affected the European countries. The end of the dictatorship was also an important factor.

41 This regime began in 1933 and ended in April 1974 with the ‘Revolution of the Carnations’.
In Portugal’s history, the turning point, from emigrant to immigrant, occurred during the 1970s. Malheiros (2002) considers it consists of three periods:

- **Decolonisation**: African workers arrived from Cape Verde in the first half of the 1960s but the numbers only became significant in the 1970s, with more than half a million people arriving in Portugal. These immigrants, known as ‘retornados’[^42], came mainly from Cape Verde and Angola, but also from colonies such as Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau, and they settled in the Lisbon area (Malheiros, 2002);

- **Immigration in the 1980s and 1990s**: with Portugal’s need for labour and joining the European Union in 1986, the country continued to receive immigrants from the ex-African colonies, but also from Brazil and other parts of Europe (e.g. the United Kingdom, Germany) and the world (e.g. China, India, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal) (Malheiros, 2002);

- **From the end of the 1990s**: this period is characterised by the arrival of thousands of immigrants from Eastern Europe (e.g. Ukraine, Russia, Moldova, and Romania) (Malheiros, 2002).

Since it constitutes a new phenomenon in Portugal, this last period of migration is now being studied by Portuguese scholars. Until 2000, colonial links and a common language explained the high number of immigrants to Portugal from its former colonies, but with few links, little history or even migrant networks with Eastern countries, this topic now interests scholars (Marques & Góis, 2007). For Marques and Góis (2007, p.7), immigration occurred “because organisations with lucrative objectives, and organized networks of migration assistance, particularly active in Ukraine, promoted migration to Portugal.” Along with African immigrants, the Ukrainians[^43] took up the ‘3D’ (dirty, dangerous and difficult) jobs (Marques & Góis, 2007).

In order to control and regulate entry to Portuguese territory, the government created various types of visas (Fonseca et al., 2005) and these visas allowed immigrants to stay and work permanently; or to study; or to work for a period of time; or to legalise their status; or to stay for a short time. The status of being legal or illegal in the country, as mentioned earlier, was not part of the scope of this research.

[^42]: Meaning: “The ones that return”.
[^43]: The majority of Ukrainian immigrants declared as having high qualification levels (Marques & Góis, 2007).
As stated in Chapter 1, the majority of immigrants who arrive in Portugal are unskilled and are on a ‘non family’ basis, although the tendency for family reunion is increasing (Fonseca & Silva, 2010). Since African immigrants are in the country for a longer time, solid family networks are well established, therefore, few male immigrants come alone and find a job, many just join their existing, extended family in Portugal. Brazilians and Ukrainians tend to follow through traditional migration routes and only after a period does a family reunion happen. However, among the Brazilian community, a balance is struck between ‘pioneer’ male and female workers, with a large number of female immigrants coming alone (Fonseca et al., 2005).

Portugal is working on the integration of its immigrants, and it is possible to find some examples of this effort. Schools had to adapt to the new reality of migration because before 1999-2000, most immigrants were from Portuguese-speaking countries. With the new wave of migration, with children coming from Eastern European countries and also Asia, schools had to find ways to deal with their lack of knowledge about the language, by offering Portuguese language classes (Fonseca et al., 2005). According to the same authors, some studies showed that children from African communities were more vulnerable to being socially excluded and to delinquent behaviour, hence some housing policy and neighbourhood programmes were implemented in order to try to minimise cycles of poverty and stigma for these populations (Fonseca et al., 2005).

In February 2007, the Portuguese parliament approved a new nationality law. To acquire Portuguese nationality, immigrants from Portuguese-speaking countries had to prove they were legal and had lived continuously in the country for a minimum of six years, while this period was ten years for other nationalities. This law made thousands of immigrants of African descent who had been born in Portugal, foreigners. The new 2007 law brought new perspectives for immigrants allowing (ACIME, 2007):

- the third generation to automatically become national citizens;
- the second generation, born in Portugal, needs to prove that one of the foreigner progenitors has been living legally in the country for a minimum of five years;
- the naturalisation of immigrants born in Portugal must be achieved by the time they complete their 18th anniversary and they must have lived in Portugal for the last ten years.
The number of legal immigrants among the Cape Verdean and Ukrainian communities has been decreasing\(^{44}\) over the past few years due to the lack of employment and other opportunities. Nevertheless, these two communities are still among the three largest immigrant communities in Portugal (SEFstat, 2010).

The settlement of these immigrants has had an impact on Lisbon’s urban fabric, such as: segregation but also assimilation. This impact is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

2.6. Summary

Migration is a complex phenomenon and is interpreted in various ways by different schools of thought. Each discipline has its own concepts and the articulation of ideas and communication between authors from each discipline is not always easy. This chapter has been concerned with examining key and general points about migration. A more in-depth study would allow further concepts that cover the very broad theoretical spectrum of the phenomenon to be presented, including its causes, implications, effects and future developments.

Migration can occur for various reasons, however, for the individual, the prospect of a better life and to seek an improvement to economic wellbeing are among the major reasons for emigrating. Joining other family members and/or the presence of strong networks in the receiving country tend also to facilitate migratory movements. Cultural factors, however, and the part they play, are not examined as fully as they might be in most migration theories and although they may not be a decisive factor, they appear to constitute a gap in the research, both on a macro and micro level. ‘Multiculturalism’ and ‘transnationalism’, for example, are of special significance, giving good clues as to some of these processes, but the political focus that tends to characterise them does not always allow a deeper examination of cultural bonds.

It is also important to recognise that the political views of the receiving country also influence the migratory experience of those who arrive in the hosting society. Through analysis of some of the examples described above, it is possible to verify how the policies in different countries have led to the integration, assimilation or exclusion of immigrant communities and consequently, the way these communities experience the city/neighborhood in which they live. For the purpose of this research, it is crucial to understand this two-way process: the arrival of immigrants and the impact they may have in

\(^{44}\) The Ukrainian community had 66,227 legal immigrants in 2005 (ACIME, 2005) but this number had dropped to 52,293 by 2009 (SEFstat, 2010); The Cape Verdean community had 64,164 legal immigrants in 2005 (ACIME, 2005), while in 2009 this number was 48,845 (SEFstat, 2010).
the hosting society. The theory of ‘assimilation’ and ‘transnationalism’ seem particularly relevant to this research. Along with the ‘push-pull’ factors that led to the migration of the three immigrant groups from Brazil, Cape Verde and Ukraine, these theories are relevant to understanding immigrants’ place attachment and their use and perceptions of public open spaces.

When planning an analysis of new public spaces in multicultural cities, it is important to understand other specific, complex issues, such as living experiences, shared values, positive valued characteristics, memories, expectations, environment perception and migrants’ experience of their interaction with public space in home and host countries. The next chapter examines importance of public spaces, their meaning and evolution.
Chapter 3: Public (open) spaces

3.1. Introduction

As seen in the previous chapter, migration is a complex process, where multiple variables take part. Once the borders are crossed, immigrants face a new country which has its own landscape, shaped by culture, history and geography. Public spaces are part of the new panorama, and become part of the physical environment that supports immigrants’ lives.

A central part of this research is based on the concept of public space (PS). From a design perspective that includes landscape architecture public space plays an important role in society since it is part of the daily life of a city and its inhabitants. It is the outdoor platform for social encounters and exchanges, leisure and recreation, and it lets the diversity of users enjoy daily activities and celebrate on special occasions (Carr et al., 1992). Each city consists of a variety of public open places such as: streets, squares, parks, gardens, waterfronts, promenades, beaches and urban forests.

Public space is made up not only of physical space, but also of a more complex interrelationship of variables such as: users, design, accessibility, location, activities, materials, time of day, culture and policies. These variables allow different important benefits and values to emerge, including: economic and social values; benefits for all age groups, health and wellbeing benefits, safety and reduction of crime as well as biodiversity issues (CABE, 2004). It is possible to find different examples of these values and benefits in the relevant literature. The social values are, possibly, the aspect that is most relevant to this research. These values, and the particular dimensions of each public space, foster: social networks, the manner in which users interact in a particular space, a diversity of users, and the exchange of friendship, ideas and skills (Francis, 2003; Worpole & Knox, 2007). Authors, including William White (1980) and Jan Gehl (1987), have mapped comprehensively the use of public spaces and types of outdoor activities (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, eating and reading).

The next sections review concepts, approaches and characteristics of public spaces in Europe, America and more, specifically, in Portugal. This overview also tackles the relationship between immigrants and public spaces by reviewing some of the work developed specifically in this context.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------

45 According to Portuguese Law 468/71, the spaces that are public include all beaches and land 50m from the margin adjacent to the sea or navigable rivers.
3.2. What is public space? Notions and definitions

Public space, as a concept, links together two terms ‘public’ and ‘space’, both with a number of diverse and contested definitions. ‘Public’ has its Latin origin in ‘populus’, which means people. The Oxford Dictionary (1999, p. 1156) refers to ‘public’ as “concerning, or open to the people as a whole”, and ‘space’ as “a continuous area or expanse which is free or unoccupied”. The term also has a variety of meanings, from the political arena of “collective citizenry” to the daily use “of designating everyone or anyone” (Chua & Edwards, 1992, p. 2). Often the notion of ‘public’ is defined in terms of it being the opposite of ‘private’. According to Chelkoff & Thibaud (1992), the notion of ‘public space’ is based on the premise that it is open to every individual and that, in it, they circulate freely. Conversely, when access to a space is controlled and only certain persons can use it, it is designated ‘private space’. These spaces are separated by barriers that circumscribe each one, but in certain cases, there is a “degree of porosity” between them (Chelkoff & Thibaud, 1992), making it difficult to identify their limits.

The concept of ‘space’ is a commonly used concept, often referring to the outer-space beyond Earth. Some dictionaries define space as “an empty place” (Cambridge Dictionary, no date, online), and introduce another concept – place. Human geography has grasped the differences between these two concepts, which complement each other. According to Relph (1976, p. 8): “Space is amorphous and intangible and not an entity that can be directly described and analysed.” Tuan (1979) has also debated these two terms and his notion of ‘space’ and ‘place’ is closely associated with movement and time. According to this author, “Place is a pause in movement” (Tuan, 1979, p. 138) as opposed to space, of which Tuan says: “We have a sense of space because we can move (...)”(Tuan, 1979, p. 118). Tuan also said that when people stop in a certain place they attribute a value to it: “The pause makes it possible for a locality to become the center of felt value.” (Tuan, 1979, p. 138). Therefore, as noted by Cresswell (2004), a space becomes a place when the subjects introduce meanings and feelings to a particular area: “When humans invest meaning in a portion of space and then become attached to in some way (naming is one such way) it becomes a place” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 10).

Each society creates public spaces as a mirror of their notions of public and private. These notions are constructed on the values of the society, implying identification of the needs and rights of their members (Carr et al., 1992).

46 There are, of course, cultural dimensions to the term. Slessor (2001, p.1), for example, refers to the differences between the Mediterranean and Muslim North African cultures, where for the latter, the “civic and
The concept of ‘public space’, which has been used extensively in different disciplines, has a multiplicity of meanings in the respective literature, the sense given by each discipline being different. On the other hand, the term has also various meanings in “different societies, places and times” (Smith & Low, 2006, p. 4). Brodin (2006) divided the concept into two different perspectives: a) ‘metaphorical public space’, which represents a “mental space” for communication and discussion among individuals (Brodin, 2006, p. 3), which is dominated by a political and philosophical framework; b) ‘literal public space’, which represents a physical space (Brodin, 2006, p. 7), one that is studied by architects and geographers. Both terms can, however, inform each other. Goodsell (2003, p. 367), in his revision of the concept of public space, provided another interpretation, shaping the concept into a threefold perspective: a ‘political philosophy and democratic theory’ which has its focus on the public discourse and political arena; ‘urban planning and design’, which deals with the physical environment, such as gardens, parks, streets and plazas; and the ‘political interpretation of architecture’, which is the interpretation of public buildings and the demonstration of political power in public spaces.

In this research, the perspective of ‘literal public space’ (Brodin, 2006) is the main focus, but, inevitably, there is an overview of some concepts that have been added by other commentators/theorists to notions of ‘metaphorical public space’. The aim in doing that is to establish fundamental, relevant detail that is related to presentation of the broadest conceptual parameters discussed in the literature. The research also discusses the notion of ‘public space’ as used by planners and designers, where it is associated with “open physical places within cities that will adequately function as sites of public use and citizen interaction” (Goodsell, 2003, p. 363).

The literature also discusses other terms that are used to refer to different types of public spaces: ‘public open spaces’, ‘urban green spaces’, ‘open spaces’, ‘urban open spaces’, ‘urban open public spaces’. According to Golicnik (2005), the word ‘open’ informs the kind of space it is, and as proposed by Tang (2004, p. 15) it “indicates all the outdoor spaces open to the sky with a natural climate”. Again, in this research, the term ‘public open spaces’ is used throughout the thesis, based on Tang’s (2004) definition, which refers to all outdoor spaces with public access, such as squares (Praças47), streets, gardens, parks, sightseeing

religious power is manifest in palaces, town halls and churches that face main streets and squares. In Muslim North Africa, public space is limited -- apart from markets and shopping streets -- yet the private domains of the home, mosque and Koranic school are rich in form and expression”.

47 Portuguese term for plaza.
points, riverfronts and promenades, beaches, coastal trails and (urban) forests\footnote{Although most of the study focuses on an urban setting, this research does not use the term 'urban' because it would narrow the field of study such that it might disregard important elements that lie outside Lisbon's urban boundaries, such as beaches, forests and parks - and they are equally important to the study.}, where citizens can engage with the environment and each other.

### 3.2.1. Other terms that are related to ‘public space’

Public space in cities is often used as a stage for protests, a common place to hold debates, or for the discussion of politics and the exchange of ideas. This type of political discussion and participation is often linked with what Habermas has termed the ‘public sphere’. Habermas (1991) considers a ‘public sphere’ as a space in which a democratic discussion of public values occurs that is beyond the influence of the state. Nancy Fraser describes Habermas' public sphere as "(...) a theatre in modern societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk. It is the space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs. (...) This arena is conceptually distinct from the state." (1992, p. 110). This normative term is related to what Brodin (2006, p. 3) defined as 'metaphorical public space' and, therefore, it is beyond the scope of this research. However, if physical public spaces provide an opportunity for discussion then, arguably, the 'public sphere' is a part of 'public spaces' and thus, its importance should be acknowledged.

Other terms such as ‘public realm’ and ‘public life’ are often used in the literature. Both terms are closely related to the social and democratic dimensions of public spaces, as well as to the notion of the ‘public sphere’. ‘Public life’ is the mirror of public spaces’ social dimensions. Carmona et al (2003, p. 109), based on Loukaitou-Sideres and Banerjee’s (1998) work, defined the ‘public realm’ as consisting of three aspects: a “forum for political action and representation”; a space for “social interaction and communication”; a space for “learning, personal development, and information”. Clearly, the first aspect is linked with Habermas’ ‘public sphere’. The other two aspects are embedded in the social life and dimension of public spaces, which will be discussed in more depth later.

Although this research does not explore directly how immigrants’ viewed and expressed political and democratic values in Portuguese public spaces, it does describe significant events, for example, in June 2008, different immigrant communities gathered in a
public square (Largo de São Domingos, Lisbon), to express their disagreement with the new European Directive regarding immigration⁴⁹.

3.3. **Historical perspective**⁵⁰

In his seminal work “*The Fall of the Public Man*”, Richard Sennet (1978) looked at the history of the term ‘public’ and pointed out that it was first used in English to “identify the ‘public’ with the common good in society” (Sennet, 1978, p.16). In the latter part of the 17th century, the term ‘public’ gradually began to acquire the meaning that is closer to ours today, that is, to refer to the “open scrutiny of anyone”, as opposed to ‘private’, a “sheltered region of life defined by one’s family and friends” (Sennett, 1978, p.16). In France, the concept ‘le public’ had a similar meaning, and was used during the Renaissance to mean “the common good”, gradually becoming a “special region of sociability” (Sennett, 1978, p.16). Private and reserved spaces belonged to the social elites of the 18th century, and it was not until the 20th century that the concept of public space acquired its meaning of being a participatory space, wellbeing, part of a city and of political participation (Fortuna, 2005).

Throughout history, spaces for commercial transactions, rituals and sacred celebrations were created to support communities’ needs (Slessor, 2001), but until the 18th century, public space was “an honorific place” where kings and/or the aristocracy celebrated their power and sovereignty (Boyer, 1996, p. 7).

The Greek ‘agora’ was the central meeting and market place of most Greek city states. It was located in a space that was lower than the sacred and religious place (acropolis) and it was an open space for social events such as gatherings, assemblies, festivals, and also as a market (Mumford,1961). Political participation and the right to public space was only partial, since women, foreigners and slaves were excluded from the political process of the state (Basson, 2004) and were not considered citizens, and for this reason, they could not enter in to public spaces (Mitchell, 2003): “(...) and though one part of the agora was often reserved for housewives, the agora was pre-eminently a man’s precinct” (Mumford, 1961, p. 177).

The Roman ‘forum’ was the equivalent of the Greek ‘acropolis’ and ‘agora’, being a complex, open space for civic gatherings, markets, athletic competitions, and religious rituals,

---


⁵⁰ This research is based on a Western European and American interpretation of public space.
accommodating different types of buildings (Mumford, 1961). Favro (1988), described the importance and evolution of the ‘fora’ in Rome, describing the shifting from the central ‘Forum Romanum’ - “a monument to the State”- which was considered a representation of the republic’s political system to the imperial ‘fora’ – associated with the concentration of political power in the emperor (absolutist imperial state). The imperial ‘fora’ were an expression of the emperor’s power: “…monuments to individuals (...) these new environments provided the appropriate backdrop for imperial actions” (Favro, 1988, p. 20). These grand spaces contrasted with the conditions of most dwellers who lived in poor and unsanitary conditions, narrow streets, and crowded quarters (Mumford, 1961).

In medieval times, the marketplace was the open space for gathering and commerce par excellence (Ribeiro, 2008). The marketplace was usually divided into two places: one adjacent to the cathedrals, since this was where inhabitants would meet more often, or a square for that purpose, resulting from the organic growth of the city, leading to a shapeless space (Mumford, 1961). The narrow streets of the medieval cities were “heavily used” (Carr et al., 1992, p. 58) and “the upper classes and the lower classes jostled together on the street, in the market, as they did in the cathedral” (Mumford, 19, p. 424). The presence of a wall around cities was a common characteristic. As noted by Mumford, the town gate was another important place in the city’s life, functioning as the transition point between the urban and rural worlds, a meeting and trade point, a “customs office, a passport office and immigration control point” (Mumford, 1961, p. 350). Another interesting aspect of the wall, described by Mumford was the use of the wall as “an open promenade for recreation” (Mumford, 1961, p. 350).

Between the 15th and 18th centuries, urban life changed, significantly. The Renaissance brought the first changes: the openness of the medieval urban fabric, the construction of straight streets and square/geometric plazas51, contrasting with the organic development of open spaces during the Middle Ages (Mumford, 1961; Carr et al., 1992). This was a time of social and economic change as the dominant classes of the Middle Ages - the clergy and nobility - saw a decrease in their power, contrasting with the emergence of a growing middle class of merchants and bankers (French, 1978). However, the differences between classes continued sharply and, for instance, during the 16th century, the use of the royal parks52 was a privilege granted solely to members of the royal court. The first residential squares in Paris, such as the Place de Vosges, began to be built in the early 17th century,

51 Italy, the European centre of the Renaissance, uses public spaces especially its plazas or piazza.
52 Originally, the word ‘park’ or ‘parc’ meant “an enclosed area containing animals for hunting” (Whitaker and Brown, 1971, cited by Carr et. al, 1992, p. 62)
offering exclusive access to the residents around it, working as a “common backyard for storage, and various domestic uses, having for embellishment only the centrally located statue of the king” (French, 1978, p. 90). It was not until later in the century that it was redesigned into a formal green space. During the 17th and 18th centuries, these types of residential squares became more popular in Europe. In England, apart from the marketplace, squares were relatively unknown until the Renaissance influence was felt at the end of the 16th century (Lawrence, 1991). In London, the first residential squares began to be built during the first half of the 17th century. These urban elements increased the value of the surrounding properties, attracting wealthier tenants. In the late 17th century, open spaces, such as common lands and quadrangles, were part of the urban design of many towns in Britain, as a place for promenades and the social gatherings of high society (Lawrence, 1991). According to Lawrence, these 17th-century squares were “socially ambiguous landscapes” since access to them was not entirely private (Lawrence, 1991, p. 97). Also, the land where these squares were built was not entirely private, since land from the commons was used. The first attempt to privatise the use of these types of spaces occurred in 1735 when the English Parliament agreed to a petition from residents to close access to the squares by fencing them, restricting access to the residents who had keys only (Lawrence, 1991).

With the revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries, the meaning of public space was extended to the concept of a “democratic public sphere” (Boyer, 1996, p. 8), as a place for social encounters and where the debate of ideas could occur, in contrast with the “ancien régime” (Fortuna, 2005, p. 2). The French Revolution helped to shape public space for a liberal bourgeoisie which based its ideals on the notions of equality, liberty, and fraternity. Spaces in the city became public for all classes, as places of civic expression, encouraging socialisation among “different social sectors” (Pardo, 2007, p. 15). In the 18th century, London and Paris became a stage for the mixture of people from different groups, and the word ‘public’ slowly acquired its modern/actual meaning. In the words of Richard Sennett: “...it

53 Covent Garden was the first residential square. Its primary purpose was to be a private square, however, it worked also as a public open space, leading to tensions and conflicts between the elite residents and other users: “The Duke of Bedford had not anticipated that the square would become a favorite place for market vendors, cab men, pickpockets, prostitutes, and others who sought to make money off the presence of the wealth residing around the square.” (Lawrence, 1991, p. 94)

54 The commons worked as an open space “which prior residents had old rights of access for productive activities like drying and bleaching of cloth and for nonproductive activities, such as military training and recreation.” (Lawrence, 1991, p. 97)

55 Residents from Lincoln’s Inn Fields (Lawrence, 1991).

56 These two centuries were marked by the Industrial Revolution along with political revolutions, such as the American and French Revolutions. The French Revolution was marked by a social transition from a total monarchical and feudal system to the rise of the bourgeoisie (Baker, 1990, p. 1).
meant not only a region of social life located apart from the realm of family and close friends, but also that this public realm of acquaintances and strangers included a relatively wide diversity of people" (Sennett, 1978, p. 17). As cities developed, new spaces for socialising emerged: “This was an era of the building of massive urban parks, of the first attempts at making streets fit for the special purpose of pedestrian strolling as a form of relaxation” (Sennett, 1978, p. 17). Patterns of social interaction emerged and all social classes - from the elite to the working class - adopted social habits such as promenading through the parks, which until then were just the privilege of the aristocracy. On the other hand, the upper social classes had their own private gardens, the previous residential squares of the 17th century. The use of trees and dense vegetation in these residential squares, and the iron fences provided a refuge from the ordinary street life. As Henry Lawrence explained: “Rather than resorting to them for social encounters and public display, they [the upper classes] went for private relaxation, as individuals and as families, privileged to have a park of their own out their front door, safe behind iron railings, locked gates, and a screen of vegetation from the eyes and voices of those on the street” (Lawrence, 1991, p. 108).

The 18th century was also the era of the coffee houses, which became social centres (Sennett, 1978). In Habermas’ book, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (1989), coffee houses play a central role as places for the “emergence of a bourgeois public sphere in Early Modern Europe” (Laurier & Philo, 2005, p. 24). Habermas presents coffee houses as calm places where “the rise of the public sphere is assisted by the image of those educated representatives of the bourgeois discoursing enthusiastically about the big issues of the day over steaming pots of coffee in these smoky spaces of public opinion-forming spread” (Laurier & Philo, 2005, p. 8) and also as places detached from the outside – the street (Laurier & Philo, 2005). Montag saw this separation of Habermas’ ‘public sphere’ from the street as problematic since it implies that the street is located “outside the public sphere” (Montag, 2000, p. 141). As Laurier and Philo point out (2005, p. 12), for Habermas, the street did not offer the same calm and concentration that coffee houses offered for the discussion and exchange of ideas. Richard Sennett also (1978, pp. 83-85) argued that the promenades along the streets were a threat to the “speech as a system of signs” practised in the coffee houses. Streets became a stage where people wanted to see and make contact with other people. However, streets (in London and Paris) were narrow and violent, leading to the need for public parks as safe places for pedestrian use and carriage rides: “The building of new parks and the renovation of older undeveloped areas into parks and promenades began in great earnest in the 1730’s. In the middle decades of the century, walking and riding in the park – especially
European cities in the 19th century were influenced, strongly, by the significant impact that the Industrial Revolution had on them. Migrations from rural to urban environs played an important role on public space during this period. These were times of strong internal migrations when millions of people moved from the countryside to the cities, leading to cities’ rapid growth, and consequently, to their overcrowding. Public transportation was poor in the early stages of the Industrial Revolution and, therefore, the working class had to live near their place of work, in poor and unhealthy conditions (Carmona et al., 2003). The differences between the poor and the rich became evident, with the response to these differences shown by protests and disturbances in the streets and a rising number of uneducated and illiterate people (Boyer, 1996, p. 8). As noted by Mumford: “(…) between 1820 and 1900 the chaos of the great cities is like that of a battlefield, proportionate to the very extent of their equipment and strength of the forces employed” (1953, p. 144). According to Boyer (1996), the demands of the working class could no longer be answered by the bourgeois public sphere, and the state had to intervene in answering their social needs such as for housing, education, transportation, creating a shift from the bourgeois sphere to the “public sphere of the welfare state” (1996, p. 8). The state became the provider in terms of social order and for the fulfilment of people’s needs (Fortuna, 2005). However, as noted by Carmona et al. (2003), city authorities were not prepared for this rapid growth and change.

In the United Kingdom, in response to the poor living conditions, and based on hygiene and humanitarian ideas, parks were seen as an answer to the health problems (Clark, 1973). In 1848, the Public Health Act, recognised the importance of open spaces in crowded towns and enforced the design of ‘public walks’ and “means of exercise for middle and humble classes”(Clark, 1973, p. 31). The lack of open spaces in London, and the urgent need for these types of spaces led to the creation of places for public walking and the opening and creation of public parks (Lawrence, 1991). During the 1830s, Regent’s Park, Kensington, Hyde Park, Kensington Gardens, Green Park and St James’s Park became London’s public parks (Clark, 1973).

Paris is another well-known example of the response to cramped public space as a result of the impact of the Industrial Revolution. Baron Haussmann’s famous interventions,

---

57 Lawrence (1991, p. 111) pointed out that the opening of parks “(…) was not pure altruism, however. The Committee felt that one of the principal benefits would be an improvement in the character of the poor.”
between the 1850s and 1860s, opened up Paris’ urban fabric with wide avenues, boulevards, a network of parks, along with the creation of sewerage and water supply systems and strong building regulations (Berman, 1983; Relph, 1987). The boulevards cut parts of poor working-class neighbourhoods – quartiers – leading to the displacement of many of its inhabitants, but allowing the remaining inhabitants the possibility of moving in and out of the neighbourhood. These wide avenues became places for socialisation, where pavements had specific functions such as walking and sitting in outside cafés and restaurants (Sennett, 1990). Besides the fact that these boulevards allowed better traffic circulation, they worked also as a measure to ensure soldiers could have rapid access in case of rebellion (Relph, 1987, p. 51). The ‘net’ of boulevards connected the most important places in the city, such as train stations, parks, etc. (Samper, 2003). Haussmann developed an established system of parks in the city, from the large-scale parks in the city’s border, to the urban parks and the smaller-scale green spaces, on a street/neighbourhood level (Samper, 2003). The smaller green spaces were inspired by the British residential squares, but they were distributed in Paris’ urban fabric, along, not only the residential, but also the commercial areas, and they were open to the general public (Alphand 1968-73, cited by Lawrence, 1991).

In America, the 19th century was influenced not only by industrialisation, but also by the strong wave of international migration from Europe. America was also struggling with poor living conditions in its cities and with a clash between different classes. At the beginning of the century, the promenade, the act of ‘seeing’ and ‘being seen’, was taken as an opportunity to create ties between the different social classes. By this, Bluestone tells us, “(...) the heterogeneous urban crowd, with its tenuous social connections, was transformed into a unifying body of leisure, enjoyment, and refinement” (Bluestone, 1987, p. 529). In the middle of the century, the desire for promoting promenades and squares led to the development of urban parks (Bluestone, 1987). In America, the design of parks was seen as an expression of democratic values, while in Europe, the main drive was to increase health among urban dwellers (Clark, 1973). Olmsted envisioned urban parks, among other aspects, as being a part of urban citizens’ democratic right to have access to nature in the urban environment (Clark, 1973). He, along with other park advocates, believed that parks could be central to reducing the differences between classes, through their “restorative and calming powers” (Taylor, 1999, p. 427). Reinforcing this idea, Bluestone (1987) argued that the design of urban parks, such as Central Park, continued to promote the promenading tradition: “They [Olmsted and Vaux] also included more formal areas where they hoped to create a better setting for promenading than had previously existed in the United States (...) Indeed, promenades
formed part of Olmsted specifically recognizing the importance of the promenade in relation to parks” (Bluestone, 1987, p. 539). The development of public urban parks continued not only in New York (Central Park and Brooklyn) but in other places also, such as Buffalo, Boston and Chicago.

Although the transformations of the 19th century appear to have created an opportunity for the increasing development of public spaces such as squares, parks and gardens, Doherty et al. (2008) argue that industrialisation in the 19th century also led to a certain degree of privatisation, with the construction of residential gated neighbourhoods, funded by wealthy dwellers, in order to avoid the industrial tumults. These developments, located at the rural-urban edge, led to the first steps of suburbanisation (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 2003). In America, the development of the railroad system during the second half of the 19th century was the main driver for suburbanisation (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 2003).

The 20th century was marked by an explosion in transportation, information and technology. Samper (2003, p. 16) claims that the 19th century was the pedestrian’s era, with the promotion of promenades and boulevards, whereas the 20th century was the era of the car as a “symbol of movement and progress”, leading to the construction of motorways, and the consolidation of the suburbs.

At the beginning of the century, city leaders invested more on civic rights, building different kinds of social facilities (libraries, schools, swimming pools and parks) (Fortuna, 2005). The period between 1930 and 1965 was characterised by Cranz (1982, cited by Carr et al., 1992) as “the era of recreation facilities” (Carr et al., 1992, p. 66) for outdoor and indoor recreation, since the growing middle class demanded these type of facilities for their leisure time.

In America, during the 1950s, the acquisition of private cars allowed the middle classes to move to the suburbs where they could build their ‘dream house’ with their own private green space (Carr et al., 1992). With the progressive abandonment of the city centre, middle-class interest in, and support for, the city’s public spaces declined, and these spaces became under the domain of the more disadvantaged social classes. Conversely, in the suburbs, a new space for gathering was created, the ‘shopping mall’ (Carr et al., 1992, p. 70).

58 Bourgeoisie families wanted a separation between their working and living spaces, with offices in the city centre and houses on the periphery. They also aimed to have an exclusive neighbourhood for their social class (Southworth & Ben-Joseph, 2003).
59 Up until the 19th century, leisure time was a privilege of the upper classes only (see Veblen’s theory) (Kraus, 1998).
These shopping centres consisted of not only two enclosed rows of shops facing each other, with a pedestrian street in the middle, but also of a variety of spaces for eating, exhibitions and other events, often decorated with different themes (the presence of vegetation, water, sculptures, etc.). One of the main characteristics of these spaces is the fact that they are controlled environments (climate and surveillance). In order to revitalise city centres, some of the cities’ main streets were closed to traffic, becoming exclusively pedestrian, creating ‘pedestrian malls’. These types of public spaces were developed during the 1960s and 1970s. However, due to the perceived failure of pedestrian exclusivity in some cities, by the end of the 1960s, some cities included public transportation in pedestrian areas (Carr et al., 1992). Different variations of this type of space developed in America during the following years, and throughout the 1970s and 1980s, another type of controlled environment, in addition to the ‘shopping mall’, emerged: the ‘indoor mall’ in the city centre (Carr et al., 1992). The indoor spaces evolved in different forms: “atriums, galleries, courtyards, through-block arcades, indoor parks, covered pedestrian areas”, and although sometimes considered as ‘dreadful’, some became successful since they catered for users’ needs (sitting; food; retailing and toilets) (Whyte, 1980, p. 76).

In the mid-20th century, architecture and planning were strongly influenced by the modern movement and the ideas of Le Corbusier (in France), Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe and Walter Gropius (in Germany). In terms of the use of space, modernism is well known for its principles of function which were translated into zoning according to use/function, leading to social and urban spatial segregation. Transport corridors (for use of private cars) linking different functional zones were promoted, while pedestrian use of streets was discouraged, and traditional public spaces, such as streets, squares and boulevards, were at risk (López, 2000). The expansion of the city led to a reduction in the use of public spaces (López, 2000).

In Europe, after the Second World War, in the late 1940s, reconstruction was urgently required. The reconstruction of the shopping areas in Coventry and Rotterdam city centres, led to the creation of exclusively pedestrian areas connected to each other and with shops on the side (Relph, 1987). Many European cities, which had retained their medieval urban fabric with narrow streets for vehicles, took this approach, revitalising their city centres and opening

---

60 During the 1960s, public spaces in city centres became central stages for social protests such as women’s liberation, civil rights, ethnic and racial, anti-war movements (Vietnam War) and environmental movements. According to Carr et al. (1992, p. 36), these public demonstrations helped to place “value on the street, the square, and the parks as forums for debate and public outcry.”
them up for social gatherings and public use of the streets. Due to its success, urban planners repeated this formula in some European cities.

Modernist principles were then opposed by the ‘new urbanists’ who were in favour of a return to street life and neighbourhoods composed of shops, parks, schools, churches and working places. The work of Jane Jacobs - *The Death and Life of Great American cities* (originally published in 1961) - is a fundamental study. She criticised the separation of function in the cities and the lack of social interaction, and argued in favour of diverse cities: “(...) the need of cities for a most intricate and close-grained diversity of uses that gives each other mutual support, both economically and socially. (...) I think that unsuccessful city areas are areas which lack this kind of intricate mutual support” (Jacobs, 1993, p. 19).

During the 1970s and 1980s, the urban fabric of cities began to be renewed and reconstructed in an attempt to “restore the public realm of the city” (Boyer, 1996, p. 4). According to Fortuna (2005), due to cultural, social and economic differences, the process of cities' regeneration is different in American and European contexts. The American model is based on the idea of the privatisation of public spaces and a redevelopment by private entities, the continuation of suburbanisation and, consequently, the emptiness of the city centre. Conversely, the European model enhances public spaces in the city centre, emphasises the re-appropriation of public life, the development and regeneration of the street and neighbourhood, based on the state. However, Fortuna (2005) argues that the notion of ‘public’ associated with the state has a negative connotation, namely, of an unproductive administration and bureaucracy, opening a space for the development of the private domain. However, contrary to America, European cities are characterised by a good quality of life, a sense of place due to their history, city centres with pedestrian areas, good transport, a variety of parks and “well designed public spaces” (Balsas, 2007, p. 238).

In a ‘disperse and fragmented’ urban reality, characterised by vast areas of peri-urban residential neighbourhoods (Lopéz, 2000, p. 5), the values and importance of public spaces are beginning to be recognised. In recent years, public spaces have become part of regeneration agendas and recognised as vital spaces which can create an attractive image for visitors and residents, and promote the economic development of an area (Inroy, 2000; CABE, 2004). The importance and values of public spaces will be discussed later, along with the loss of public space.
3.4. The current situation

3.4.1. The loss of public space

Throughout the literature, authors express concern for the loss and ‘decline of public space’ and the rise of private spaces thanks to the privatisation of public spaces, an increasing number of shopping centres and gated communities (Massey, 2005, p. 152). Jan Gehl wondered whether the use of public spaces as social meeting places is declining due to the emergence of an electronic society (Gehl, 2004) where the more common meeting place has become a virtual one (e.g. social networking sites, such as Messenger, chat forums and Web2.0).61

Often, clusters of middle or upper classes live in the city centre. Ruth Glass62, in the 1960s, was the first to use the term ‘gentrification’ to describe the upward mobility of the middle class to the inner residential parts of London, where improvements in the housing stock, along with the rise of prices, led to the displacement of the working class who had previously lived in these areas (Hamnett, 2003). Since then, the term has been used extensively to illustrate this type of social reconfiguration of a city, and it is a trend that is evident now in cities worldwide63. A number of authors have attributed this shift to economic factors. Hamnett (2003, p. 2402) proposed that the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial urban economy based on financial, business and creative services was the basis for these changes in the urban fabric. Lees (2003) proposed the term ‘super gentrification’ to describe what was happening in cities such as London64 (see Butler & Lees, 2006) and New York, where areas already gentrified are going through yet another gentrification process, changing from an upper-middle-class neighbourhood to an even more exclusive area. Once again, the movement of ‘super-rich ‘financiers’ (Lees, 2003, p. 2487) from the corporate industries and financial global market to the city is based on economic and globalisation trends.

Over the years, the positive aspects of this process, such as the reduction in vacant properties, the rise of property values, the rehabilitation of areas and especially the increase in social mix have been advocated by politicians. However, some authors, including Loretta Lees (2008), have questioned whether gentrification really leads to a less segregated and more

61 The study of this new technological phenomenon and its impact on the use of public open spaces is beyond the scope of the present research.
62 The author used the term gentrification to point to the emergence of a new “urban gentry” (Hamnett, 2003).
63 Due to its connections with the term ‘class’, this process is also referred to as ‘urban rehabilitation’.
64 Various academic works have studied the case of London’s neighbourhoods such as: Barnsbury, Islington.
social and mixed society. In her review of the different urban policies in the UK, Netherlands and US, she pointed to the fact that gentrification may lead to social polarisation, and through her literature review, gave examples and evidence as to how gentrification can lead to the displacement and social segregation of lower income communities (Lees, 2008). As an example, gated communities are marks of and symbols for the middle and upper classes in the urban fabric. These enclosed residential areas are designed to provide collective open spaces and facilities for its residents, restricting the access of those who live in the vicinities, therefore, exacerbating the gap between classes and excluding the possible social mix that public open spaces could provide.

3.5. Immigrants and space

3.5.1. Historical perspective

Historians have mapped in detail the way the United States reached an unprecedented economic position through manufacturing and technological developments in the 19th century and the resulting political and environmental changes. In the 19th century, Europeans who suffered through the Industrial Revolution from poverty, poor living conditions and serious famine, faced no alternative but to leave their countries in the hope of creating a better future. America was seen as a land of opportunity, and massive immigration to this country took place. It is estimated that, between 1820 and 1920, 33 million immigrants settled in America (Ward, 1971).

A new industrial labour force of unskilled workers made up, largely, of immigrants poured into mills, factories and coalfields, generating new living environments and large structural changes in city size, urban designs and population composition. American cities became bigger, with denser and more diversified populations and, above all, they became the prime location for the assimilation of newcomers into American society (Zurn, 1982). With them, also, came new ideas and new ways of perceiving nature and life in the cities. In fact, when European immigrants arrived in Boston in the 17th century, they brought with them images of pastoral landscapes from England and Ireland (Lanfer & Taylor, 2004). 'Boston Common', created in 1634, is one of the first examples of a common space created by immigrants. Originally it was used in an informal way, for grazing cattle and military purposes and it turned into a public park in the 19th century (Low, Taplin, & Scheld, 2005).

65 The UK government promoted social mixing through the “state-led gentrification of public housing”; The US promoted the “spatial deconcentration of poverty”; and the Netherlands have demolished and rebuilt low-income areas (Lees, 2008, p.2452).
After the mid-19th century, the crowding of industry and people in the large cities of the American Northeast and Midwest produced a rapid reorganisation of the urban landscape “marked by a concentration of business activities in a downtown core, by a crowding of ethnic neighborhoods around that core, and by an extension of suburbs for middle-income groups far into the countryside along radial lines of public transportation” (Lloyd, 1981, p. 460) (see also, Ward, 1971).

One such example is New York, characterised by the rapid growth of industry and commerce, one of the main cities to absorb these immigrants, and between 1841 and 1850, New York received 1,713,251 immigrants from Europe, living in poor houses, lacking water, sanitation and heating (Broadbent and Spon, 1996). In New York and Boston, public life was happening in the streets, with a mixture of all kinds of people. However, streets were “dirty, overcrowded, and often dangerous” (Francis, 1987, p. 23). As the number of immigrants continued to grow and the living conditions to deteriorate, leading to houses crowded with immigrants, public health problems and sanitation problems, a new movement called the ‘Park Movement’ emerged in the 1840s. It was based on Romanticism, the idea that nature and natural scenery would improve people’s spirits, and as an escape from their poor living/working conditions (Low et al., 2005). The American Park Movement was inspired by the new European public parks, and also the popular use of cemeteries in America, such as the Mount Auburn in Massachusetts (Low et al., 2005). Before 1857, there were no developed urban parks in America and city squares, commons, cemeteries or the countryside were the only places where people could have contact with nature and the pastoral landscape (Taylor, 1999). The rural garden cemeteries were very popular among citizens, with their romantic design, curved paths, ponds, ornamental plants, trees, and as a place for picnics and walks (Low et al., 2005).

Cranz (1978) surveyed the rise of the American Park Movement from 1850 to the present day as having four stages: the ‘pleasure garden’, ‘reform park’, ‘recreational facility’, and ‘open-space system’. According to her, they all share the fact that they were mechanisms of social control which grew out of an effort to solve urban problems arising from the twin processes of industrialisation and urbanisation. The ‘pleasure garden’ (1850-1900) was a “vast landscape of alternating trees and meadows, undulating hills, slowly meandering waterways, and broad reflecting ponds-an idealized agrarian scene, orderly but without the fussy decorations of architecture, sculpture, or flower beds” (Cranz, 1978, p. 1).

Frederick Law Olmsted, the designer of most of the parks of this period and his partner, Calvert Vaux, were responsible for the design of Central Park in 1858, one of the best
examples of the American Park Movement. Olmsted designed the “scenic antithesis to the urban condition and a tool for achieving democracy and social welfare” (Ward Thompson, 1998, p. 2). The park design included picturesque and pastoral scenery, achieved large green areas defined by informal compositions of trees and shrubs, but also more formal areas intended for promenading in the European tradition (Bluestone, 1987).

Social concerns were also in the minds of the two architects. Vaux himself, by the 1870s, had become architect to the Children’s Aid Society, a philanthropic organisation formed in the 1850s to aid the children of immigrant families, who were concentrated on the city’s East Side (Kowsky, 1998). Olmsted was particularly concerned with the social problems faced by America and the increasing number of immigrants, not only from Europe but also from rural America, in the eastern cities. For him, the park was seen as a new “challenging” opportunity to “advance the cause of civilisation in his lifetime” (Beveridge & Schuyler, 1983, p. 6). Olmsted wrote: “(...) but we have nowhere on the western frontier a population newer to its locality and so little socially rooted or in which it is possible for a man to live so isolatedly from humanizing influences and with such constant practice of heart-hardening and taste smothering habitats as that to be found in our great Eastern cities” (Beveridge & Schuyler, 1983, p. 6).

Besides the democratic right of access to the parks, Olmsted viewed parks as a place of congregation where all classes could mix, diluting the differences between them (Taylor, 1999). In fact, parks were designed to reflect middle-class standards and therefore, were ‘models of social control’ (Taylor, 1999) and “planners excluded aspects of popular culture—such as alcohol, raucous music, and dancing—associated with immigrants and their crowded slums” (Cranz, 1978, p. 2). It was expected that the lower classes would behave in ways similar to the middle classes, and this could control workers’ behaviour and instil the “‘proper’ rules of decorum, grace and charm” (Taylor, 1999, p. 460). Central Park was designed with picturesque and pastoral scenery, intended to improve the quality of life in New York, but from the social point of view, it had very strict rules in place to control the behaviour of the lower classes, and “bad” behaviour, such as excessive drinking, provoking behaviour, indecent language, etc. would be punished (arrests and fines) (Low et al., 2005; Taylor, 1999). The parks were always at the edge of the city where land was cheaper, but this location was also said to be an appropriate way to gain distance from city life.

The Park Movement spread to other cities and the continued influx of immigrants to the United States reinforced the creation of urban parks, not only for recreation but also as a source of employment (Low et al., 2005; Taylor, 1999). Although it was not possible for all the
cities to build parks such as Central Park, in the 1880s, a new movement began, battling for the construction of small, neighbourhood parks for recreational purposes. This was in response to the spread of disease, the lack of open public spaces, the massive number of immigrants in the cities and overcrowding among the working classes. This movement wanted to provide playgrounds for children, contradicting the image of immigrant children being arrested for playing in the streets and harbours, since the parks were based on the needs of the native-born middle class and not always accessible, in terms of distance, to the lower classes (Cranz, 1978; Taylor, 1999). At the turn of the century, there was pressure to create 'small parks' in the heart of urban slums. The campaign for this new type of park was part of the larger Progressive Era, and its purposes are succinctly summarised by what Cranz (1978) calls the 'reform park' to be used “to assimilate immigrants, reduce nervousness, and fight delinquency” (Cranz, 1980, p. S86). The Progressive Era supporters saw the leisure activities of the working class as “unhealthy and immoral” (Taylor, 1999, p. 454) and they argued that the recreational needs of this class should be available daily at nearby sites (Cranz, 1978). Public spaces became an outdoor ‘arena for socializing’ with immigrants having the values and attitudes of the higher social classes (Carr et al., 1992, p. 63). Its most enduring legacy is the playground, originating a split between the recreation movement (where there were recreational activities, mostly child-oriented) and the park movement (predominantly bucolic, for passive recreation) (Cranz, 1978).

The ‘Reform Park’ movement took place between 1900 and 1930 (Cranz, 1978), corresponding to the migration period, named by Massey (1995) as the ‘Classic Era’, when around 19 million immigrants arrived on American shores.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the Chicago sociologists were concerned with social problems, such as poverty, crime, and the housing problems of Chicago, which were becoming symbols of modern urban life, as a result of the influx of rural immigrants, not only from Europe, but also from North America, Latin America and Asia (Gingrich, 1998). The Chicago School worked on the social consequences of migration and urbanisation, emphasising the link between “social problems and the ecological processes of urbanization” (Ward, 1989, p. 158). Robert E. Park, an immigrant himself, was one of the most significant scholars of this School, and he focused on society and the urban process. Sociologically, he argued that ethnic and racial groups would assimilate the mainstream American culture and society, believing that immigrants, regardless of their origin, would like to gain the freedom and benefits from being American citizens, by abandoning their original culture (Gingrich, 1998). The city, for Robert Park, constituted a unique and rich cultural area, a location for
complex and interconnected lives. He and other theorists of the Chicago School looked for spatial patterns of social characteristics connected to the natural world, as living organisms linked in a system of interdependent lives.

With the beginning of the First World War, emigration from Europe almost stopped, and a new migration period began, known as the ‘Period of limited migration’ (Massey, 2003). Also in the period between the two world wars, especially with the Great Depression of the 1930s, there was practically no migratory movement due to stagnation and a lack of political and economic confidence (Castles, 2000).

After the end of the Second World War, patterns of migration changed and Europe saw a vertiginous decrease in the number of emigrants and it began a new cycle, turning from being a ‘sending’ area to that of a hosting one (Massey, 2003). The new immigrants in Europe came to fill the labour gap, and came as ‘guestworkers’, so they were seen just as a temporary source of labour that would live in the European country for the period of their contract only, although, during these processes, migrants and refugees continued to move to the wealthier European countries, settling in and becoming minorities (Suárez-Orozco, 1991). The arrival of new immigrants in Europe led to a new social scenario, creating tensions and new challenges for the inclusion of the new groups, and the permanent flow of immigrants has accentuated the differences between rich and poor (Madanipour, 2004). However, it is important to remember that sizeable ethnic minority populations are a relatively recent phenomenon in European cities. Inevitably, the first immigrants tended to settle in those parts of the city where accommodation could be rented at an affordable price. The high cost of accommodation and the difficulty in finding regular and secure employment contributed to the difficulty of finding shelter. It was therefore the fate of poor recent immigrants to occupy the most marginal spaces of European cities. French ‘bidonvilles’ and later the ‘banlieues’ - in the French cities in 2006 - are examples of the many working class or low-income public housing projects mostly located on the outskirts of major European cities. In his studies of these ‘sensitive neighbourhoods’ in Paris, Shon (2010, p. 1603) concluded that the more disadvantaged the neighbourhood is, the harder it is for its residents to move into a less deprived area. As an example, he pointed to the fact that Africans faced more challenges when trying to move out and were more prone to moving into the least-advantaged neighbourhoods. The Portuguese ‘bairro da lata’ or ‘bairro clandestino’, or the Spanish ‘barraquismo’ are other examples of such immigrant settlements in these countries.

Despite a significant ethnic minority presence, the way the outskirts of European cities has developed is not homogeneous and the resulting mechanisms of segregation and
aggregation are often quite different in each city. Malheiros (2002) suggested that the settlement of immigrants and segregation patterns in Europe involves two different scenarios: southern European cities are characterised by low levels of ethnic and social segregation, while the northern European cities have higher levels of segregation. Malheiros (2002) pointed that the reasons for these differences are because immigration took place in different periods, a high percentage of illegal immigrants were involved in informal activities in the southern European countries and urban and housing policies diverged, resulting mainly in a lack of public housing in those countries. On the other hand, Amsterdam, as a northern city, has highly segregated patterns as the immigrant clusters in that city show. They do not constitute ghettos\(^6\), but a significant number of Surinamese, Moroccans and immigrants from non-industrialised countries live in specific areas of Amsterdam (Deurloo & Musterd, 1998). Although ethnic and residential segregation is common among immigrants from less developed countries, high levels of segregation exist among highly skilled immigrants from developed countries (White, 1998; Favell, 2003; Arapoglou, 2006). White (1998) studied the residential patterns of highly skilled labour migrants who stay for a short time in London. He found high levels of segregation among Japanese-born immigrants. These ‘circular immigrants’ do not integrate fully within the host society given the temporary character of their stay and they create their own schools, shops, etc. within their area of residency. Favell (2003) had similar findings with the example of Brussels, where he felt it was possible to identify “the emergence of distinctly European neighbourhoods within the multicultural mosaic typical of international cities” (Favell, 2003, p. 16). In Spain, retired immigrants from northern European countries settle in ‘urbanizaciones’ (residential estates) (King, Warnes, & Williams, 1998) developed for this type of migration\(^7\).

In Portugal, the Northern European, Eastern European and Brazilian immigrants are an example of low segregation in the peri-urban areas. The low segregation of the first group is mainly related to their economic capacity to live in “private condominiums with good accessibility and environment”. The other two nationalities opt for shared dwellings to reduce living costs (Malheiros & Vala, 2004, p. 1082) whereas the immigrants from the ex-colonies

\(^6\) In American literature, under the influence of the Chicago School, references exist to the concept of the ‘ghetto’, deeply embedded with the notion of the ‘Black Ghetto’, representing an idea of high levels of urban segregation and poverty (Fortuijn et al., 1998). In the European context, “few ghettos can be found”, mainly due to recent experiences of segregation (Fortuijn et al., 1998, p. 367). Segregation is seen as a failure to assimilate ethnic minorities and most societies aim to avoid ethnic residential division. Kaplan and Woodhouse (2004) described the main causes responsible for segregation as: discrimination; socioeconomic position; the role of preferences and the preferences of a dominant ethnic group; self segregation.

\(^7\) The movement of retired people from northern European countries to places in the southern part of Europe is described in the literature as International Retirement Migration (IRM).
tend to live in more segregated neighbourhoods. Historically, in the late 1960s and 1970s, the Lisbon metropolitan area initiated its suburbanisation process with the establishment of unofficial housing on the outskirts of Lisbon to accommodate not only the influx of inland migrants from rural areas, but also international migrants from ex-African colonies who built their houses in shanty towns on public land (Castela, 2007). These areas grew outside all the planning regulations (alignments, density, height, etc.) and without infrastructure, leading to poor environments and poor housing conditions (Malheiros & Vala, 2004). Cova da Moura neighbourhood is one example of this unplanned and illegal genesis. Two-thirds of the resident population in this area are foreigners (Mendes, 2008), mainly immigrants from Cape Verde and their descendants, who have, over time, settled in and developed their own unofficial quarters. The southern part of this neighbourhood is characterised by densely-built, informal houses, in very poor structural condition, on narrow streets, with a lack of green spaces, little infrastructure and few amenities (Horta, 2008; Mendes, 2008), and they represent, to a degree, a rupture in the urban fabric, being characteristically different from their surroundings. Apart from its morphological and physical problems, the neighbourhood is also known for its social problems. The majority of the working population has a low income and low skilled jobs: men tend to work in the construction sector, while women are employed as cleaners and in domestic jobs (Horta, 2008). Over recent years, the neighbourhood has also been characterised by the media as an unsafe and crime-ridden place, creating the image of a “black ghetto” with an unemployed and troublesome young population (Horta, 2008).

Other metropolitan areas in Lisbon have not developed in an ad-hoc way, like the district described above but have been filled with poor quality, public social housing. These neighbourhoods are often segregated spaces, packed with a low-income population and vulnerable groups. The monotony of construction, the similarity of the buildings, colour schemes, facades; the inadequacy of open spaces, the low quality of the social environment, the lack of facilities and amenities (Augusto, 2000) lead to a feeling of exclusion (Figure 3:1).

![Cova da Moura (illegal construction)](image1)

![social housing](image2)

Figure 3:1 - Deprived areas (source: author)
Although legalisation and urban rehabilitation programmes were implemented during the 1990s in order to clean up the slums, revitalise and improve the living and social conditions of some problematic neighbourhoods (Malheiros & Vala, 2004), the signs in the landscape of this unplanned suburbanisation and migratory movements are still visible.

3.6. Public spaces in Portugal – Lisbon

3.6.1. Historical perspective

Lisbon, also known as the city of seven hills, has experienced intense transformation of its urban fabric, partly without any planning resulting in the spatial fragmentation and poor quality of some of its public spaces and neighbourhoods (Silva, Serdoura, & Costa, 2001).

It is a city that has been occupied by different cultures. Historians have found traces of pre-historic occupation, followed by the Romans during the first century AD. Archaeologists have found the ruins of a theatre dedicated to Nero, public baths and temples and today it is still possible to point out the main Roman routes (França, 2005). After a period of consecutive invasions, the Arabs occupied Lisbon from 719AD until the eighth century, developing a narrow and organic urban fabric (França, 2005).

Lisbon became Portugal’s capital during the 13th century. Its geographic location over the River Tejo (Tagus) and near the Atlantic Ocean transformed it into an important harbour city, where commerce was the main economic activity with the exchange of rare and exotic products from other geographic areas. Different defence walls were built, as the medieval city expanded, and the spaces between the walls or near the main entrances were occupied. This was done in a random way, constructed according to need, leading to the urban fabric being dominated by narrow and dirty streets (Salgueiro, 1999). With the expansion of its maritime commerce, Lisbon expanded beyond the defence walls, but parallel to the river. The first planned urban intervention took place during the 16th century. A new area of the city was developed based on a rectangular grid that was influenced not only by other European countries such as France and Germany, but also by Spanish ideas of the so-called ‘Siglo D’Oro’. This new neighbourhood, called ‘Bairro Alto’, was described by a commentator as a place with: “beautiful streets, the “most praised”, with “grand” buildings and “very noble”, with “modern” and “roman facades”, in everything deserved by the “important noblemen” which live and walk there” (França, 2005, p. 15). Throughout the city and its surroundings, the nobility

---

68 Portugal was a dominion of Spain between 1580 and 1640.
69 The golden century.
built palaces with private gardens, and the clergy punctuated the city with churches (França, 2005).

The 18th century, however, was a turning point in Lisbon’s urban morphology. In 1755 an earthquake, followed by an intense fire, destroyed a large part of the city. Under the governance of Marques de Pombal, the downtown area – Baixa Pombalina - was rebuilt under a new layout inspired by baroque influences (see Figure 3:3). The intervention included a hierarchical grid and two major squares: one on the north side and the other close to the river. This last square - Praça do Terreiro do Paço or Praça do Comércio (see Figure 3:2) - faces the river, and is surrounded by noble buildings with a neoclassic facade, and with a statue of the king as a central piece. The north square is enclosed by different types of buildings. The main street, Rua Augusta, links the two squares in a single axis, allowing a visual continuum between them. Today, this intervention is considered extremely important. Due to the strong presence of shops, cafés, restaurants and exclusively pedestrian streets, it constitutes one of the most used public spaces in the city, gathering various types of user (different social classes and ethnic groups). However, according to Salgueiro (1999, p. 178), this intervention did not have much recognition, domestically or abroad, since the first users, already in the 19th century, were more influenced by Romantic ideals.

Figure 3:2 - Baixa Pombalina and Praça do Comércio. Source: French, 1978.

70 Marques de Pombal ordered several studies to rebuild the area. Since the layout was totally new, he defined rules in order to evaluate the price of the land and pay a fair price to the landlords, and he prohibited any kind of (re)construction in the area. The construction of each block was governed by very strict rules for the facade, besides the introduction of new features such as sewers and glass in the windows (Salgueiro, 1999).
Nine years after the earthquake (1764) following European trends, and as an attempt to revitalise the city, the first public garden was built – ‘Passeio Público’ (Public Walk). It was just a simple walled space with lines of trees, where the bourgeoisie could enjoy their leisure time (França, 2005). During the first quarter of the 19th century, the walls were removed and replaced by an iron fence, allowing for greater visibility, to see and be seen (Salgueiro, 1999). Nevertheless, according to França (2005), this was not a very successful place since “the middle class wasn’t used to entertain, especially the female elements, who were always at home” (França, 2005, p. 44).

The beginning of the 19th century in Lisbon was a disturbed period. The French invasions created political instability and the economy became weak, interrupting the development of the country and putting it behind the European development (Salgueiro, 1999). Unlike the impact of the Industrial Revolution in other European cities, the Portuguese cities did not expand their urban perimeter, and Lisbon’s most important expansion took place only in the last quarter of the 19th century (Salgueiro, 1999). In terms of public spaces, one of the city’s most important gardens, Jardim da Estrela, was opened in 1852. Inspired by the Romantic, English gardens, it had a curvilinear layout, trees, lakes and a Chinese pavilion. It
also had an iron fence (Braga, no date), which still remains, constituting one of the few fenced gardens in Lisbon. The garden is located in a grand and affluent area of the city and until the end of the 19th century, it was used by the aristocracy, who would conduct high society parties in it, along with charity events organised by high society women (Braga, no date). In 1863, another garden, also located in an aristocratic area of the city, was opened to the public - Principe Real (França, 2005). Influenced by the Parisian boulevards, a new polemic project to extend the city was initiated. It involved demolishing the old Passeio Público (see Figure 3:4), in order to make way for a large avenue/boulevard (Avenida da Liberdade Figure 3:5). Mirroring the French boulevard, this avenue had large, wide pavements, lines of trees and other ornamental green elements, finishing on the north side with a large garden (which was just finished during the 1940s). All over the city, other small green areas and gardens started to appear, making the most of common spaces (market places, small squares, empty spaces near the river bank) and also private gardens adjacent to the convents and palaces (Salgueiro, 1999).

Figure 3:5 - Av. da Liberdade. Source: Silva in Instituto Camões, 2006.

Although the new industries had a moderate impact they did attract more workers to Lisbon, and during the last quarter of the century, the city needed to expand, since its existing buildings could not support the new demand (Salgueiro, 1999). The city developed to the north, with relatively wide avenues, an organised layout, marked with luxury palaces belonging to bankers and important aristocratic families (França, 2005). However, not all the city’s expansion was done according to urban plans. Salgueiro (1999) points out that the working
class could not afford to live in these new neighbourhoods and that some traders invested in poor quality housing for this poor class, creating a typology of space called ‘vilas’.71

The early 20th century was a turbulent period, with the assassination of the king and the emergence of the republic. A few years later, in 1926, a military revolution established a dictatorship, which remained until 1974, and the country went through a deprived economic phase, with a high degree of illiteracy and a large number of poor rural populations. In Lisbon, urban development continued, mainly due to private investment. The city was expanding and trams were introduced in the beginning of the century as the main means of public transportation. The train also allowed easy access to Lisbon’s small surrounding villages along the coast. These villages became summer holiday destinations for Lisbon’s residents, and wealthy people built their second homes there (Salgueiro, 1999).

The dictatorship centralised all power and administration, restricting initiatives for the city’s development. In 1932, the state identified the need for a number of infrastructure projects, such as roads, airports, harbours, railways, which influenced the urban policy (Serdoura, 2006). In 1948, an urban plan was developed by Etienne de Gröer, a French urbanist, who transformed Lisbon into “a monumental imperial capital” (Castela, 2007, p. 6). During the 1940s, the state organised an exhibition to celebrate the Portuguese empire. This exhibition took place in Belém, an area of the city close to the river and well-known due to its importance during the discovery period. Different buildings were built, along with monuments, gardens and a formal square, converting the space into a “symbol of the empire and a monumental area of the city” (Salgueiro, 1999, p. 254). Today, Belém is one of the most visited places in Lisbon, not only by tourists but also by Lisbon’s inhabitants, who go there for a walk or simply to relax in the gardens.72 During the 1940s, another important public space was also created. Parque Florestal de Monsanto, approximately 900 ha, of urban forest - located on the city’s western edge - was considered the ‘green lung’ of Lisbon because of its natural elements, size and scale. As a consequence of extending this enormous urban forest, the design included several smaller green areas inside the forest, for different uses (sports, barbeques, picnic, etc.).

Compared to the rest of Europe, the modern movement found late expression in Lisbon’s urban development. The break with traditional design and the use of the street occurred for the first time in the 1950s, with the construction of modern neighbourhoods,

71 This type of housing consisted of a block of poor quality apartments with a common open area in the middle (connected to the street) (Salgueiro, 1999) where the inhabitants could gather.
72 Information gathered from the focus groups.
characterised by tall buildings raised above the floor, supported by pillars, with considerable green areas around them, and following land zoning, according to its functions (Salgueiro, 2002).

Just after the Second World War, suburbanisation became widespread (Salgueiro, 2002). The extremely poor conditions in rural areas led to two types of emigration: international emigration\(^{73}\) and a strong wave of internal migration to the main cities, where industries were located. With the rural exodus, demographic pressures increased, leading to speculative use of land (Salgueiro, 1999). During the 1960s, the inland immigrants settled on the outskirts of the city where the land was cheaper, but there were fewer if any services (water, sewerage, electricity)\(^{74}\) (Castela, 2007). Suburbanisation continued during the 1970s but then it was partly due to international migration. Immigrants from ex-African colonies built their houses in shantytowns on public land, leading to poor environments and poor housing conditions (Castela, 2007).

The city’s development changed after the dictatorship ended in 1974 and public space started to achieve its true meaning (Fortuna, 2005). The social panorama changed also and Portugal’s predominantly rural society became more urban.

The 1980s were marked by the consolidation of the democratic state, economic development and the creation of infrastructures (Fortuna, 2005). During these years, Lisbon continue to expand “without a sustainable planning logic”, leading to “the desertification of the city’s centre” (Serdoura, 2006, p. 178).

The 1990s were seen as new era in the cities’ development, not only in Lisbon but also in other Portuguese cities, promoting urban renewal and unity, without eliminating social, economic, morphological and environmental diversities (Serdoura, 2006). In Lisbon, one of the most symbolic regeneration projects was the World Exposition, EXPO’98, which renewed the riverfront in the eastern part of the capital. Another important project was the revitalisation of the downtown area – Baixa – which included the urban design of different squares. However, this area is still under regeneration, since many of the buildings are empty or rented by an elderly population who pay low rents, making it difficult for landlords to renovate their buildings. Over the last years, the municipality has revitalised some of the city’s public spaces such as five of its main squares: the Praça do Comércio, Praça do Rossio, Praça da Figueira, Praça de Comércio, and Praça das Flores.

\(^{73}\) Most of the emigrants left the country through illegal networks, since the country was under the dictatorship.

\(^{74}\) These types of neighbourhoods were known as the ‘bairros clandestinos’, illegal/clandestine neighbourhoods, similar to shantytowns.
Largo de Camões and Praça do Municipio, restoring, in some cases, their pedestrian function, and/or creating underground parking (Balsas, 2007).

The EXPO’98 intervention (also known as ‘Parque das Nações’) was built not only for the world exhibition, but also as part of a renewal of the urban environment. The planners aimed to create an ideal city with green spaces, residential areas, services and infrastructures, promoting a healthy and well-balanced lifestyle (Castel-Branco, 1998). With 110ha of green spaces, 5 km of riverfront and modern design, this intervention was an immense success.

1 – Monsanto (urban forest); 2 – Belém’s garden; 3 – Waterfront; 4 – Bairro Alto (neighbourhood); 5 – Downtown neighbourhoods (Baixa/Chiado); 6 – Parque Eduardo VI (park); 7 – Colombo (shopping centre); 8 – Parque das Nações/Expo (park); 9 – Costa’s Beach

Figure 3:6 – Lisbon’s main (public) spaces.
1 – Guincho’s Beach; 2 – Linhas’ Beach; 3 Costa’s Beach; 4 – Natural Park; 5 – Monsanto (urban forest); 6 – Parque das Nações/Expo; 7 – Lisbon’s city centre; 8 – peri urban/rural area.

CV – schematic representation of the major Cape Verdean neighbourhoods (adapted from: Fonseca, 2003); As described, previously, Brazilians and Ukrainians immigrants do not present such a high level of segregation.

Figure 3.7 – Lisbon’s greater area and location of major Cape Verdean neighbourhoods.
3.6.2. The current situation in Lisbon

In the Portuguese context, the loss of public space is not a central issue, and little has been written about it. Graça (2006), a Portuguese architect, argued that public spaces are no longer seen as meeting and socialising spaces. The square and the park have lost their social importance and are now places for occasional socialisation. The same is true of the street, which has become just a corridor without providing an environment for socialisation.

There are also signs of privatisation, such as gated communities, public and private partnerships for the construction of green areas, theme parks and shopping centres (Graça, 2007). The limits between private and public space have begun to be defused since: “playful commercial equipments substitute progressively urban public spaces, where private mechanisms are introduced to produce public spaces and collective uses of private spaces” (Graça, 2006, p. 9). Shopping centres, located on the urban periphery, with different space typologies, play an important role in citizens’ leisure time. On average, each European citizen visits a shopping centre 17 times a year, spending an average of 1.5 hours on each visit, and only 25% of the time looking for a specific product (Cushman & Wakefield, Healey & Baker, 2004, cited by Graça, 2006, p.7). In Portugal, 63.9% of the citizens visit shopping centres during their leisure time. However, this figure increases to 87.9% when the visitors are between 18 and 24 years old (Marktest, Setembro 2004, cited in Graça, 2006, p.7).

Over the past two decades, the Lisbon metropolitan area has witnessed inner-city desertification (some neighbourhoods lost 40% of their population between the 1991 and 2001 Census) compensated by an outer-city sprawl. The phenomenon of gentrification is also present in the city centre. Authors such as Barata Salgueiro (1997), Mendes (2006), Xerez (2006) have questioned the impact of such gentrification on the city. According to Mendes (2006, p.77), this phenomenon has enclaves with particular cultural and social practices which have led to a new complex social fabric which is “difficult to decode”. In Lisbon, according to Barata Salgueiro (n/a), gated communities still have a scattered pattern. These communities are mainly in “prestigious neighbourhoods that are either stable owing to the value of their charming buildings and environment, and the residents’ status, or the pleasant panoramas overlooking the Tagus River in Lisbon” (Barata Salgueiro, n/a, p. 4). Nevertheless, and following the same line of thought as Lees (2008), mentioned above, the author also emphasises the social segregation that is created by noting that the new residents in these communities do not interact with their neighbours living in the vicinity outside the condominium.
Both shopping centres and gated communities present some common features such as: a pleasant environment, safety, the avoidance of beggars and poverty. The private and artificial spaces are different from the outside world, and possibly, the social life in them is also different from that which occurs in public spaces.

3.7. Summary

This chapter reviewed the meaning of public spaces, the various definitions and how this term is used in this research. Throughout history, public open spaces have played an important role in cities, being places for commercial transactions, religious celebrations, meeting places or for celebrations of power by the aristocracy, but access to those spaces was a just privilege for a few. During the seventieth and eightieth centuries this tendency started to change and public open spaces became, gradually, places which could be used by all members of society. The impact of the Industrial Revolution in cities was felt at various levels and cities went through various transformations and in response to these changes, new public spaces emerged, such as the first public parks. The 20th century was characterised by an increase in access for people to means of transport, allowing built environments to spread outside the cities’ core and new private spaces, such as shopping centres proliferated in the cities, along with gated communities. With the increase in the number of private spaces in cities and with new technologies, the loss of public spaces is now being questioned. Lisbon’s public spaces also followed European tendencies and influences throughout the time. In the 20th century, during the dictatorship period, monuments were built to celebrate Lisbon’s historic past, including green spaces but it was during the 1990s that the city initiated and implemented major regeneration and rehabilitation projects, which involved revitalising and building new public spaces.

When focusing on migration, either internally or externally, this phenomenon has also affected cities, especially with the settlement of immigrants in the urban fabric, raising concerns about segregation. American history reveals the role of public open spaces, with Central Park as a prime example of a space that can improve the quality of life for those living in poor and crowded areas, including immigrants. However, whether these spaces were truly a point for socialisation is still debated by authors.

One question has arisen at the end of this chapter: what is known, today, about the use of public spaces by immigrants? The next chapter explores the theoretical framework which helps to structure this research to unveil the relations between immigrants and public open spaces, and it reviews, also, the studies which have addressed this question.
Chapter 4: Theoretical Framework

4.1. Introduction

The previous two chapters explored migration to and public spaces in Lisbon, Portugal. Chapter 2 reviewed theories on migration, the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors that, generally, lead to migration, the different policies on receiving immigrants, and how Portugal, has been dealing with the phenomenon of being a host country over the last four decades. Chapter 3, on the other hand, investigated notion and definitions, the evolution of different public spaces, and reviewed the various challenges these spaces are now undergoing, with the research focus on Lisbon. This chapter aims to bring together, through the theoretical framework, these two realms of immigrants and public open spaces, as previously described, focusing on the dynamic relation between people and place (Figure 4:1).

The relationship between people and the environment is complex; it has many facets which overlap and interconnect, when, as Bell (2009) pointed out, the person and the environment are conceptualised in an integrated sense: “(...) people do not tend to think of the physical environment as a separate entity from the social or economic environment, nor separate from the actions they take or the perceptions they hold” (Bell, 2009, p. 23). Understanding how this relationship develops, especially what individuals' responses are to their surrounding environment, has been looked at by researchers in the field of environmental physiology. Within this field, the seminal work of David Canter’s (1977) ‘theory of place’ is particularly relevant to understand how people relate to place, since it allows unfolding this relation into different aspects.
This chapter examines, therefore, Canter’s (1977) ‘theory of place’ and each element of his model – the physical characteristics, activities, perceptions – is then investigated by reviewing the interdisciplinary literature.

4.2. Theory of Place

In his book *The physiology of place* Canter (1977, p. 158) posed the question: “What are the major constituents which amalgamate to form place?” According to the author: “(...) we have not fully identified the place until we know what behaviour is associated with, or is anticipated to be housed in it, what the physical parameters of the setting are, and the descriptions or conceptions, which people hold of that behaviour in that physical environment” (1977, p. 159). Therefore, the concept of ‘place’ is made up of the interaction of three components: 1) ‘conceptions’, which refers to the perceptions and values that individuals hold; 2) the ‘activities’ that people may engage in; and 3) the ‘physical attributes’ of the environment (e.g. size, shape, colour, textures and forms).

![Figure 4:2- Canter’s (1977, p.158) ‘Theory of place’ model](image)

Canter (1996) acknowledged some conceptual similarities between his theory and the earlier work of Roger Barker (1968), who promoted the concept of the ‘behaviour setting’\(^\text{75}\). However, he noted that his notion of ‘place’ differed from Barker’s by “(...) including much more directly the understanding and expectations that participants have of the place in which they find themselves, together with the qualities that the physical shape and perceptual properties of that location have.” (Canter, 1996, p. 112).

Canter (1997) also contrasted his definition of ‘place’ with the work of other authors such as Tuan (1974) and Relph (1976) (see Chapter 3), who attributed a positive quality to a

\(^{75}\) “A behaviour setting is an ecological unit which connects a physical environment and behaviour in a particular situation” (Fu, 2008, p.32).
location. Canter believed that by attributing a "special quality to a location", it could create a difficulty in the interpretation of 'place', since the "(...) personal value judgements of the properties of certain physical phenomena are being treated as if they were technical definitions for the existence of common experiences." (Canter, 1997, p. 117). On the other hand, Canter advocated that the term 'place' should be used as a 'neutral, technical term' in order "to make available a unit of study that encapsulates the mixture of processes that create our experience of our sociophysical surroundings" (Canter, 1997, p. 118).

Another value of this model is that it integrates three elements which are often seen and studied independently, exposing the importance of multiple attributes in the experience of a place. By examining the physical attributes of the environment, in the case of this research, the public open spaces in Lisbon, the interactions with other components such as the activities in which users may engage, and their perceptions of the places can also be investigated. The presence of 'conceptions' in the model is also particularly relevant, since this research aims to uncover the cultural values of the different users. Moreover, Canter has also emphasised the idea that place experience is a combination of "individual, social and cultural processes" (Canter, 1997, p. 10).

In the field of landscape architecture, the work of Ward Thompson et al. (2004) and Bell (2009) are examples of the application of this model in research. Ward Thompson used the model to explore the role of local woodlands, while Bell investigated the perception of Latvian landscape. In both studies, it is possible to see how the research and results are centred in the three main attributes of Canter's (1977) model.

At a practical level, this model is particularly relevant to the disciplines of planning and design (including landscape architecture), since, as pointed out by Canter: "Designers are, officially, the modifiers and creators of physical form. But from the model we can see that their task is to manipulate the physical attributes in such a way as to draw upon, or create, the appropriate context for specifiable activities and conceptions." (1977, p. 163). More recently Ward Thompson (2004) has also reinforced this idea, acknowledging, though, that changing people's perceptions might be more challenging than changing the physical attributes and influencing activities. However, according to the above authors, aspects such as community participation and information can support this component.

4.3. Activities and uses

This section aims to explore the three elements of Canter's (1977) 'theory of place' from other theoretical perspectives, starting with 'activities'.
As described in Canter’s (1977) model, activities are one of the components of place. The classic work of White (1980, p. 14), refers in detail to how so many different activities can take place in a plaza: “on a good day, there would be a hundred and fifty people sitting, sunbathing, picnicking, and shmoozing – idly gossiping, talking ‘nothing talk’.”

Then Gehl (1987, p. 11) identified three types of activities that occur in outdoor spaces:

- **necessary activities**: those activities that need to take place, independent of the quality of the surrounding physical environment. Going to work, to school, taking the bus are examples of these almost compulsory activities, and many of these activities are related to walking;
- **optional activities**: these activities are dependent on other conditions, such as the weather, and what the outdoor physical environment can offer. Activities such as taking a walk to get fresh air, sitting, reading outdoors and sunbathing are not obligatory.
- **social activities**: these occur when people meet in a particular place (children playing, meeting, having conversations, having a picnic).

According to Gehl, when places have a ‘high quality’ (1987, p. 13), the more optional activities can occur and the duration of necessary activities also increases. Social activities reflect the quality and length of the other types of activities.

While researching minority groups, the concept of activities can also redirect us to another major research topic: leisure recreation in outdoor spaces among ethnic minorities. To explore and explain cultural differences, a number of theories on cultural differences in outdoor recreation have emerged over the past decades. According to Sasidharan et al. (2005), the majority of studies in this field are based on two major theories: ‘ethnicity theory’ and ‘marginality theory’:

- **Ethnicity theory**: this theory suggests that the different patterns of outdoor activities among ethnic groups are based on norms and value systems, and social organisation, which can be different from the majority of the population. Washburne (1978) compared the use of wild-land areas by black and white Californian urban residents, revealing that black users were less likely to participate in undeveloped areas than white people, even when socioeconomic factors were invariable.
Marginality theory: this theory proposes that variations in outdoor recreation participation are influenced by limited access to socioeconomic wealth, which is caused by discrimination and people’s lower social position within the society. According to Hung (2003, p. 10), matters such as lack of unrestricted funds and transport were some of the socioeconomic barriers which prevented access to and the use of outdoor spaces for recreation.

More recently, other theories have been incorporated into the debate about variations in recreation patterns among different user groups include:

- Socioeconomic demographic theory: this theory explores the role of class differences. Floyd et al. (1994) suggested that recreation patterns are not only influenced by race but also by social class. In their study, variations were found among women who considered themselves as poor and working class. Juniu (2000), in the context of her study, concluded that social class was more important than ethnicity in influencing uptake of outdoor recreation.

- Acculturation and assimilation theory: this theory suggests that increased levels of acculturation and assimilation among ethnic minorities will likely influence their recreation patterns, which will be closer to the mainstream population. The level of acculturation, the ancestral group, and the generation’s status are likely to explain the differences in intra-ethnic recreation experiences (Carr & Williams, 1993). In their study of two forests in southern California, Carr and Williams (1993) found that in places with an equal number of White and Hispanic users, it had the highest proportion of immigrants of Hispanic descent, and the lowest proportion of second-generation individuals as well as the lowest acculturation levels. Conversely, in places where White users were in the majority, the number of Hispanic immigrants was lower, but the proportion of second-generation users was higher, and it had the highest acculturation levels.

Leisure and recreation theories are relevant to this research, however, they should be analysed and interpreted with caution, since they have been tested mainly with certain ethnic groups (African American, Hispanics and Whites) and only with first-generation immigrants.

---

76 See Chapter 2 for definitions of acculturation and assimilation
As pointed out by Stodolska (2000, p. 40), the number of studies that have focused on recent immigrants is ‘still scarce’, and her research has focused on bridging this gap. By looking at the changes immigration has on immigrants’ leisure activities in the host country, Stodolska (2000, p. 61) suggested a simultaneous addition and elimination of leisure opportunities generated by the difference in the environments between two countries. Immigrants were likely to keep some of their previous activities to give them a sense of continuity and “psychological comfort”, she argued.

Stodolska and Jackson (1998) have also investigated the reasons for low levels of participation. The authors proposed that cultural and language barriers and the lack of access to information are likely to impede immigrants’ outdoor recreation activity. Askins (2004) has also reported similar finding in her doctoral research in relation to ethnic minorities. The author noted that users were inhibited about making visits to and enjoying recreation in the countryside due to a lack of public transport, feelings of alienation and lack of confidence. Low et al. (2005, p. 172) reinforced the idea that new ethnic groups can feel excluded due to their lack of understanding of cultural barriers, such as: unfamiliarity with the language, non-verbal architectural cues, and signs of cultural representation. As noted by Ward Thompson (2002, p. 60): “Different social and cultural groups have different perceptions of what is acceptable or safe behaviour”, therefore, cultural barriers and cultural shocks can result in breaking the norms of recreation, as pointed out by Rishbeth (2004). Juniu (2000) also showed that the lack of time and work constraints were barriers to immigrants’ engagement in leisure activities.

Studies have focused too on the activities in and use patterns of outdoor spaces. In her study, Loukaitou-Sideres (1995) observed that White users preferred the aesthetic qualities of spaces, as opposed to Hispanic and African-American users, who tended to emphasise the social opportunities that parks provided. Hispanics were more likely to be with family members, have picnics, family gatherings and celebrations, and were interested in changing and adding things to the park in order to accommodate their needs. African-Americans would go with peers and the sports fields were popular with male users. Caucasians were more likely to go alone, and do self-orientated activities, with the exception of the elderly, who would play games. Finally, Asian groups engaged in physical activities such as Tai-Chi, many would socialise, and mothers with children would use the play areas. Reinforcing these findings, Low et al. (2005, p. 52) also suggested that the notion of the “park as a place of opportunity to do things” was higher among Blacks and Hispanics, in comparison with White users. Picnicking was also more common among the former ethnic groups, rather than the latter. Lanfer and Taylor (2004), in their research of Cochituate State Park, observed
that Latinos tended to concentrate along the water’s edge; Muslim people would go to the park sometimes in groups or alone; Russians tended to gather in a wooded area and use the park all winter; while Asians preferred to stay in places where they could look over the plain. Carr and Williams (1993) recognised that cultural differences could influence patterns of recreation, however, their study focused on ethnic/racial differences, which included not only migrants, but those who had been born in the country, and therefore who were citizens. In his analysis of the use of Chicago’s largest park, Lincoln Park, Gobster (2002) observed patterns of use, preferences, and perceptions of it by different ethnic/racial groups. Despite users’ race or ethnicity, walking, swimming or enjoying the sun at the beaches, picnicking and barbecuing, sitting and relaxing, and bicycling were common activities among all users. Significant differences were found among Latinos who would have barbecues more frequently; while social activities, such as talking and socialising, were greater among Black users.

In the UK, studies have suggested that Asian groups prefer to use parks in family groups (Burgess, Harrison, & Limb, 1988). In Germany, Jay and Schraml (2009) focused their research on the perception and preferences of urban woodlands by migrant groups from Turkey, the Balkans and Russia-Germany. Their findings suggested differences between Turkish participants and the other two groups but pointed to activities common to all three groups, such as walking, jogging and barbecuing. Hiking and picking fruit and/or mushrooms appeared to be popular activities among the Russian-German and Balkan immigrants. In the Netherlands, Peters et al. (2010) in their study of uses and attachment to urban parks by non-Western migrants (Turkey, Morocco, Suriname, the Dutch Antilles or Aruba) and the native population, also found similar leisure activity patterns, such as walking, cycling, having a barbecue or picnic or meeting other people. The latter activity included watching other people, simply hanging around, or more active forms such as engaging with relatives and friends. Nevertheless, ‘having a picnic or a barbecue’ and ‘meeting other people’ were more relevant for immigrants than the native population, whose members preferred to go cycling and walking.
4.4. Physical Attributes\textsuperscript{77}

Physical characteristics, such as: shape, form, colours, patterns, materials, natural elements, plants, trees, benches and fountains are all constituents of place, and determine its appearance. Environmental studies have explored people’s preferences regarding the environment. The presence of water, trees and woody vegetation in parks seem to have a positive impact on a park’s high scenic quality (Schroeder & Anderson, 1984). Examples of paths bordered by trees and shrubs, allowing wide views and water features (Giles-Corti et al., 2005), are described as elements that are preferred by individuals, which can promote active use of public open space, and seasonal variation of trees’ colour, especially in autumn, can also contribute to enjoyment of outdoor physical activities (Krenichyn, 2006). Trees and greenery were also considered by most people to be aesthetically pleasant and psychologically important in a study by Kaplan and Kaplan (1989).

With reference to the role of culture, some research has been conducted which has tried to understand the preferences and perceptions of different cultural groups regarding landscape. Zube and Pitt (1981) found cultural differences between Yugoslavians, West Indians and Americans regarding their perception of landscape which included man-made structures, versus natural landscape. Most of the Yugoslavians chose pictures of the landscape without man-made structures; on the other hand, some of the city-centre African American residents chose pronounced man-made structures in the landscape. Newell (1997) tried to find out if people from different cultures shared preferences for certain aspects of the environment. In her study, the Irish group was more likely to select pastoral environments; while the American participants were more likely to select family home and surroundings; and participants from Senegal preferred the oceans/beaches and built environments (such as theatres and sports centres).

In the UK, cultural differences have also been assessed. Rishbeth (2001, p. 361) pointed out how ‘garishly lit fountains’, which are popular in parks frequented by Pakistani people, or even electronic music broadcast in streets and public gardens used by Chinese people, would not suit white British people. The same author (2004) also found that the value of “wild” was gauged differently by Asian/Africans in comparison with white British users. The former groups were more likely to appreciate the wildness, compared with the British users.

\textsuperscript{77} Gibson (Gibson, 1979) proposed the theory of Affordances, by suggesting that the physical attributes of a place could afford (i.e., enable/support) different types of activities. This research will not explore this theory since it does not focus solely on an analysis of the activities with which people engage, and the methods chosen for all the analysis might not be the appropriate one to study this theory.
Few studies have focused on an analysis of waterscape preferences. The work of Herzog (1985) showed a higher preference for mountain waterscapes. The category, ‘large bodies of water’ scored high preference values for spaciousness and texture, and lower values in terms of complexity and mystery. In a cross-cultural study, Yang and Brown (1992) found that Korean people preferred a Western landscape style more, in comparison with their own Korean landscape style, while the Korean landscape style was appreciated more by Western tourists. However, research also seems to point in the opposite direction, and likewise, Yand and Kaplan’s (1990) studies have suggested that a preference for waterscapes was common among different cultural groups. Lake and ponds; beaches; peacefulness, friendly atmosphere; people and varied activities; and the park’s proximity to the lake were among the common preferred characteristics of Lincoln’s Park, Chicago (2002). Natural features were also highly regarded, however, Gobster found variations among the groups: the park’s scenic beauty was most appreciated by Asians; while Latinos preferred the cool refreshing ‘lake effect’; White users appreciated the trees and other vegetation; while Black users preferred the facilities, maintenance, park activities and sports.

4.5. Conceptions and emotions in relation to spaces:

4.5.1. Emotions: Place Attachment

There is a body of research which has explored people’s emotional relationships with space and many similar terms have been used to describe these relations: ‘Sense of place’, ‘place attachment’ and ‘place identity’. These terms have been broadly defined and the boundaries between the concepts are sometimes blurred. In fact, some authors (Williams et al., 1992) have suggested that ‘sense of place’ is one of the components of ‘place attachment’, while Hay (1998) suggested the opposite.

Human-geographers in the 1970s, such as Tuan (1974) and Relph (1976), dedicated their research to finding the meaning of place in peoples’ lives and the sentimental bonds they created with places, and they developed the concept of a ‘sense of place’. Tuan suggested the concept of ‘Topophilia’, defined as the “…affective bond between people and place…” (1974, p.4).

A similar notion is the concept of ‘place attachment’, developed by Altman and Low (1992). This concept refers to a positive bond between people and the environment. According to the authors, “…place attachment may contribute to the formation, maintenance, and preservation of the identity of a person, group, or culture. And, it may also be that place attachment plays a role in fostering individual, group, and cultural self-esteem, self-worth, and
self-pride” (Altman & Low, 1992, p. 10). Williams and Vaske (2003, p. 381) have identified in the literature two dimensions of place attachment: place dependence and place identity. According to their study, the two dimensions are moderately correlated, but also constitute two separate dimensions of a single concept (place attachment). ‘Place dependence’ can be defined as the physical attributes of a space which offer the opportunity to develop or engage with certain activities. ‘Place identity’, on the other hand, is related to emotional attachment, focusing on the symbolic importance of a place. This aspect is often associated with what Prokansky et al. (1983) have defined as ‘place-identity’\(^78\) and ‘self-esteem’ (Korpela, 1989)\(^79\).

According to Hidalgo and Hernández (2001), the main characteristic of ‘place attachment’ is the affective positive bond that exists between an individual and a place; more specifically, there is a strong tendency for the subject to maintain closeness to such a place. Giuliani et al. (2003) have classified three different processes that may lead to feelings of attachment between people and places, which may overlap and occur to form attachment to one single place or different ones. The first process describes attachment as a process of positive evaluation of the place’s qualities which allows a person to fulfil his/her needs, and it is more a cognitive than an affective process; the second process is attachment as based on the meaning that a place has in relation to someone’s identity; the third describes attachment as a bond which is related to long residence and familiarity (Giuliani, Ferrara, & Barabotti, 2003).

Transposing the notion of ‘place attachment’ and emotions with regard to place and to the life of immigrants in the host country, raises a question: what happens when s/he faces a new environment, possibly completely different from the one they were brought up in, where places and elements do not trigger any memories or emotions? Aziz (2001) said that although people develop feelings and affection for certain places, movement and changes in the modern world, such as tourism and migration, make people's place attachment always likely to be in a state of flux. Nevertheless, the notion of being emotionally connected to a different place when movement takes place has not been commonly agreed. In the social sciences, mobility and attachment have been regarded as “mutually exclusive phenomena” (Gustafson,

\(^78\) Proshansky et al. (1983) defined the concept of ‘Place-identity’ as “…a sub-structure of self-identity of a person…” (Proshansky et al., 1983, p.59), where the significance of the physical places is attributed and related to personal cognitions. On their work about the role of place and identity process, Twigger-Ross and Uzzel (1996) suggested that places were used in the preservation and continuity of self (Twigger-Ross & Uzzel, 1996).

\(^79\) Korpela (Korpela, 1989, p.245) considered that the emotional links with places are the basis for place-identity and suggested that places are a means “of regulating the pleasure/pain balance and one's self-esteem.”
Taking into account a world of movement, changes and generalisations about cultures, Relph and Tuan have developed arguments about the negative effects of ‘placelessness’. According to Relph (1976) ‘placelessness’ is described as a person finding a lack of meaning in the environment and the loss of recognition of significance in places, which can result in the loss of roots and symbols and consequently, it can generate a world without significance. Following the same line of thought regarding world changes, Tuan considered that the concept of time does not match the concept of place, since, in his perspective, place is seen as a static concept (a pause) and time as the opposite, making it difficult to achieve a sense of place in the changing world (Tuan, 1979). The idea of ‘insideness/outsideness’ presented by Relph (1976) is particularly important in the context of migration and sense of place. ‘Existential insideness’ occurs when a place is experienced in an involuntary way, without an intentional self-conscious reflection and characterises belonging to a place (e.g. such as being at ‘home’) (Relph, 1976), while ‘existential outsideness’ is expressed by a feeling of ‘alienation’ from places and people, with the incapacity to relate to the meaning of the place.

Studies focusing on immigrants and place attachment are still rare. Gustafson (2001b), in his study of the phenomenon of international retirement migration patterns of Swedish people to Spain, concluded that participants had multiple attachments, feeling ‘at home’ in Spain and Sweden. Churchman and Mitrani (1997) studied the relationship between a group of immigrants from the former Soviet states living in Israel and the new physical environment. They found that their preference for the new characteristics was associated with attachment to the new, and the preference for the old resulted in a lack of attachment to the new environment. One example was the lack of attachment to parks, since there were more parks and trees in cities of the former Soviet states. Some migrants to Israel felt that parks there were less ‘natural’ – parks were perceived as being more designed (Churchman & Mitrani, 1997, p.75) . They also suggested that people who had a positive reason to immigrate to Israel expressed less nostalgia for their home country and had a stronger attachment to the new place.

Dines et al. (2006), in their study of public spaces in east London, referred to how length of residence could influence attachment to specific places, since, according to the authors, emotional bonds were consolidated over the years. Other aspects that contributed to place attachment included: familiarity with it; social networks; and the distinctive aspects of a
place, the features that make it unique which could also contribute to the positive or negative bonds users feel with a space.

4.5.2. Childhood memories

Attachment to place starts in childhood (Chawla, 1992). According to Cooper Marcus (1992, p. 89): "We hold onto childhood memories of certain places as a kind of psychic anchor, reminding us of where we came from, of what we once were, of how the environment nurtured us when family dynamics were strained."

The importance of childhood memories to the experience of outdoor spaces as adults was highlighted by Ward Thompson (Ward Thompson, 2004; Ward Thompson, Aspinall, & Montarzino, 2008), who suggested that those who did not visit woodlands frequently in childhood were less likely to visit them as adults. Rishbeth (2004) also corroborated the significance of childhood, suggesting that preferences and patterns of use of open spaces as adults were influenced by experiences at an early age. The author addressed the topic of migration by exploring childhood memories of Asian women migrants in the UK. The participants revealed multi-sensory experiences of green spaces as children, but very low participation in the use of green space in the UK.

Low et al. (2005), in their analysis of Prospect Park, also demonstrated the value of childhood memories, showing that they were equally important for those who had visited the park in their childhood, as well as for those who had grown up in another place but had experienced the contact with green spaces (including immigrants).

4.5.3. Homeland memories

Other elements in the landscape can also trigger memories, not only from the users' childhood, but from other moments in their life in the host country. In her study of the migration routes of British Asians, Tolia-Kelly found that “mobility seems to enhance the need for familiar landscapes, sometimes even particular plants and trees” (2004, p. 287), stressing the role of gardening and plants in contributing to promoting users' memories of familiar landscapes and to making the host landscapes more meaningful.

Rishbeth (2001) also discussed the importance of symbolic references in the landscape, either through planting or built features which could work for migrants as allusions to their past. However, according to Rishbeth, the use of icons and symbols to trigger
emotional responses could be a weakness as well as a strength. By including those symbols which had a meaning for some users, this would exclude those who felt the icons and symbols had no particular meaning for them.

In their study of refugees in the UK, Rishbeth and Finney (2006) highlighted that memories can create links between users’ two lives (before and after migration).

4.5.4. Perceptions of Safety

Humpel et al. (2002) reported that perceptions of safety have a great influence on whether people visit parks. Perceived safety can be described as: how safe people feel about their green spaces and neighbourhoods in relation to crime.

Some studies have suggested that green space may enhance feelings of social safety in a neighbourhood (Kuo & Sullivan, 2001). Schroeder and Anderson (1984) have also found that perceived safety in urban green spaces is related to park features and layout. The authors of these studies established that some features that were perceived as enhancing the scenic quality (such as vegetation), were at the same time negatively influencing perceived safety. However, Kuo and Sullivan (2001) reported that the greener the surroundings of a building, the lower the rates of reported crime. According to Semenzato et al. (2011), both perceived and actual safety can be improved by keeping the spaces lively throughout the day and night.

In the UK, Woolley and Amin (1999) concluded that safety is a barrier to making visits to public parks. Ravenscroft and Markwell (2000) revealed that black youths had concerns regarding their personal safety in public parks. More recently, Rishbeth and Finney (2006) suggested that safety in wooded areas or places with few visitors was a concern for refugees. However, the authors suggested that the same concerns were likely to be similar in non-refugee populations. Ward Thompson et al. (2009) found that ethnicity was more likely to influence safety concerns where Bangladeshi and Pakistani respondents reported feeling least safe in comparison to other ethnic groups. Jay and Schraml (2009) described how users’ fears about personal safety and problems with dogs may discourage immigrants’ visits to urban woodlands.

80 The term ‘actual safety’ is used in opposition to the fear of crime – perceived.
4.6. Defining the research sub-questions

The literature reviewed in this chapter, along with the review in the previous two chapters, gave insight into the theory behind user engagement with the environment by minority groups, in particular immigrants. The compilation and assessment of the relevant literature, facilitated to focus and narrow the initial hypothesis and general research question described in Chapter 1, can now be divided into seven research sub-questions which are as follows:

1) What are immigrants’ leisure and recreational patterns?
   - The research tries to comprehend immigrants’ recreational patterns (the individual’s activities during his/her leisure time) that may take place in either formal or informal settings. The aim is not only to understand what recreational activities are done outdoors but what types of recreation are preferred which may overcome his/her need (or at times, disinclination) to go outdoors;

2) What are immigrants’ preferences in relation to public open spaces?
   - The study examines immigrants’ preferences, by trying to understand what physical attributes of the spaces they prefer, what activities are most appreciated and what is their perception of public open spaces;

3) How do immigrants use public open spaces?
   - The research aims to uncover whether immigrants use public open spaces or not. If so, with whom do they go? How often? What are the most visited public open spaces? What is their favourite place?

4) What barriers and conflicts do immigrants find which can deter them from using public open spaces?
   - The study undertakes research into possible less positive experiences, perceptions of different behaviours, safety, and other barriers.

5) What is the role of memories?
   - This examines immigrants’ past experience and memories related to their country of origin.

6) Do immigrants feel attached to the new places?
This focuses on the notion of ‘place attachment’ by trying to understand to what degree immigrants feel emotionally bonded to the new places.

7) **How do immigrants, from different backgrounds and with different life experiences, respond to the new spaces?**

- The study compares cultural differences between the three different communities but also focuses on other demographic variables, and assesses to what degree their reason for migrating and their experience as immigrants influences their use of public open spaces.

### 4.7. Summary

The main theoretical framework of this research is underpinned by David Canter’s ‘Theory of Place’ in order to allow a discussion of immigrants’ relationship with public open spaces in the host country, Portugal. The activities undertaken in the environment may be compulsory or optional, and social activities are often a product of the two.

Different theories were discussed which explained ethnic minorities’ leisure and recreation patterns, including the role of culture, identity, class, socioeconomic problems, acculturation and assimilation, but little is still known about immigrants’ leisure once they are in a new country. Although few studies have been conducted in relation to immigrants, people’s preferences regarding the environment’s physical characteristics and the activities they engage in and the differences between individuals from different cultures have only been mentioned in a small body of research. Studies provide evidence that perceptions of safety may influence the use of spaces, and this is particularly true for minority ethnic groups. Other barriers such as lack of transportation, language and cultural alienation also seem to affect minority groups’ engagement with the environment.

People’s emotional bonds to places start in childhood, and childhood memories seem to have a great influence on the use of outdoor spaces as adults. ‘Place attachment’, and other similar terms have been described in the literature, however, it is not clear if, and how, immigrants develop bonds with the new places.

By reviewing the studies which focused on the engagement with the outdoor environment under the three components of Canter’s (1977) ‘theory of place’, and linking those findings with theories of migration, and those on how immigrants are received in the host country (Chapter 2), along with the evolution of public open spaces (Chapter 3), it was then possible to define the research sub-questions.
The next chapter (Chapter 5) explores in detail the methodology used to test the initial hypothesis and research questions, by detailing how the research process took place, including the challenges of researching minority groups.
Part II
Chapter 5: Methodology

5.1. Introduction

How immigrants interact with place in the hosting country has implications, not only in terms of the choice and implementation of the theoretical framework described in Chapter 4, but also for the selection of the research methods. This chapter discusses the range of methods that are possible when conducting research with minority groups, especially immigrants; it describes why this research uses particular methods; how they have been implemented; and it outlines the various challenges the research encountered when collecting the data. The literature reveals that a large variety of methods (quantitative and/or qualitative) have been used in research studies of ethnic minorities and/or immigrants. Examples in the literature include:

- Interviewing: focus groups (Burgess, 1996; Askins, 2004; Lanfer & Taylor, 2004; Ward Thompson et al., 2009); and interviews (Askins, 2004 Low et al., 2005; Rishbeth & Finney, 2006; Jay & Schraml, 2009);
- Questionnaires (Loukaitou-Sideris, 1995; Askins, 2004; Seeland et al., 2009; Ward Thompson, et al., 2009; Peters et al., 2010);
- Observations (Loukaitou-Sideris, 1995; Lanfer & Taylor, 2004 Low, et al., 2005; Peters, et al., 2010);
- Case studies (Rishbeth, 2001);
- Rank-order and Q-sort (Zube & Pitt, 1981)
- Guided Walks (Burgess, 1996; Rishbeth & Finney, 2006)

Rishbeth and Finney (2006) also applied methods that are less commonly used, such as photographs taken by participants and going on site visits with them (Rishbeth & Finney, 2006).

In this study, the use of ‘behavioural observation’ as a method of enquiry was not an option since its limitations were problematic for the focus of the study. From the initial hypothesis, one research aim was to understand the role of migrants’ culture and its impact/influence on their engagement with the environment in the host country. Behavioural observation did not prove to be appropriate because, when observing the three immigrant groups, it was difficult to distinguish a Cape Verdean from an Angolan, or a Ukrainian from a

81 “Observation as a research method is well known in the field of environmental psychology. It deals with how to understand what people do in particular spatial settings…” (Golicnik, 2005, p.53).
Russian. For this reason, behavioural observation as a method was excluded from the research’s methodological framework.

This investigation of immigrants’ experience of public open space in Portugal is new research. The information available specifically on immigrants and public open spaces is limited. This research, therefore, chose to address the investigation’s questions from a more general methodological starting point; the results from the first focus-group findings were subsequently refined to generate more specific questions in the subsequent questionnaire and ‘go-along’ methods. It is the choice and sequence of the various methods (mixed method research) that makes the research methodology innovative.

5.2. **Mixed method research**

This type of research offers not only a multiplicity of methods - as the literature (cited in section 5.1) shows but the possibility (and challenge) to combine more than one method. Traditionally, social and behavioural sciences have applied both quantitative and qualitative research methods to their investigations. The use of both methods in one single research study is not new. Examples of the use of mixed-methods in social research can be found in the work of anthropologists and sociologists during the first six decades of the 20th century. Although recognition of the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods as a single methodology is relatively recent, this third type of ‘methodological movement’ is now accepted and categorised as mixed methodology (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p.4). As Johnson et al. (2007, p. 129) suggest, this methodological approach can be defined as "an intellectual and practical synthesis based on qualitative and quantitative research; (...) It recognizes the importance of traditional quantitative and qualitative research but also offers a powerful third paradigm choice that often will provide the most informative, complete, balanced, and useful research results."

Campbell and Fiske (1959) were the first authors to formalise the use of multiple research methodologies supporting ‘multiple operationalism’ (Campbell & Fiske, 1959, p. 184) as part of a validation process. The convergence of findings from independent methods

---

82 In this research, the word ‘methods’ will follow the Johnson et al. definition (2007, p.118): “a broad interpretation and use of the word methods (in mixed methods) allows inclusion of issues and strategies surrounding methods of data collection (e.g., questionnaires, interviews, observations), methods of research (e.g., experiments, ethnography), and related philosophical issues (e.g., ontology, epistemology, axiology)).”

83 In their paper, Johnson et al. (2007, p.118) gave examples of several authors who use different terminology such as: integrative research, multimethod research, triangulated studies, etc. Nonetheless, all these terms refer to the same type of methodology.

84 Working in the field of psychology.

85 More than one method is used.
is, therefore, one way to ascertain results. This concept of mixing different approaches to validate one idea is tied in with the notion of triangulation, broadly defined by Denzin\(^6\) (2009, p. 297) as “the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon” to ensure cross validation\(^7\) and to avoid bias of a single method. Jick (1979, p. 603) advocated not only the importance of cross validation but also the fact that triangulation allows a ‘holistic’ overview of the study, “beyond the analysis of overlapping variance, the use of multiple measures may also uncover some unique variance which otherwise may have been neglected by single methods”. Jick (1979) also argued that validation is based on the premise that the weaknesses of one method will be overcome by the strengths of another.

Although some social scientists think that analysis of a problem by using different methodologies allows an overview of the issue from different angles, it is relevant to ask how two different methodologies, namely, qualitative and quantitative, which have distinct philosophical positions\(^8\), can work together. Johnson et al. (2007) and Morgan (2007) support the concept of pragmatism\(^9\) as the philosophical position which logically justifies bridging the gap between methods while applying mixed-method research. In their summary of the general characteristics of pragmatism, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, see author’s full paper for a further discussion) refer to this philosophical theory as a recognition of the importance of the natural/physical world and the social/psychological world (subjective thinking, language and culture) – it means that the constructions of truth relative to the self are also based on experience of the outside world. By crossing the boundaries relative to the split between the empiric and the rational, and admitting that different types of inquiry have weaknesses and strengths, the use of mixed methods can fill the gap between methodologies and present stronger evidence for a possible conclusion by corroborating the findings.

---

\(^6\) Work was originally published in 1978.

\(^7\) Different authors have established methods to triangulate a research study (see Johnson et al, 2007 for a detailed discussion).

\(^8\) Qualitative research is usually associated with the constructivist tradition, while quantitative research positions itself on the (post)positivist framework (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). According to Bryman (1988), in positivism it is believed that, within social sciences, some concepts are often described as ‘abstract’, therefore, some of the methods applied in natural sciences are appropriate to use in the social sciences field “(…) there is seen to be need to provide operational definitions whereby their degrees of variation and covariation may be measured.” On the other hand, constructivism is based on the premise that the physical world is different from the natural, therefore individuals construct multiple realities. Morgan (2007, p. 73) summarised qualitative research as an “inductive–subjective–contextual” approach and quantitative research as a “deductive–objective–generalizing” approach.

\(^9\) For more details on pragmatism, see the work of the philosophers: Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey.
Another common question that arises when considering mixed-method research design methodology is what form should it take? How should it be created? Is it possible to conduct quantitative and qualitative research at the same time? John and Onwuegbuzie (2004) advocated that in order to consider a mixed-method design, the findings must be mixed at some point. In other words, if the different methods are applied in a sequential order, one has to inform the other, but if the methods are applied simultaneously, the findings need to be integrated during the interpretation phase. The complexity of the mixed-method design can vary, and it depends on how many stages are conducted.

Greene et al (1989, cited in Johnson et al 2007, p.115) acknowledged five general purposes for conducting mixed-method research: (1) ‘triangulation’ (i.e. the corroboration and convergence of results for the same phenomenon using different methodologies), (2) ‘complementarity’ (i.e. the use of one method to explain and clarify the results from another), (3) ‘development’ (i.e. using the results of one method to inform the other), (4) ‘initiation’ (i.e. the discovery of possible contradictions which may lead to a rethink and redefine the research question) and (5) ‘expansion’ (i.e. expanding the area of inquiry).

Following the above discussion on mixed-methods, the methodological framework of this research uses a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods.

As Figure 5:1 shows, this study’s first qualitative research method involved the focus group interviews with participants from the three immigrant communities. Once the main themes emerged from the focus-group findings, a quantitative method (questionnaires) was the next method in the sequence. A control group was introduced at this point in the research. In scientific experiments, a control group is usually defined as the group which has not been altered or exposed to, for instance, a treatment. In this research, the Portuguese control group let the research compare people’s experiences of open space as immigrants to Portugal with native-born Portuguese people’s experiences. It also provided a small insight into the
Portuguese reality, helping to establish a comparison between the needs, uses, experiences and perceptions of public open spaces of the two respective groups, that is, the native-born Portuguese and migrants to Portugal. The focus groups were used as a specific methodological tool to understand the views and experience from an immigrant’s perspective, therefore the inclusion of a Portuguese control group would not have made sense in that context.

Finally, in order to gain a more in-depth understanding of some of the open questions (used in both the focus group interviews and questionnaires) a third qualitative method was used, namely, ‘go-along’ interviews (Carpiano, 2009). This method was, once again, conducted solely with Brazilians, Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians, since one of the aims was to focus on the experience of place by those who were displaced from their home country. The use of this method is in line with Thwaites (2001), who reinforced the need to understand how the experience of place is meaningful to the users and how people attach meanings and values to places. The same author advocated the concept of ‘experiential landscape’ as “(...) a provisional outcome of an exploration to identify experiences (...)” (Thwaites, 2001, p. 253).

This research follows the argument of Greene et al. (1989) that use of a mixed-method approach has major benefits. These are:

- ‘Triangulation’ – this involved the application of three different methods and perspectives in order to answer the research questions;
- ‘Complementarity’ – this resulted when one or more methods were used to reinforce the results of another method and the general findings;
- ‘Development’ – the questionnaires were based on topics from the focus groups; the ‘go-along’ were developed based on issues brought up in the focus group interviews as well as in the questionnaires;
- ‘Expansion’ – apart from the initial research questions, new questions emerged when the different methods were analysed. Some were discussed and explored in this thesis; other findings could be explored in future research.

As mentioned previously, different methods can bring results that are contradictory but in so doing, this can provide a more in-depth explanation of the original research problem. In this research, the three methods’ findings did not contradict each set of findings, individually, but, as stated above, they led to the exploration of new questions. David Canter’s
‘theory of place’ was the unifying theory for all three methods and it was studied in each of them.

5.3. Preparation of the data collection and the challenge in researching immigrant groups

It is important to detail all the preparatory work done for the data collection. In order to understand immigrants’ needs, it is crucial to work closely with this group, however, collecting data among ethnic minorities is challenging and it can be a long and difficult process. Throughout the research process, several questions arose regarding participant access and involvement:

- Where could I recruit immigrants willing to participate in the research?
- How should I approach would-be participants?
- How could I gain access to these communities?

During the data collection, various barriers and challenges arose, such as: gaining access to the communities; lack of time (the recruitment process was time consuming); the status of the participants; a lack of faith in the research outcome; and a lack of confidence in (and suspiciousness of) the researcher (female, young, Portuguese), which, in some aspects, limited the research process.

5.3.1. Engaging with immigrants

In general, it is often described as a hard task to find participants willing to collaborate in research. A normal first step when doing so is to ‘gain access’ to the relevant communities, however, that is an extremely hard and complex process and “it is not a straightforward procedure” (Burgess, 1995, p. 45). Nonetheless, it is a crucial stage, and if unsuccessful, the research can be compromised. According to Shah (2004, p. 557), how you gain access to participants can influence the relationship and ‘nature of the data’ collected. In order to recruit successfully and ethically, you must approach potential informants respectfully, request time to talk with them, and inform them about the study and the process of participation without exerting any pressure on them (Gibson & Abrams, 2003, p. 464).

Once you have established first contact, you must ‘engage’ with the participants. This can be described as “the process of persuading gatekeepers in focal communities to become interested and involved in a proposed research project” (Gibson and Abrams, 2003, p. 464). Gibbs and Bankhead-Greene (1997, p.49, in Gibson and Abrams, 2003) described this
process as time-consuming, anxiety provoking, and sometimes confrontational but important, in order to ensure a good starting point for the research.

A way to engage with would-be participants is first to identify key people in the communities and gain their support. In this study, I made my first attempt to interact with the three Lisbon communities through immigrants’ associations, which I contacted in advance. I tried to schedule meetings in order to present my research and ask for their support with my study. Initially, very different responses were obtained: some people did not answer at all, while some said they were willing to help. Since this support was not enough to deliver the number of participants I required, I approached ‘cultural insiders’ to see if they could help me to make connections to each immigrant group. Cultural insiders can be defined as “persons who have knowledge of the language and familiarity with the culture of a particular group through their membership in that group” (Birman, 2006). They play an important role in the community and they are invaluable to a research study. Often referred to as gatekeepers, they comprise “those individuals in an organisation that have the power to grant or withhold access to people or situations for the purposes of research” (Burgess, 1995, p. 48). In this case, access to these gatekeepers was sometimes gained by using social networks. I had a few contacts among some of the Brazilian and Cape Verdean communities (from university, friends of friends, to housekeepers) and through them, I tried to establish points of contact with them. With their support, I was invited to people’s houses, clubs, parties, dinners and Sunday barbeques, which gave me the opportunity to experience, at first hand, a flavour of the culture, food, lifestyle, routines and problems, separate from thinking about data collection matters.

I found that the Brazilians were the easiest group to establish contact with, the one I had the most contact with, and the group keenest to share their opinions and experiences with me. I maintained contact with some key people continuously throughout the different research phases and some participants took part in at least two methodologies. Although I knew some Cape Verdeans, recruiting participants was not as straightforward as it was with the Brazilians. The Cape Verdean community is known to be a very close community. Consequently, in the majority of cases, gathering information was mainly achieved through gatekeepers who were present while interviews or questionnaires were undertaken; only a small number of questionnaires were collected without gatekeeper help. Finally, the Ukrainian community was the most problematic group to gain access to, since, apart from the Ukrainian association, I hardly knew anyone. Again, I made first contact through social networking. A Ukrainian woman, who worked as a cleaner in a friend’s home, was a key person in the research. She is
very well-known and active in her community: she runs a Saturday school for Ukrainian children, works closely with the ambassador, and runs another Ukrainian association. She helped to set up some focus groups and distributed the questionnaires in the community. A second gatekeeper, a Ukrainian translator, helped to collect some of the questionnaires and supported the ‘go-along’ group.

5.3.2. ‘Positionality’

There is a significant body of research focused on cross-cultural interviews (see Gelfand, Raver, & Ehrhart, 2004; Sands, Bourjolly, & Roer-Strier, 2001; Shah, 2004). In the cross-cultural interviewing process, the rôle of the researcher as an insider/outsider plays an important part (Shah, 2004). As Sands et al. (2001) point out, the researcher and the participant may or may not have some things in common (age, gender, social position, religion90, culture91) and therefore, they can place themselves in many positions. This may influence interaction between the researcher and the participants and it is often described as ‘positionality’ (Shah, 2004). Earlier theories viewed the researcher as either an insider or an outsider, ignoring the dynamic of the different ‘positionalities’ (Mullings, 1999). More recent literature shows this argument is more complex; the boundaries are not as well defined as Mullings assumes and fluidity exists between these two states (Sands et al., 2001).

This research draws on my particular personal experiences, such that I recognised that ‘positionality’ affected my information-gathering process, that it is always subjective rather than neutral and therefore, I must pay attention to that fact.

While I established first engagement with gatekeepers and tried to recruit the first participants, I was seen as an ‘outsider’. I did not share their cultural background and belonged to the host community. In most cases, I was from a different social background and often my age worked against me (the young researcher versus the older participants). Despite being aware of this perspective and barrier, I did not know exactly how to overcome it or even if it was possible to establish any other position. While briefing the participants about the research, I explained that the research was being supervised in another country (Scotland), rather than in Portugal. From then on, the participants’ view of me changed and they started to see me as an ‘insider’, an immigrant too (a Portuguese student in Scotland). In sharing my

90 In this particular research, ‘religion’ never presented itself as a major aspect (according to the statistics for each country, the majority of the population is Catholic (Brazil and Cape Verde) or Orthodox (Ukraine).

91 In a broad way, ‘culture’ is defined as the beliefs, values, identities, and traditions that individuals and groups share.
experience as an immigrant, it created a bond, establishing common ground between me and the participants, which then fostered trust and honesty throughout the research process.

My position as an insider and outsider shifted significantly during the research process. However, I do not consider the ‘researcher as the outsider’ an unconstructive experience. As argued by Gibson and Abrams (2003, p.468), “(...) this can be a positive process for qualitative research”. As an outsider, the participants described, in detail, their experiences, the norms, their habits in order to give me a better context and understanding. Viladrich (2005) has also argued that the idea of a ‘total ethnic insider’ is not true, due to group heterogeneity (Viladrich, 2005, p. 383).

5.3.3. Confidentiality

Confidentially\(^{92}\) and anonymity\(^{93}\) were always assured to the participants. They were never asked their names, and if mentioned, for whatever reason (e.g. during a conversation or in the focus groups), I always guaranteed their subsequent anonymity.

Although some gatekeepers were present throughout the process, some participants remained suspicious. There is no evidence that this reaction had an impact on participants’ answers, however, it may have been a possible limiting factor. During the focus group preparation, some participants contacted the researcher, saying they were no longer willing to participate in the research. This might have been because of their immigrant status (legal or illegal). Throughout the research, the participants asked me several times if I was going to ask for their passport number or for any other form of identity. This supports the view that their immigrant status may, perhaps, have also affected their willingness to participate fully in the research.

5.3.4. Language and communication

Language is a way to express thought. When research is carried out in a different language, this may be a barrier therefore, linguistic and cultural skills are important in order to achieve accurate interpretation (Chui & Knight, 1999). Often a research process makes use of a translator to ensure appropriate language matching. In this research, language was a barrier only for the Ukrainian group. Brazil and Cape Verde are Portuguese-speaking countries, so no major linguistic issues occurred. Nevertheless, each culture uses specific terms, and a term

---

\(^{92}\) The respondents’ identity is known to the researcher but she is keeping that information confidential. No one, apart from the researcher, will have access to the information.

\(^{93}\) The researcher does not know the identity of the participant (Sommer and Sommer, 1980).
that is used and understood by a native-born Portuguese may not always be understood by someone from another Portuguese-speaking country, and vice versa. The focus groups and ‘go-along’ interviews made allowances for this. Care was taken too with the questionnaire - the language was kept as simple as possible and, as mentioned previously, some adjustments were made, after feedback from the pilot study.

The Ukrainian community’s fluency in Portuguese is very good and it is known for its efforts in speaking the host language as accurately as possible. During the focus group and ‘go-along’ interviews, the questions were asked, and the answers were given in Portuguese. However, often some intra-dialogue would take place, either in Ukrainian or Russian, to discuss particular terms or the meaning of certain questions. The participants helped each other to express their views in Portuguese, so the language was never felt to be a major barrier. All the conversations were recorded and the intra-conversations were translated into Portuguese by a professional translator.

5.3.5. Ethics

Throughout the research, it was never my intention to identify the immigrants’ status, whether ‘legal’ or ‘illegal’. Since the majority of the recruitment of participants (for the focus group and ‘go-along’ interviews) was done through third parties, I had no control over this process and I never asked what their status was. However, during our conversations, and once the participants felt they could ‘trust’ me, some would mention how their status influenced either their life as an immigrant, in general, or their experience of public open spaces in Lisbon. Faced with this new information, I continued the interviews as objectively and non-judgementally as possible. Independent of their status, I always treated the participants with respect, I respected their cultural values, kept their anonymity and assured them that the information they gave me was confidential and would be used for academic purposes only.

5.4. Focus group interviews

Focus group interviews have been used in marketing research and in different academic disciplines, from behavioural studies, social studies to health and can be traced

94 Consent forms were not used. In order to simplify and create a less formal atmosphere, I let the participants know that the research would keep their anonymity and that any information they provided would be kept confidential, and I just asked them, during the focus groups and ‘go-along’ interviews, only to fill in an index card.
back to the 1920s to their use in Bogardus’ work (Morgan, 1996). This research method is defined in many ways but here, focus groups are defined as “an interview with several people on a specific topic or issue” (Bryman, 2004, p. 345).

The advantage of using this method with ethnic minorities is widely recognised, especially in health research (Chiu and Knight, 1999) and in social science research. According to Ruppenthal et al. (2005), the oral tradition is a big component of some groups’ culture, so focus group methods may be an appropriate way to research marginalised groups with diverse cultural values and traditions, such as different ethnic minority groups. It is a very valuable tool in accessing in-depth information in what Munday (2006, p. 95) refers to as “the ‘true’ nature of the reality of the participants”. Morgan (1996) emphasises the importance of regarding focus group interviews as a group discussion, where interaction between group members generates the data. Participants not only respond to the researcher’s questions but also comment on other participants’ views. Ruppenthal (2005) mentions how vulnerable populations, such as ethnic minorities, can sometimes hide negative comments about and views on a subject or they may feel insecure in relation to their understanding of an issue or in giving a response because of language problems. This can be overcome with a group discussion, which can elicit a positive response. This research wanted to collect information from the three cultures as three groups, not as individual experiences, and to gather true opinions (not the expected answers), so that was why focus group interviewing was an entirely appropriate method.

This choice, as the first one in the methodological process, was premised on the fact that the focus groups were designed to identify the issues that really mattered to the three groups in terms of their engagement with public, open spaces in Lisbon. The aim was to hear directly from them about their specific needs, perceptions, fears and experiences. This method offered them the opportunity to ‘give a voice’ to their communities. It also provided a fresh insight into the research topic, beyond the information gleaned from the literature review. Also, by identifying the pertinent issues at this first stage, this ensured that the follow-up questionnaire was meaningful and relevant to the communities and not simply reliant on the literature review findings.

5.4.1. Preparation of the focus groups - selecting the participants and challenges

Any research process requires sampling of participants and ‘segmentation’ is often a standard procedure to gather participants (Morgan, 1996, p. 143). ‘Segmentation’ allows groups with particular characteristics to come together (e.g., by age, gender and ethnicity)
which, according to Morgan (1996), facilitates comparisons to be made by having participants who share similarities. This research used segmentation - different focus groups were conducted according to the participants' three nationality-types.

The associations willing to support the research agreed to find participants for the focus group sessions. However, as non-governmental organisations, and reliant on volunteer staff, this resource was not enough to guarantee the number of participants, therefore gatekeepers and friends became an important resource to recruit and organise the focus groups. The recruitment was very difficult and various focus groups were cancelled at the last minute, mainly because participants became suspicious and worried about confidentiality (see section 5.3.3). Also, although the immigrants’ associations were very helpful in recruiting participants, this had its downside. In some cases, I felt that immigrants had been chosen to accord with what the associations thought would give a ‘good’ image of their community, presenting, perhaps, a biased, and not entirely ‘true’ representation of the respective immigrant communities.

A pilot study\(^\text{95}\) was undertaken in September 2007 before the main focus group interviews. A group of seven students (two men and five women) from Edinburgh College of Art took part in the study. The key aim was to test the semi-structured interviews, to assess whether the questions were clear and how to best conduct the interviews (with consideration given to issues such as: timing; giving each participant the chance to speak and redirecting the conversation back to the topic).

5.4.2. Running the focus groups

In October 2007, nine focus groups (three from each nationality) were conducted in Lisbon. In total, fifty-nine participants took part in this method (forty women and nineteen men) (see Table 6:1, for more detail). The research aim was to achieve a balance of participants from each nationality, so twenty participants from Brazil, nineteen from Ukraine and twenty from Cape Verde made up the focus groups. The number of participants in each group varied from five to nine participants. It was impossible, though, to achieve gender balance – there were more female than male participants. The focus groups took place at the various associations and in participants’ homes. Snacks and refreshments were provided as a ‘thank you’ to the participants. All the focus group discussions were recorded, with the participants

\(^{95}\)Pilot studies are a good way to validate and see how reliable a research tool can be, as well as to anticipate future problems while conducting the method
giving permission to do so. A research assistant\textsuperscript{96} took notes of all the discussions that were later used in the analysis of the entire interview content. In each session, I gave each participant an index card to write his/her age, gender and how long s/he had been living in Portugal.

When various focus groups are undertaken, it is normal to expect a degree of standardisation. That is, all the groups should be issued with the same sets of procedures and questions. This allows later cross comparison, especially if the aim is to compare responses between different groups (Morgan, 1996). However, it is also important to keep a certain degree of flexibility with each group in order to avoid “the fallacy of adhering to fixed questions” (Morgan, 1996, p. 142).

In this research, the group discussions were semi-structured\textsuperscript{97} (see Appendix 1) around a set of questions and the procedures were the same across all groups. The questions derived from the literature review and the research aim was to tackle the key issues and gather the groups’ first impressions of the topic. The questions varied, from the general to the specific. They invited openness, tried to avoid bias and to make the participants feel comfortable. They also gave them time to tell their stories, to laugh and not to feel forced into answering the questions in a mechanistic way. The participants were not told of the exact content of the discussion but were given a broad definition – namely, public spaces in Lisbon.

Throughout the interviews, my ‘positionality’ varied significantly. I was, at various times, questioned about my experience as an immigrant. I felt that participants were trying to find out if we shared similar experiences that somehow validated their feelings and responses. They would often complain about their way of life, claiming how difficult it was to live abroad, and they would look at me, saying: “You know, you’re also an immigrant...” (Brazilian woman).

However, once they began criticising Portugal (e.g., politics, culture and the society), they would refer to me as being in the ‘Portuguese group’ and they would speak more carefully: “You, the Portuguese, are...” (Cape Verdean man).

\textsuperscript{96} The research assistant, a student, was introduced to the participants and he sat next to me during the discussions. He was responsible to take notes and check if the recorders were recording and located across the table. He did not intervene during the discussion.

\textsuperscript{97} The term ‘semi-structured’ is mainly used to describe a type of interview. Both focus group and semi-structured interviews are based on a conversation with people done in a semi-structured manner. However, semi-structured interviews focus on the interaction between the interviewer/researcher and one participant, while focus groups are based on the dynamics between the various members of the group.
I tried to remain as neutral as possible and avoided expressing my own views or gave ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answers, but visibly, the participants’ discourse changed, according to their perception of me as either an ‘insider’ or an ‘outsider’.

5.4.3. Data analysis

Focus groups allow observation of the interactions that occur between different group members (Bryman, 2004). However, according to Munday (2006), these processes are often ignored by researchers who concentrate on the content, rather than the dynamics. When I was transcribing the interviews, I was conscious of the group dynamics and I noted participants’ interactions and took them into account (for example, their different opinions, humour, etc.). I transcribed all the discussions and then analysed their content.

When I conducted the analysis, I assessed the empirical data, using general ideas to make generalisations and reach a conclusion. Often, qualitative data is analysed by organising it into different categories by coding the data. I used Nvivo 7.0, a qualitative research method data analysis software to analyse the focus group content. This software assisted with textual analysis of the transcriptions looking, for instance, at the frequency of words/topics. After a first analysis and review, I coded the data. The codes were based on different categories that formalised the themes and the participants’ perspectives, giving a first overview of the research topics (see Appendix 4). The various codes were organised in a hierarchical way: the main themes contained various sub-themes; these, in turn, had different attributes.

5.5. Questionnaires

The second method used in this research was a questionnaire which was given to the three immigrant groups and the control group (Portuguese). Questionnaires are tools used when taking a deductive approach, where the starting point is the theoretical framework and the final stage is the empirical measurement and data analysis (Neuman, 2000) and they can provide “useful” quantitative data (Zeisel, 2006, p. 257).

When a researcher uses questionnaires, the main objective is “to discover regularities among groups of people by comparing answers to the same set of questions asked of a large number of people” (Zeisel, 2006, p. 257). As Zeisel says, the construction of a questionnaire

\[98\] For more detail on the different steps of coding, see Neuman (2000).
\[99\] The literature distinguishes between ‘questionnaires’ and ‘interview schedules’, the main difference being that the latter requires the physical presence of someone who asks the questions and the former may allow respondents just to fill in the answer to the written questions themselves (Sommer and Sommer, 1980).
can be based on issues raised in previous research, such as "observations, archival data analysis, and focus group interviews (…)" (Zeisel, 2006, p. 257). In this study, that same principle applies, that is, the questions used in the questionnaires were informed by the main topics that arose in the focus group sessions and the literature review. The literature reveals that in the small cluster of research on immigrants and outdoor spaces, some researchers used questionnaires. In researching migrants and outdoor spaces, Peters et al. (2010), for example, used questionnaires to understand the use of parks in the Netherlands by first and second generation immigrants. Seeland et al. (2009) applied a quantitative study method to the role of public green spaces that would encourage the social inclusion of youths from various cultural backgrounds. Rishbeth (2004) combined questionnaires with observation and interviews to uncover the strengths and limitations of ethno-cultural urban landscapes.

The research needed to gather information in a standardised way, therefore, this method was chosen in order to confirm or contradict the previous findings from the focus groups. This method is very useful too when investigating patterns and frequency of use, along with immigrants’ expectations, preferences, priorities and attitudes.

5.5.1. Questionnaire design

- Questionnaire structure: using ‘Facet theory’

‘Facet theory’ was applied at this stage in order to design the questionnaires based on the focus group findings and to avoid missing key concepts and possible interrelationships. Facet theory is described as "(...) a comprehensive approach to the design of observations and the analysis of empirical data in behavioural research" (Shye, Elizur, & Hoffman, 1994, p. 1). The work of Bell (2009) and Ward Thompson et al. (2004) shows how this theory has been applied in landscape architecture. In both studies, the authors used facet theory to reveal the central issues that arose from the focus group discussions and then they designed the questionnaires. This let Bell (2009) explore participants’ perceptions of Latvian landscape during a period of social and economic transformation; and allowed Ward Thompson (2004) to study the use of local woodlands as a tool for social inclusion.

‘Facet theory’ addresses research complexity by identifying the various components of each concept and characterising the relations between them. In this research, once the key issues were identified, based on the questionnaires and literature review, the major topic clusters were created. By using a ‘mapping sentence structure’, the central issues were then organised into ‘facets’, which are described by Canter (1983) as: “any way of categorising
observations so long as the elements of the category scheme are mutually exclusive” (Canter, 1983, p. 37). The structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public open spaces</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes of person X towards</td>
<td>from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5:2 - Mapping sentence structure

‘Facet theory’ has been proven to be a robust and logical way to ensure that a link is established between two methods (see Bell, 2009). It allowed statements to be made which embedded this study’s qualitative findings generated by the research questions and which expressed participants’ point of view. From the focus group findings, a questionnaire was designed that was meaningful to all the participants.

The questionnaire consisted of:

- First part – ‘Activities’. A list of activities was drawn up, based on the answers given in the focus groups. This was a compilation of the activities that the participants had described as part of their daily life and it included not only the activities they enjoyed in outdoor public spaces but also indoors and in private spaces. When these activities were analysed, the research gained insight into what immigrants did indoors and out. They mentioned ‘going for a walk’ frequently in the previous focus-group method therefore, the questionnaire included a section asking where these walks took place. Finally, it also included two questions about the activities participants had undertaken previously in their home country and that they still enjoyed in Lisbon or their engagement, if any, in new kinds of activities in Portugal.

- Second part - Canter’s model: Outdoor Environment Preferences. This section of the questionnaire asked the participants what physical attributes of a space they preferred (the presence of green elements; water (river versus sea); the elements that enhance their enjoyment of outdoor activities; their perceptions of open spaces (e.g. natural versus urban spaces, tranquillity and company) and finally, some questions about the activities they undertake outdoors.
Third part – Which spaces were used, and how. This section focused on public spaces in Lisbon: participants’ favourite places; the types of places which they used frequently and those they did not use. The names of places participants mentioned consisted of a compilation of names gathered during the focus group sessions. Other questions covered: frequency of use; use of space(s) alone or in company; the time of year; ease of access (i.e. means of transport and time of access). A further aim was to understand why, in some cases, spaces were not used on a regular basis, so a list of motives (again, these were based on answers given previously in the focus groups) was presented, along with a question about participants’ perceptions of safety.

Fourth part - Memories and experience. One of the key aims of the research was to look at the importance of memories so participants were asked questions about their frequency of use of public spaces during childhood (childhood memories). They were also asked about their memories of home, particularly, the things they missed. It was important for the research to establish whether immigrants’ experiences back home, and the reason(s) why they had migrated in the first place, could affect their use of outdoor spaces in Lisbon.

Fifth part - Participants’ background. The final part of the questionnaire included questions about: nationality; age; gender; education; occupation; number of years spent living in Portugal; the type of place in which participants used to live; and where they lived in Portugal.

The majority of the questions were ‘closed questions’\(^\text{100}\). The reason for using this type was because they allow a quick response and it is easier to analyse these questions, statistically.

In terms of gauging the answers, the majority of the questions used the five-point Likert Scale\(^\text{101}\), varying from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. In order to avoid automatic responses, where participants might tick, continuously, the same side of the column, the order

\(\text{\ldots}\)

\(^{100}\) Since the focus groups already allowed the participants to express their own issues (Newell, 1993; Sommer & Sommer, 1980).

\(^{101}\) A Likert Scale is a one-dimensional scale where participants are asked to choose one option that best describes their view. A few authors focused on cross-cultural differences in response to Likert Scales and found some differences among the populations (Lee, Jones, Mineyama, & Zhang, 2002). Although the researcher is aware of possible differences of use of the scale, this is beyond the scope of this research.
of the scale was altered for some of the questions. The use of an odd-numbered scale (five points) gave participants the opportunity to choose a neutral midpoint. Questions about frequency of use also used five measures (from ‘every day’ to ‘never’). The questionnaire also included ranking questions. This type was included to better understand respondents’ preferences, encouraging them to make a choice between the options that were presented. Only three ‘open-ended’ questions were used, following a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer.

The length of a questionnaire depends on the format and the respondents’ characteristics. Neuman (2000) advocated that generally, a short questionnaire – three to four pages - is appropriate. Although this research focused on minorities, it made sense to follow this rule, and the final questionnaire had four pages in total (see Appendix 2). The layout of the questionnaire included a cover sheet explaining the research, why it was being conducted and it was designed to be answered within ten minutes (maximum).

In May 2008, a small pilot study was conducted to test the questionnaire. A preliminary version of it was sent to several participants from each nationality group (15 participants in total responded to the pilot study). The answers to this preliminary version were not analysed since the main objective was to discover any possible flaws in the questionnaire. Most of the comments about this pilot study included problems with interpretation of some of the sentences and even some place names in Lisbon. All these comments were addressed in the final version of the questionnaire.

It is common practice today to distribute questionnaires through computer networks on the World Wide Web, however, this research used a ‘traditional’ paper-based questionnaire since access to new technologies among the three immigrant groups might have been low, and that could have compromised the data collection.

Three versions of the questionnaire were printed: one for the Brazilian and Cape Verdean communities; the same questionnaire in Ukrainian, and a slightly modified version for the Portuguese participants in the control group (see Appendix 2.B). The control group’s version reflected the experience of being a native respondent, eliminating the possible answers which were mainly focused on the experience of migrating to another country.

---

102 Researchers have debated whether it is appropriate to use an odd or even numbered scale (Neuman, 2000).
103 Ideally, the questionnaire should have been translated into Russian and Ukrainian, but due to funding restrictions, I could only choose one language. After some deliberation, and not to offend those who defended Ukrainian as the official language and the participants’ cultural identity, I chose Ukrainian. The translation (Portuguese to Ukrainian) was made by a professional Ukrainian who has been living in Portugal for more than six years.
Therefore, the questionnaire did not include: in the first part, questions related to previous activities; in the third part, whether the respondent would go with friends from Portugal; in the fourth part, ‘memories and experience’ did not include the questions on elements that the respondents missed and about their experience as immigrants; and finally, in the background data, instead of asking how long the respondent had been living in Portugal, the question asked how long s/he had been living in Lisbon Metropolitan Area.

5.5.2. Collecting data

Data collection took place in June 2008. I re-contacted the previous immigrant associations, gatekeepers and some participants. I established a new contact with a governmental department - CNAI\textsuperscript{104}. The majority of the questionnaires were answered in this governmental department, where I spent five mornings and two afternoons. In this case, the sampling technique was ‘convenience sampling’, where only those participants who were available responded to the questionnaire. While collecting this data, I always introduced myself as a PhD student from Edinburgh College of Art who was carrying out research on outdoor spaces.

Once again, my role as a researcher may have influenced the number of questionnaires returned and completed. On the one hand, many respondents were happy to answer the questionnaire, since it was a way to spend the time while waiting their turn to be called. However, the fact that I was clearly not an immigrant and because of the ‘official’ nature of the place, this may have led some respondents to think that it would be better to answer the questionnaire. Nevertheless, I always stressed that doing so was voluntary and that I had nothing to do with the government.

The remaining questionnaires were collected either through the previous contacts\textsuperscript{105} (where participants ask others to participate in the research, increasing the number of respondents) or in public spaces. I had two assistants with me when I visited parks, gardens, the beach, the urban forest, but the number of respondents willing to participate was very low.

\textsuperscript{104} CNAI (Centro Nacional de Apoio ao Imigrante). This department offers services that all immigrants use when applying for, or renewing their visas, when paying taxes, getting their social insurance number, etc. Usually immigrants have to spend a long time in this place, and experience long queues.

\textsuperscript{105} In this case, the sampling technique was the ‘snowball effect’.

I contacted other places such as shopping centres or Expo\textsuperscript{106}, but none of them gave me authorisation to issue and collect questionnaires in those places.

As stated above, the questionnaires were translated into Ukrainian, however, some participants, especially the older ones, had some difficulty in understanding the questionnaire in Ukrainian, and a small percentage refused to answer it because it was not written in Russian.

Nearly 600 questionnaires were distributed among the three immigrant communities and the total number of valid questionnaires collected was 184 (n=184). The number of questionnaires distributed among the Portuguese\textsuperscript{107} community was 80 and the total number of valid questionnaires collected was 68 (n=68).

5.5.3. Data analysis

The data was analysed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software version 17. All the data was coded and inserted directly into the SPSS database. The open questions, in the case of the Ukrainian group, were also translated by the same translator who had dealt with the questionnaire responses.

The first analysis was mainly descriptive, and assessed the data from the three nationalities and the control group, giving a general idea of how the groups used, perceived and preferred public open spaces.

Factor analysis was also carried out as a data reduction technique to simplify the data by organising it into smaller groups of independent factors, revealing the main themes present in people’s responses. This method allowed the research to confirm the categories that were assumed during the questionnaire design stage and to uncover possible new categories that were not originally included in the set of questions.

This was followed by analysis of significant predictors, using Kruskal Wallis\textsuperscript{108} and Mann-Whitney tests to uncover differences in the data, to show which variables were significant (p<0.05). Finally, a series of logistic regressions was carried out to predict participants’ use of outdoor spaces.

\textsuperscript{106} Although, Expo is a public place, maintenance and administration of it is done by a private company – Parque Expo.

\textsuperscript{107} Contrary to the researcher’s experience of gaining access to the immigrant communities, engaging with the Portuguese population was fairly straightforward. A large number of questionnaires were collected from students from the Instituto Superior de Agronomia, as well as from colleagues and acquaintances.

\textsuperscript{108} The Kruskal-Wallis test is a nonparametric test used to compare three or more samples, while Mann-Whitney compares two samples (Field, 2005).
5.6. ‘Go-along’ interviews

The third, and final method conducted in this research were the ‘go-along’ interviews. A ‘go-along’ is an in-depth interview where the researcher accompanies participants on a walk in their familiar environments (Carpiano, 2009)\textsuperscript{109}. Carpiano (2009) defended this as a good tool with which to explore the different dimensions of place and how they are experienced by users and “through asking questions and observing, the researcher is able to examine the informants’ experiences, interpretations, and practices within this environment” (Carpiano, 2009, p. 264). There are different terms in the literature for this type of interview while accompanying participants on a walk, such as ‘walking through interviews’ (Zimring, 1987) or ‘walking interviews’ (Clark & Emmel, 2010). Although the ‘go along’ method, used to explore the interaction between users and the environment, has not been used extensively, it is possible to find a few examples. Authors such as Kevin Lynch (1960, in Carpiano, 2009), for example, used ‘walk-along’ methods to understand how residents from US cities interpreted environmental images in their usual activities. Bechtel and Srivastava (1978, in Hussein, 2009) advocated the use of this type of interview to evaluate post-occupancy evaluation. Burgess (1996) in her study of risk and fear of crime in recreational woodlands, combined walks to the forest, followed by focus group interviews.

Peters et al. (2010) have also conducted interviews in parks with migrants and native populations to assess the meaning of the park for migrant and non-migrant users in the context of social cohesion, however, no details were given as to how the interviews were conducted. It has not been possible, then, to consider if they were similar in any way to the ‘go-along’ method this research used. In the field of landscape architecture, Rishbeth and Finney (2006) used a different approach. As part of a large project, they undertook group visits to different green spaces with refugee participants; they then asked the participants to take photographs to record their experiences. As stated above (see section 5.2), Thwaites (2001), also in the field of landscape architecture, advocated the concept of ‘experiential landscape’. Thwaites and Simkins (2007, p. p.142) noted that ‘experiential landscape’ correlates with theories of place, and that it “(...) emphasizes spatial experiences that encourage place attachment in people, strengthen orientation and stimulate a sense of neighbourhood.” Thwaites (2001) conducted semi-structured interviews, during which participants talked about their neighbourhood. Thwaites also organised the participants’ experiences into four different

\textsuperscript{109} There are variations on the name: ‘walk-along’ if the researcher walks; or ‘ride-along’ if driving is involved (Carpiano, 2009) or ‘ride-along’ if wheels are involved (Kusenbach, 2003). In this study, the broad term ‘go-along’ is used.
themes that combined both the spatial (centre, direction, transition and area) and experiential (attachment and significant (the restorative and social aspects orientation and neighbourhood awareness) dimensions (see Thwaites, 2001, p. 254).

Kusenbach (2003), in the context of ethnography, explored the role of space in social problems by studying how residents of Hollywood's neighbourhoods perceived local problems by looking at their daily interactions. The author discussed this method at length, decoding the benefits of participant observation and interviewing in a single method. When you interview participants sitting down in a room, it removes them from the environment under discussion, and it relies on their memory and not actual experience. On the other hand, just observing participants in a specific place does not give a true view of what they are experiencing (see Kusenbach's work, 2003, for more detail). According to Kusenbach (2003, p. 463), the strength of the 'go-along technique' “(...) is that ethnographers are able to observe their informants' spatial practices in situ while accessing their experiences and interpretations at the same time.” In comparison to other methods, Kusenbach (2003), in her approach to neighbourhoods, identified five themes which the 'go-along' method can shed light on:

- Perception - participants' knowledge and values that guide their experiences in the place
- Spatial practices – participants' engagement with the environment;
- Personal biographies – possible links between personal histories and the environment;
- Social architecture - relations between people;
- Social realms – place’s role in the nature of interaction between people

Some of these topics were difficult to pursue in this research, since only two specific spaces (and not area/neighbourhood) were included. Nonetheless, ‘perceptions’, ‘special practices’ and ‘personal biographies’ were discussed at length while applying the method. For design disciplines such as landscape architecture, where visual aspects and the design of the space are extremely important, this method is also invaluable in encouraging participants to relate to the environment’s features, objects and elements, and to discussing them in detail. As mentioned previously, when participants are interviewed in a room and asked about a specific place, they rely on memory and can miss many aspects110. However, when participants actually visit an environment and experience it directly, it seems to be a critical

110 Showing participants illustrations, pictures, maps and asking them to draw can also help to trigger memories but even so, they are detached from the experience of the place (Kusenbach, 2003).
factor in evoking participants’ memories and it prompts them to indicate a better knowledge and description of a place. Anderson (2004, p. 260), in his detailed study of “walking while talking”, explored how conversations in ‘place’ can “(...) successfully tap into the non-mechanistic framework of the mind and its interconnections with place to recall episodes and meanings buried (...)”.

As described above, this research started from very general assumptions and at all the various steps in the sequence of methods, the questions were narrowed down. The ‘go-along’ interviews were used as a method to explore how participants perceived and experienced ‘place’. Although the other two methods also explored the notion of ‘place’, they were more focused on public spaces in general, while this qualitative method (the ‘go-along’) was specifically applied to two public spaces in Lisbon. Another aim was to explore the notion of ‘place attachment’ and to understand if the participants had already developed bonds with places in Portugal, and whether this gave them positive experiences. The ‘go-along’ method also allowed participants to discuss topics that neither the focus group nor questionnaire results had given clear answers to. Another important aspect of this method is the experiential and embodied nature of this method. As suggested by Degen et al. (2010), people experience the surrounding environment, and its physical attributes (e.g. the texture and design) influence how they perceive places, providing them with multi-sensory experiences beyond the visual (e.g. touchscape, soundspace and smellscape).

5.6.1. Preparation

Kusenbach (2003) supported having more than one participant in an interview since it can minimise discomfort between participants and the researcher. Burgess et al. (1988) debated the value of ‘small groups’ in in-depth interviews that are focused on examining environmental values. Burgess et al. acknowledged that a small group can encourage participants to engage in a discussion, enabling the “(...) researchers and group members to explore together the embeddedness of environmental experiences and values within different cultural contexts.” (1988, p. 310). Based on this research and my experience of conducting focus groups with five participants, I felt that five participant might have been too many to include in the ‘go-alongs’. I opted, therefore, to have three participants in the ‘go-along’ groups, since that seemed an easy number to accompany while walking through spaces with them and three is a workable number of people likely to encourage intimate discussion.

Participants were recruited thorough the contacts I had made when conducting the previous research methods. The Ukrainian group was organised by the translator, while the
Cape Verdeans and Brazilians were organised by housekeepers whom I had met on previous occasions. Due to the small number of participants in each group, each gatekeeper contacted friends or relatives to participate in the research.

Burgess et al. (1988), however, suggested that groups should meet more than once and that the continuity and frequency of meetings helps to create intimacy in the group and consequently, participants are encouraged to share their feelings. Although this was a relevant point, I did not have the necessary resources to schedule more than one meeting, but the dynamic of the groups never seemed to reveal any constraints among the participants since they knew each other from previous occasions, or were even friends.

5.6.2. Conducting the ‘go-along’ interviews

The ‘go-along’ walks took place in March 2009. Over three afternoons, three groups of participants (each group consisted of three participants of the same nationality), were taken as individual groups to two public open spaces in Lisbon, Expo and Belém. The majority of the participants were females, and only two male participants took part in this and they were both Ukrainian (see Chapter 8 for more detail).

I met the participants at a specific location in Lisbon. They had been informed previously that we would spend the afternoon outdoors and that I would conduct an interview. Since one of the aims of this method was to gain a better understanding of ‘place attachment’, a topic that had not been discussed in depth in the previous two methods, it was up to the participants to choose the places to visit. However, I gave the participants a list of ‘favourite places’ based on answers to questions given in the questionnaires. From that list, participants were asked to choose two locations to visit on a particular afternoon. This was an important step as the aim here was to encourage the participants to talk about two environments that were familiar and of comfort to them, and not to pick two places randomly that might have had little significance for them. The list of favourite places varied for each nationality but there were places they all liked on the three lists. By coincidence, all three groups chose the same places: Expo and Jardins de Belém.

Once we were in the first location, Expo, I asked each participant to write their age, where they came from and where they were living in Lisbon. I explained that they could take me to any places they thought appropriate or meaningful in the park and take whatever route they wished. In each place, the participants took the lead as they walked a route of their choice. Each group took a different route through the places, either showing me particular spaces or features that had a special meaning for them.
Due to the windy weather conditions and since I did not have a high-quality, professional-standard tape recorder, I asked the participants to keep close together as a group so that I could use my own tape recorder to record the ‘go-along’ interviews (if they were willing to let me do that - which they were).

The participants were also given two cameras during the walks: one to take pictures of the things they liked, and with the other, of things they disliked. Although taking photographs was not intended to be a method per se, it was meant to record, visually, what participants’ interests and dislikes were. Visual materials have been used in social science disciplines, mainly in anthropology, but other disciplines such as sociology and psychology are increasingly using them (Bank, 2001). This idea of adding a visual layer to this research method was inspired by Rishbeth and Finney’s (2006) study, where the authors allowed direct participant involvement111 by asking each person to take pictures of the landscape and later, discussed the significance of the photographs. In this research, it was not the intention to follow Rishbeth and Finney’s approach as such, rather, why I asked participants to take photographs was because they illustrated what they were discussing in the ‘go-along’ interviews. On some occasions, it even promoted further dialogue and raised new questions and answers.

As in any interviewing methodology, the format of the interview can vary. On the course of the walk, as pointed out by Carpiano (2009), prepared questions encourage participants to discuss the research topics and are also useful, sometimes, when the conversation is not flowing too easily. The topics in the ‘go-alongs’ were based on some of the research questions which (see Appendix 3) had not been covered fully in the two previous methods. Ad hoc questions regarding the environment, its features or having a deeper understanding of a topic were also included. Each ‘go-along’, therefore, followed a basic but flexible structure, giving each interview its own shape.

Above all, this method allows closer contact between the participants and, as part of the group, I was able to observe first hand what was important to them, and to discuss their

111 The use of images has been applied to find landscape preferences and perceptions (Dramstad, Tveit, Fjellstad, & Fry, 2006; Todorova, Asakawa, & Aikoh, 2004; Ulrich, 1979; Zube & Pitt, 1981; Zube, Pitt, & Evans, 1983). Scott and Canter (1997) criticised these studies due to lack of participant involvement, arguing that they were just tested relative to their reactions to the images and did not have any active engagement with the landscape “there is a difference between an evaluation of the content of a photograph and an evaluation of the experience of the place as if person was actually there” (Scott & Canter, 1997, p. 263). What is important to stress is the potential for this method to allow a discussion in situ as a group, where participants share, not only their personal points of view but also challenge and discuss others’ perspectives while being in a public space environment.
reactions to things. As I already knew some of the participants that helped them to overcome their suspicions of me, which I had felt were apparent when I conducted the previous methods. As in the focus groups, participants related to my ‘immigrant’ status, and often would ‘include’ me in their group. Due to the nature of this method, memories were brought up almost naturally, the discussions became very personal at some points, and details of participants’ lives became part of the conversation. Some topics were deeply personal but not always relevant to the research aims. Due to the sensitive nature of the conversation, therefore, I had to be very careful to redirect it to the first purpose of the interview, without implying that the participants’ stories/memories were not valuable and of interest to me.

5.6.3. Data analysis

Each discussion was recorded\textsuperscript{112} and then transcribed. The analysis of the ‘go-along’ interviews used a similar method to that used in the focus groups. The interviews were coded and the results were grouped into the main themes. However, since a relatively small amount of data was collected, Nvivo software was not used in this analysis.

5.7. Summary

A mixed-method approach was used as the methodological framework for this research. The different research methods used, combined with qualitative and quantitative approaches, allowed the full range of research issues to be addressed via the questionnaires, focus group and ‘go-along’ interviews. All the methods were chosen to answer the questions; to triangulate the research; to check the complementarity of each method’s results (and between methods); to expand the scope of the initial research; and to allow the different methods to work together in an integrated way.

There were many challenges when carrying out the investigation with the three migrant communities in Lisbon. These challenges included: how to gain access to the communities, how to engage with the participants, to gain their trust, to assure them of anonymity and confidentiality, how to behave ethically to overcome barriers between the participants and the researcher. All these factors had to be addressed when working out and then implementing the research methodology.

The participants were first involved in the focus group interviews. This gave the research a greater insight into their cultural background and participants used the opportunity

\textsuperscript{112} With the participants’ consent.
to express their views on the research topic. From analysis of the focus group interviews, other research topics emerged that could be explored further at a later stage.

The questionnaire was then designed, based on the focus group outcomes and by implementing ‘facet theory’. The key aim of this quantitative research method was to explore the differences and similarities between the groups by asking defined research questions and then exploring the themes that the initial answers to the questions raised. This method involved the largest number of participants, however, the three immigrant communities in Lisbon were not the only subject of study; the research also included people from the Portuguese community to serve as participants in the control group.

Finally, the ‘go-along’ method was conducted on a smaller scale in order to explore in greater depth some of the research questions. Contrary to the previous two methods, this ‘go-along’ method has not been widely used and it added a new dimension to the research.

The next three chapters reveal the main findings from the three different methods.
Chapter 6: Findings from the focus group interviews

6.1. Introduction

As stated in Chapter 5, the intention behind the focus groups was to gain a deeper understanding of the three immigrant communities. This was the first contact with the immigrant communities and since little had been written about them, the aim was not only to understand their experience of public spaces in Lisbon but also to have a better understanding of these communities in general. The focus groups were also an opportunity to listen to participants’ opinions and concerns, identifying the topics that to the three immigrant groups found most meaningful and therefore, that should be included and pursued further in this study.

6.2. Participants

A total of 59 participants were interviewed in nine focus groups: 20 participants from Brazil, 19 from Ukraine and 20 from Cape Verde.

Individual participants had different profiles (according to their immigration status, education, employment, socio-economic status, age and gender). Participants in the first Brazilian focus group had been living in Portugal the longest and represented the first wave of migration from Brazil. They belonged to a higher social class, had higher educational levels and were employed in skilled jobs in Portugal. The other two Brazilian groups were much more alike, corresponding to the subsequent massive waves of migration to Portugal. Most participants in these latter two Brazilian groups belonged to a lower social class, had a lower educational level and were employed in the “3D” jobs (see Chapter 2, section 2.5.2). Participants from Cape Verde were also divided into the same two categories, that is: those with a higher educational level and from a higher social class (the first focus group and a few participants in the others); and those with a lower educational level and more precarious job security (groups 2 and 3). The participants in the first focus group from Cape Verde had been living in Portugal for 15-plus years, and were more than 50 years old (with only one exception). Participants in the Ukrainian group were more alike with no obvious differences, either in terms of social class or education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of participants:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazilians</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age: 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>F (average age)</td>
<td>M (average age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in Portugal</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainians</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age: 36</td>
<td></td>
<td>F (average age)</td>
<td>M (average age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in Portugal</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Verdeans</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age: 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>F (average age)</td>
<td>M (average age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in Portugal</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6:1 shows, the number of female participants was always higher than that of males. The number of years each participant had been living in Portugal varied, and it was influenced by, and a mirror of, the different waves of migration (see Chapter 1 and 2): from less than 1 year to more than 30 years for the Brazilians; for less than 1 year to 10 years for the Ukrainians; and between 1 year and more than 30 years for the Cape Verdeans.

6.2.1. The structure of the focus group discussions

As explained in the methodology (Chapter 5), the discussions were semi-structured, based on a set of questions of four main themes (see also Appendix 1). They are as follows:

- Past experiences: childhood and adult memories; cultural background, norms and values;
  - Present experiences - living in Portugal: exploring David Canter’s (1977) ‘theory of place’: activities, perceptions and physical attributes of public open spaces;
  - Barriers to the use of public open space;
  - ‘Place attachment’.

All the participants were invited and encouraged to comment on, give their thoughts about, and provide feedback to each question. I tried to redirect the conversation back to the main topics every time I felt it was moving away from the key research objective.

6.3. Findings

6.3.1. Pre-migration – immigrants’ use of public open spaces in their home country

6.3.1.1. Childhood memories

The theme of childhood memories was introduced to the participants in the first question: “where did you play, when you were a child?” This question was used as an icebreaker to help the participants relax and feel more at ease with the focus group procedures by asking them to recall their memories of the past. As the literature review shows (see Chapter 4, section 4.5.2), for immigrants’ being outdoors during their early years seems to be particularly relevant.

Table 6:2 - Types of places where respondents used to play in their childhood (the numbers in brackets signify the number of times it was mentioned in the focus groups)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Place</th>
<th>Indoor</th>
<th>Outdoor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazilians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home (2)</td>
<td>Street (9)</td>
<td>Farms (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backyard (6)</td>
<td>River (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gated communities (2)</td>
<td>Waterfalls (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolyard (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square (1)</td>
<td>Beach (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Football fields (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home (3)</td>
<td>Street (11)</td>
<td>Countryside (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backyard (1)</td>
<td>Garden (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Verdeans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street (18)</td>
<td>Beach (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolyard (2)</td>
<td>Sea (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backyard (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the Cape Verdean respondents had spent their childhood in urban environments\(^{113}\), while for the Brazilians and Ukrainians, the proportion of those who lived either in cities or rural areas was more split. Some Ukrainians and Brazilians had lived in small rural villages and, a small number of participants from Brazil had been raised on farms\(^{114}\) outside the urban perimeter.

The respondents reported that they played mostly in outdoor spaces in their childhood. ‘Home’ was the only indoor space they mentioned during the interviews, and it was either their own homes or that of neighbours.

They also said that a range of built and natural outdoor spaces were very much part of their lives. For the respondents from all three immigrant communities, the ‘street’ was one of the most significant types of public open spaces. It was the ‘stage’ for most of their childhood adventures, bringing children together to play, especially for those who had lived either in a more urban environment or in a smaller village. Although given less weight, the ‘backyard’ was also mentioned by the three immigrant communities.

\(^{W3}\) – We used to play close to home; the streets’ pavements were very wide.

\(^{113}\) It is important to bear in mind the differences between the countries. A city/metropolis in Brazil or Ukraine is on a much larger scale than cities in Cape Verde.

\(^{114}\) ‘Fazendas’, ‘Roça’ and ‘sítios’ are usually the names given to this type of rural property.
Both Brazilians and Cape Verdeans mentioned the square and the schoolyard as other types of open space that they used as play meeting points when they were children. Recalling a specific of their own urban environment, some of the Brazilian participants mentioned having played in ‘gated communities’, as opposed to in public open spaces, such as the streets or squares.

A number of the respondents had spent their childhood in close contact with a natural environment, namely, the ‘farm’ for the Brazilian immigrants; and the ‘countryside’, ‘garden’ and ‘forest’ for the Ukrainians. When respondents described their childhood experiences of nature, their voices always had a wistful tone but also tones of delight when they described their full engagement with activities in natural settings, such as climbing trees, picking fruits, being in contact with animals and water (see Appendix 4).

---

115 ‘W’ refers to woman and ‘M’ to man. The number identifies the respondent, whose identity was kept anonymous.
W1 – I used to play in the middle of the woods because I lived surrounded by them. My favourite thing when I was a child was climbing trees. I remember I used to climb trees a lot, I used to climb with my cousins (…)

M2 – Yes, I also played on the farm. I was born on a farm, and there were trees and animals. Horses… I used to love to ride them. There were so many things to play with, it didn’t have limits.

W4 – My childhood was spent on a farm. It was close to agriculture (…)

W5 – I used to climb mango trees.

W6 – And guava trees.

(All the participants laughed and shook their heads, agreeing with each other)

W4 – I used to say to my daughters they didn’t have a childhood. I was the one who had a real childhood, I was very happy.

W2 – I think it is important to say that we grew up in different types of places. Some of us grew up in the city, others in the suburbs or in the countryside. For instance, I grew up in the suburbs; it was almost like a village. It was outdoors, in the fresh air. I played outdoors, close to fields… [there was] a big open area in front of the house. First of all, there were the fields, then the river, the forest. I grew up like this in the outdoors!

W2 – I used to play on the beach, of course, and sometimes in the square.

W4 – Yes, I was always on the beach (laughs).

Other vivid memories included: close contact with water, for example, the ‘sea’, ‘rivers’ or ‘waterfalls’. The geographic location in which the respondents grew up dictated the form of water they had been in contact with; hence, the ‘sea’ was a key memory for the Cape Verdeans.

W2 - I used to play on the beach, of course, and sometimes in the square.

W4 - Yes, I was always on the beach (laughs).

Although Brazil has a long coastline, just a few of the Brazilian immigrants used to live close to the beach and none of the Ukrainians had played in this environment. On the other hand, they had joyful and nostalgic memories of times when they had been close to rivers and waterfalls, which had allowed them either time for contemplation, or to enjoy active engagement with them.

W3 – I still remember. My parent’s home was nearby a river. Not a big river, but still a river. On the other side of the river there was a big forest. There was a small elevation of land close to the river and I used to lie down there. Sometimes there were household duties to be done, but I would just go to the river and I would lie down on this slope, and look at the sky, at the clouds, I would feel the water on my feet. And then… my mum would call: “where are you? What are you doing” (sighs)

M3 – (…) the waterfalls. You know what a waterfall is, don’t you? We used to climb up and then jump. It was just so good. But now… I cannot go back to the past, can I? My childhood was really good.

Gender differences between the participants were subtle. The most significant difference was related to playing football. This was a predominant male activity and different
types of outdoor spaces had made it easy for the men to enjoy this activity (streets and football fields). Women referred to activities such as ‘playing with dolls’.

---

M2 - For us, the boys, we used to play on the football pitches, you had public arenas, and we would go there to play.
W3 – The boys were always playing football (laughs).
M2 – We loved to play football! And my city was a small place, it was developing.
(...)
M3 – Yes, I also used to play football with my friends, but it could be anywhere, in the middle of the street...

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

6.3.1.2. Adult memories

The immigrants’ then moved on from discussing their childhood memories to how they used to spend their free time, and what type of leisure activities they had engaged in as young people and as adults. As the theory on leisure and recreation shows (see Chapter 4, section 4.3), it was particularly important in this part of the discussion to compare respondents’ views of what they did in their home country with their new type of life and the activities they experienced in the host country.

For the purpose of the analysis, the activities were organised into six different clusters (see Table 6:3 below).
## Table 6.3 - Activities which the three immigrant groups did in their home country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerts (3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinema(2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing music (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor cultural activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor shows (2)</td>
<td>Barbecues (12)</td>
<td>Going to the forest (10)</td>
<td>Going to the beach (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the beach(7)</td>
<td>Going to the river (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the countryside (3)</td>
<td>Going to the park (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Going for a walk in the square (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the park (3)</td>
<td>Barbecues (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Talking and gathering together in the street (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising and gathering together in the street (1)</td>
<td>Going for a walk (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walking (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going for a walk in the city (1)</td>
<td>Berry and mushroom picking (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking trails (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indoor social activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars(6)</td>
<td>Parties (1)</td>
<td>Parties (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday lunch with family (4)</td>
<td>Visiting friends (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dating(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing and parties (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing (2)</td>
<td>Football (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (5)</td>
<td>Swimming (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (4)</td>
<td>Fishing (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (2)</td>
<td>Playing sports (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the church (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching TV (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural activities

Cultural activities, such as going to the ‘cinema’, ‘theatre’, ‘shows’/‘concerts’ were common among the Brazilians and Ukrainian communities, particularly for the former group. They attended shows that took place outdoors and they regarded that also as a part of their recreation. Interestingly, none of the participants from Cape Verde mentioned doing cultural activities in their leisure time. However, differences in social class clearly marked participants’ involvement in cultural activities. While the Brazilian respondents in the focus group used terms such as ‘literary circles’, the cinema, concerts/shows, for the Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians, the principal form of cultural activity was going to concerts.

W3 – Oh my God! In Rio [de Janeiro] you had such an extraordinary number of outdoor shows on offer, it was amazing.

W6 - Yes, yes. That’s right. I would go to the cinema, I was more interested in the literary circles, but I also loved the
cinema and I would go to as many shows as possible, including those outdoors.

(Interview 1 with Brazilian participants)

W4 – Perhaps if a singer came to our village, we would go and watch the show.

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

- Outdoor and social outdoor activities

Engaging in outdoor activities was common and popular across the three different immigrant groups. Although some activities appear to be cross-cultural, aspects of outdoor space use seem to be influenced by specific cultural norms for each group. For example, Brazilian participants highlighted the importance of barbecues, not only as an activity that occurs outdoors to enjoy food, music and good weather, but which also allows them to spend time with family and friends – thus this activity has a strong social component to it. Although barbecues take place outdoors, in most cases, they are held in a private space (a backyard, or on top of a house’s flat roof (terrace)) and less frequently in public open spaces.

W2 - Usually we do it in the backyard. If people do not have a backyard they can also use the ‘laje’. Do you know what a ‘laje’ is?

M2 – Basically, it is a terrace. In S. Paulo, we used to rent houses like that: a small house with one bedroom, a living room and bathroom, and on top of the roof, that flat area is the ‘laje’. You can have a barbecue and you even can play music.

W2 - Well... a terrace is the posh version (everyone laughs).

W3 – When you build a house, you need space for a garage and to have a barbecue. It is very typical.

W2 – You can’t find a house without one. Lately, even flats will have an area for barbecues.

M2 – Having barbecues is something that we always do at the weekends.

(Interview 3 with Brazilian participants)

W2 – In my city we did not have a beach. On a Sunday we would make a barbecue outside and dance forró\(^{116}\).

W1 – Leisure for the poor in Brazil is like this: you go to your family’s home and have a barbecue.

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

\(^{116}\) A type of music and dance.
Barbecues were described vividly by the second and third Brazilian focus groups as very popular and lively events. The first Brazilian group, however, mentioned them much less frequently. Once again, when reviewing the respondents’ quotes, it became clear that having a barbecue was a more common activity among the poorer classes than in the participants in the first focus group (who belonged to a higher class). Given Brazil’s lengthy coastline, going to the beach was a very popular activity for immigrants living close to the coast. The Brazilian participants enjoyed other outdoor activities, including visits to the countryside, parks, walking in the city and going on nature trails.

W4 – For me, it was not always at the weekend, but we had a car…. It was not a new car, but we could still use it. We would go to the beach, we would fish... We would spend Saturday and Sunday all day, we would fish and we would take everything we needed to cook a ‘moqueca’117.

(The Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

The Ukrainian participants’ connection with nature in their leisure time was strong, expressed by them visiting the forest and perhaps having a barbecue when they were there, spending time in parks, or going to the river. Going to the forest allowed them to undertake a vast range of activities, such as: relaxing, having contact with water and nature, sunbathing, spending time with friends and family, having barbecues and picking mushrooms and berries. For some respondents, they described going to the river as an activity independent of ‘going to the forest’, but the distinction between the two was not always clear. Nevertheless, in their descriptions, the river was always associated with a natural or wooded environment.

117 Moqueca is a typical dish with fish and coconut milk.
W1 - In my free time, we go to the cinema, to a concert, and every Sunday we spend all our time in the forest, in the river, sunbathing.
W3 – Usually no one goes alone, we go with family.
W2 – Also with friends.
W1 – And you can see many other families who go there to stroll.
W2 – I would not say we go for a stroll. Sometimes, I arrange to go with some other friends to take our children, to have fun, to take them to the parks, and if we have time, to the river and the forest. But not every Sunday, because we have household duties. We only go to the river with one objective, to catch some sun to sunbathe and relax. It is not really to walk or stroll. All of nature is around us...
W5 – Our village has a forest. Usually during the summer we go to the forest to pick strawberries, other berries, mushrooms and we also like to barbecue meat in the forest. And the fresh air... oh... it is so nice. It is traditional for us to go to the forest.

(Interview 3 with Ukrainian participants)

Figure 6:2 – Ukrainian family in the forest by the river – Bila Tserkva, Ukraine (source: author)

For the Cape Verdean respondents, going to the beach was the most common outdoor activity. Although the beach was highly accessible to the majority of the population, there were differences between the generations. Gender differences existed in the group of respondents made up of older people; while men could go to the beach every day, women were more restricted in undertaking this activity. The respondents said that women would only go to the beach if they had permission from their parents. Even when they did, they would not go on a regular basis, just at the weekends. This variation was not pronounced among the younger generation, who seemed to use the beach on a more regular basis. As an alternative to the beach, the respondents would go for a walk and spend time in the city’s/village’s main square.
Brazilians and Cape Verdians mentioned they liked to spend time socialising and/or gathering with friends. These activities included using the streets to stop and chat with friends, to make the most of good weather or to relax. The Brazilians’ and Cape Verdians’ descriptions showed how important it was to them to socialise with friends. This contrasted with the Ukrainians. The Ukrainian group, apart from enjoying recreation in the forest and parks, said little about social activities undertaken outdoors.

- **Indoor social activities**

Going to parties was an activity common to all three immigrant groups. Brazilians also mentioned going to parties or spending time in bars during the evenings, or enjoying family gatherings on Sundays. Ukrainian participants also referred to enjoying visiting friends’ homes, in contrast with meeting friends in outdoor spaces other than parks and the forest, as mentioned above.
- **Sporting activities**

  In general, participants’ engagement in sport was mainly the preserve of the male respondents. Football was popular, in general, with the Brazilian and Cape Verdean participants, and fishing was part of Brazilian and Ukrainian participants’ recreational activities. However, participants from all social classes did mention football. ‘Swimming’, in the case of the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents, also meant swimming outdoors, either in the sea or in lakes and waterfalls, and Brazilian and Cape Verdean women mentioned swimming too.

- **Religious activities**

  Brazilian participants talked about the role of religion in their private lives. Going to church was described only by the Brazilian participants; the physical activity of going to a church was part, not only of their weekend routines but a meaningful, everyday activity, if they had time to incorporate it into their daily lives.

  W1 – At the weekend I would stay at home with my children, or I would go to my mum’s home. And… well, of course to church!
  W2 - Yes, the church!
  W3 – The church is not a leisure activity, it is something that is part of our ideals. It is something that inspires us, to have the Holy Spirit in our lives.

  [All the participants agreed, either by saying ‘yes’, or they showed affirmation by nodding their heads in agreement when their fellow participants were speaking]

  (Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

- **Passive activities**

  Spending time at home sleeping, or simply watching TV, were the two activities the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents mentioned respectively.

  6.3.1.3. **Barriers to recreation in the home country**

  Although the discussion around leisure activities was lively in all of the focus groups, most of the participants also revealed their reasons for not engaging in recreation more often. The key barriers for all three immigrant groups were lack of time, related either to work and/or the demands of family life.
Table 6.4 - Barriers to recreation in the home country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Recreation</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems (8)</td>
<td>Family duties (3)</td>
<td>Work (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of free time (5)</td>
<td>Work in agriculture (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence (5)</td>
<td>Work (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of green areas (2)</td>
<td>Expensive (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Brazilian participants presented more barriers than the other two immigrant groups. Financial problems were discussed at length by all three groups, highlighting how it affected their access to outdoor spaces and forced them to enjoy recreation in areas close to their home, or it compelled them to stay at home. Many respondents cited violence in the streets and other public spaces as a concern and in some cases, it influenced them to the extent they would not use certain spaces due to the crime levels associated with those areas.

W6 - On some weekends we didn’t go out because we had no money to pay the bus fare. And … there was nothing nearby, everything is far away.

(Interview 3 with Brazilian participants)

W2 - Squares are the same. In Belo Horizonte, there’s one marvellous [one], called Praça da Liberdade. But how can you go there? If you go and you’ll come out of there… you’ll arrive home naked because they steal even your tennis gear, your shoes, your underwear. If you have branded things… it’s even worse.”

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

W3 - I used to live in a rural area and we had little free time. We had a great deal of work to do planting vegetables and taking care of the animals, because we had a backyard near the house, with pigs… rabbits, ducks, chickens, everything.

(Interview 1 with Ukrainian participants)

6.3.2. Present situation – immigrants’ experiences in the host country and their relationship with public open spaces

6.3.2.1. Leisure activities

After the respondents described their major leisure and recreational patterns in Portugal, their contact with outdoor spaces and what their lives were like before they migrated, they were asked about their new lives. Specifically, what were their new recreational patterns? This part of the interview aimed to understand their engagement – if any - with outdoor activities in Portugal; any barriers that prevented them from engaging in these activities; and gave them the chance to discuss any other types of activities they were involved in.
Table 6.5 - Leisure activities in the host country\textsuperscript{119}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural activities</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going to cultural activities in the gardens (1)</td>
<td>Museum (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending cultural events (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking in the city (8)</td>
<td>Beach (7)</td>
<td>Walking in the city (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbecues (7)</td>
<td>Barbecues (4)</td>
<td>Beach (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (3)</td>
<td>Going for a walk (4)</td>
<td>Going for a walk (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going for a walk in the gardens (3)</td>
<td>Walking near the water (3)</td>
<td>Siting in an outdoor café (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking near the water (2)</td>
<td>Relaxing in the gardens (2)</td>
<td>Going for a walk in the gardens (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying down on the grass (2)</td>
<td>Taking pictures (2)</td>
<td>Taking children to play (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (1)</td>
<td>Going for a walk in the gardens (1)</td>
<td>Walking near the water (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating an ice cream (1)</td>
<td>Walking in forests (1)</td>
<td>Sunbathing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the water (1)</td>
<td>Eating an ice cream (1)</td>
<td>Picnic (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking trails (1)</td>
<td>Reading outdoors (1)</td>
<td>Eating an ice cream (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading outdoors (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (2)</td>
<td>Fishing (4)</td>
<td>Going to the gym (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor/ commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the shopping centre (2)</td>
<td>Going to the shopping centre (2)</td>
<td>Going to the shopping centre (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out for a meal (3)</td>
<td>Visiting friends (2)</td>
<td>Disco (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties (2)</td>
<td>Drinking coffee (2)</td>
<td>Parties (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking coffee (1)</td>
<td>Parties (1)</td>
<td>Association's activities (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties in the gardens (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bars (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting family and friends (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to church (8)</td>
<td>Going to church (2)</td>
<td>Going to church (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (4)</td>
<td>Resting (4)</td>
<td>Watching TV (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying at home (4)</td>
<td>Sleeping (2)</td>
<td>Staying at home (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafting (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resting (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the computer (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Cultural Activities**

Similar to their responses to questions about leisure activities in their home countries ( Appendix 4 provides a table with a summary of the types of place associated with the recreation patterns.\textsuperscript{119}
Table 6:3), the Brazilian and Ukrainian respondents described the types of cultural activities they enjoyed. The Ukrainians mentioned museums and cultural events in general, while the Brazilian respondents specifically mentioned attending cultural (musical) events that took place in gardens. However, the Cape Verdean respondents did not mention cultural activities at all.

- **Outdoor activities**

For all three immigrant groups, simply ‘going out for walk’, either in the city, in parks and gardens or close to water was their most common leisure activity. Walking, as an activity to discover and enjoy the city, was common to all three groups. Compared to the outdoor activities undertaken back home (Table 6:3), walking appeared to have become a more popular type of activity for all the respondents in Portugal. The Brazilians’ enjoyment of walking and their greater regularity in doing this activity may be because they felt much safer in Lisbon’s streets than back home.

Participants from Brazil and Cape Verde mentioned the pleasure they associated with walking in Lisbon’s city centre and still being able to feel connected, visually, with the River Tagus. However, when they referred specifically to ‘walking close to the water’ what they usually meant by that was going for a walk along the River Tagus\(^{120}\), or along the coastal walkways near to the sea. Respondents said they associated being close to water with feeling good and relaxed. Going for a walk in gardens\(^ {121}\) was also a common activity for all three immigrant communities, and when some parks and gardens also offered water features that allowed immigrants again, the chance to feel connected with water.

---

\(^ {120}\) Rio Tejo

\(^ {121}\) Some other activities were done also in parks and gardens, “going to the gardens” was coded as a separate activity since participants would mentioned it as part of ‘walking’.
Going to the beach was another activity common to all the immigrant groups. As opposed to walking, this is something that most people do in summer but the participants’ descriptions suggested they valued this activity highly. As described above (Table 6:3), for the Cape Verdeans when they were living back home, going to the beach was a common activity; it was one they fitted into their daily routine, but this tendency changed in Portugal. The temperature of the sea was significantly lower, inhibiting them from enjoying swimming in the sea, and access to the beach was not as easy as they were used to in Cape Verde. Conversely, for the Ukrainian participants, ‘going to the beach’ was a new activity. Gaining access to a beach is difficult in Ukraine however, because it is easier in Portugal, the Ukrainians use the beach on a more regular basis than they do back home. The Brazilian respondents did not refer often to going to the beach, but some said it was a ‘new’ activity for them. Although all three immigrant groups mentioned going to the beach, they each had different experiences of it.

For the Brazilian participants, having a barbecue in Portugal was still very important to them and they said how much they wanted to continue this activity. Few of the respondents had a backyard attached to their homes and just two public open spaces in Lisbon offer barbecue facilities so they were concerned about not having appropriate spaces in which to have barbecues.

All the respondents had other concerns, namely, that while trying to continue their traditions, they faced other barriers, such as cultural shocks in relation to Portugal’s norms.
One of the participants mentioned how embarrassed she felt when she tried to grill some food outside on her doorstep in the street; while another person mentioned having the police knock on their door because they were playing loud music. Despite this, whenever participants had the chance to have a barbecue, they described it with delight.

The Ukrainians said that in Portugal, they continued the tradition they had enjoyed back home of spending time in the forest or going outdoors and they took the opportunity to have barbecues, mainly in Monsanto (see Chapter 3), the city’s urban forest and at Praia do Guincho, a beach on Lisbon’s outskirts. They visited these two places for other recreational purposes, such as going for a walk or to enjoy nature, not just to have a ‘barbecue’, compared with the Brazilians who, when they wanted to have a barbecue, they focused solely on looking for a specific space outdoors that offered barbecue facilities.

Having a barbecue was not a popular activity for the Cape Verdeans, and having a meal outdoors - a picnic, which does not require as many facilities as a barbecue, was mentioned only by one participant.

| W1 – You have a barbecue, you put the music on and you already have the police knocking on your door! This has happened so many times. |
| W6 – But do you know where I go to have a barbecue? I go to Monsanto! It is great. I have all my barbecues there, when I want to meet with my friends. It is marvellous over there. You cannot have a barbecue in the flat, so we all go to Monsanto. I get there very early in the morning and put a bucket of water on top of the table to reserve my space. 6am and I’m already there. |
| W7 – I know, it is a marvellous place. |
| W6 – Also it is close…. and you can grill your sardines! |

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

| M3 – If we are allowed to have a fire, then we can have a barbecue. For example, in Monsanto, you cannot have barbeques during the summer[^2]. |

(Interview 1 with Ukrainian participants)

| M3 – We sometimes go to Guincho, [it] is very beautiful over there. We catch some sun... and if you want, you can also have a barbecue. |

(Interview 2 with Ukrainian participants)

In terms of other outdoor activities that involved eating, respondents in all three immigrant groups mentioned other low-key activities, such as ‘eating an ice-cream’ while enjoying outdoor spaces. They also mentioned other outdoor activities that fostered relaxation, such as: sunbathing, reading outdoors, or simply lying down on the grass.

[^2]: Most summers, Portugal’s forests are devastated by fire. The high temperatures and dryness are ideal conditions for fire. Therefore all members of the public are asked not to make them.
Most of the respondents visited outdoor spaces either alone or with friends of the same nationality or with family members.

- **Sport activities**

In all three groups, the participants seemed to engage less in sport than they had done in their home country. Swimming was still one of the Brazilian participants’ favourite sporting activities; however, none of the Cape Verdean participants mentioned it. As one respondent mentioned previously, the temperature of the water did not encourage them to swim in the sea. Fishing is an activity the Ukrainians did back home and they do it in Portugal but not so the Brazilians. Football, which was an important activity back home for male respondents from Cape Verde and Brazil, was not mentioned.

- **Indoor/commercial activities**

Shopping and going to a shopping centre was not described as part of participants’ leisure and recreation activities back home, but it seemed to be embedded into their new recreational patterns. As discussed in Chapter 3 (section 0), shopping centres have become a very popular type of place in which to spend leisure time. They attract a variety of users and they present a challenge to greater use of outdoor spaces. What seemed to appeal to the participants was the shopping centres’ atmosphere, that is, they had many people, there was much movement and different activities occurring simultaneously.

| W6 – My age is becoming an issue for me. I like to walk... the shopping centres are a good place to do that. Colombo is the one which attracts a higher number of immigrants... and there are lots of amusements. |
| W4 – It is a very beautiful place. |
| W6 – Yes, it offers many things. The Amoreiras shopping centre does not have anything, and Vasco da Gama... well, I think there is something missing... it should have more... more recreational opportunities. |

(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

| M1 – I like to go to Colombo. I usually joke that if you do not go to Colombo, you are not Ukrainian (all the participants laughed). |
| W5 – I love to go to Vasco da Gama, all that buzzy atmosphere, being in the middle of all that movement and people. |

(Interview 1 with Cape Verdean participants)

In addition, Brazilian participants mentioned that shopping centres in Brazil were not accessible to people from poorer classes; they referred to how expensive things are, such as having a meal in McDonald’s. A visit to a shopping centre in Brazil was seen as a treat, while in Portugal, visiting a shopping centre was an activity they could enjoy regularly.

| W6 – Back home, we can’t afford to go to the shopping centre. Everything is so expensive! It’s not allowed (laughs). |
| W2 – Having lunch, or even a snack in the shopping centre is very expensive. |
| W6 – For us, going to the shopping centre to eat at MacDonald’s... it only happens at the end of the year when you... |
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### Social activities

For the Brazilian participants, social activities were many and quite diverse, such as having parties in the gardens to celebrate birthdays, or going out for a meal. Going out for a coffee, which is a culturally-embedded Portuguese practice, was mentioned by the Brazilian and Ukrainian participants. They described it as a new type of activity (see the comparison with the description under social activities by a Ukrainian participant, section 6.3.1.2). Some Ukrainian participants continued to visit their friends in Portugal, just as they used to do back home. Cape Verdeans also referred to visiting not only friends, but family as well, which was possibly a reflection of their longer migration history and patterns than the Brazilians and Ukrainians (see Chapters 1 and 2).

W2 - I also like to go out for a coffee.
W4 - Oh... coffee (laughs.)

(W Interview 3 with Ukrainian participants)

W4 – I always wonder about going for coffee outdoors. You ask for a coffee and you stay there for hours chatting... In Brazil you do not do that, do you? Because you are occupying the table for a long time. So I found that I could stay there longer and not feel ashamed. I drink the coffee very slowly (laughs).

(W Interview 1 with Brazilian participants)

### Religious activities

Brazilians were the only group who mentioned going to church (see section 6.3.1.2) and they continued to do so in Portugal. Going to church also became a new activity for a small number of participants from Cape Verde and Ukraine.

### Passive activities

From the focus-group discussions, passive activities were common and more frequent among all three groups than in their home countries. They all referred to needing to rest from their demanding jobs. Spending time at home, sleeping, resting, watching TV, and reading offered respondents in all three immigrant groups the chance to relax from their hard working lives.

W7 – I work as a waitress in restaurants. I only have Sundays off, so I usually sleep, because I don’t sleep much during the other days.

(W Interview 1 with Brazilian participants)

W2 – Sometimes, in my free time I just want to lie down and not move.

W4 – Yes, that is true. We are tired because we work so hard.
6.3.2.2. **Favourite places**

This section aimed to establish immigrants' favourite open spaces in Lisbon, and to understand the particular characteristics that made them special.

For the purpose of this analysis, all the spaces mentioned during the interviews were divided into:

- Urban built spaces - neighbourhoods, plazas, markets, ‘miradouros’\(^{123}\), waterfronts, cultural and commercial;
- Green spaces – gardens, parks, urban forest;
- Natural – beach, coastal areas, forests;
- Urban built spaces.

Table 6.6 - Favourite urban spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhoods</th>
<th>Plazas</th>
<th>Markets</th>
<th>Miradouros</th>
<th>Waterfronts</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazilians</strong></td>
<td>Bairro alto (3)</td>
<td>Praça do Comércio (1)</td>
<td>Markets (5)</td>
<td>Adamastor (1)</td>
<td>Beira Tejo (3)</td>
<td>Museums CCB (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bica (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfama (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baixa chiado (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainians</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Markets (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Paredão (1)</td>
<td>Oceânário (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Verdeans</strong></td>
<td>Baixa chiado (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adamastor (2)</td>
<td>Beira Tejo (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bairro alto (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfama (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents in the three immigrant groups reported they had several different favourite places in, and around, Lisbon. Although the question was intended initially to let the respondents focus on public open spaces, other spaces, such as cultural places and shopping centres were included in the discussion. The respondents’ references to shopping centres as among their favourite places, and the suggested growing importance of them in Portuguese society (see Chapter 3, section 0) led, therefore to this category of space being included in the analysis and results. The fact that shopping centres were not simply part of immigrants’ leisure

\(^{123}\) ‘Miradouros’ are typical Portuguese places. They are located on top of hills, overlooking the city, and function as sightseeing points.
and recreation patterns but that Cape Verdean respondents referred to them as one of their favourite places seems to point to their growing importance. The main characteristics the respondents identified as the features that make them attractive are discussed above (see section 6.3.2.1).

Even though a discussion of cultural places (museums) was out with the scope of this research, it seems worthwhile including them in the findings since the respondents showed positive emotions when they were describing them as being among their favourite places.

Brazilian and Cape Verdean participants were more likely to prefer built environments such as some neighbourhoods and ‘miradouros’. These typical, historic neighbourhoods in Lisbon’s city centre often include Portuguese cultural landmarks and some respondents admired them, not only for their physical characteristics, such as the architecture, but also for the number of people who used them and the liveliness of the streets. ‘Miradouros’ also gave respondents the opportunity to relax, enjoy the views over the city and the river and to observe people in these spaces (see Figure 6:3).

Figure 6:3 - Miradouro de Santa Catarina – Adamastor (source: Flickr by Jan Cruchfield)

W5 – I like to stop and see what is going on around me. I love to go to Adamastor on a Sunday. I like to sit there, enjoying the views and watching all the crazy people. (...) That is something I say to my friends back home... I think I have discovered the joy of public spaces – it is to enjoy the life on the streets... in the city.

(Interview 1 with Brazilian participants)

All three immigrant groups included the waterfront walkways which allowed them to be close to water, either near the River Tagus or the sea, among their favourite places in Lisbon; they described them as beautiful places that allowed time to relax. One Brazilian suggested that the positive aspect of these spaces was because they offered social
interaction between users of different ages. In addition, they provided the opportunity to engage in different types of activities, either relaxing or more physically demanding types, such as sports.

W3 – When I have time, I go to Paredão for a walk. I sit there watching the sun go down, where the sea meets the sky. You just want to stay there looking at it...  
(Interview 2 with Ukrainian participants)

W1 – Walking along the river, it is such a beautiful place. All the water...  
W4 – But do you know what I like the most? There are people who go there to read the newspaper, to run... it is exactly what I appreciate, there are all sorts of people! People from different places, with different styles, of different ages, from the elderly... on their own... babies...everyone seems so relaxed. You see so many men in their shorts doing sit ups and everything else. It is such an amazing place.  
(Interview 1 with Brazilian participants)

Other public open spaces such as the plazas were not on the list of favourite places, with one exception, Praça do Comércio (see Chapter 3, section 3.6.1), which has very strong architectural characteristics and it faces the River Tagus. Participants from Brazil and Ukraine also mentioned outdoor markets. For these participants, these spaces were important because they offered the chance to see and encounter people, to engage in transactions and negotiate and to eat special foods.

- Green and natural spaces

Table 6:7 - Favourite natural and green spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Beach</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Gardens</th>
<th>Parks</th>
<th>Urban Forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beach (5)</td>
<td>Sintra (2)</td>
<td>Belém (2)</td>
<td>Expo (4)</td>
<td>P. Eduardo VI (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guincho (3)</td>
<td>Estoril (1)</td>
<td>Jardim da Estrela (2)</td>
<td>Qt. das Conchas (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linha (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa da Catarica (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (4)</td>
<td>Costa da Catarica (4)</td>
<td>Belém (11)</td>
<td>Expo (5)</td>
<td>Monsanto (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linha (3)</td>
<td>Sintra (1)</td>
<td>Jardim da Estrela (3)</td>
<td>Qt. das Conchas (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principe real (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beaches were mentioned as one of the participants’ favourite places. They are all located within Lisbon’s metropolitan area and Portuguese people enjoy them too in summer, when they are heavily used. Participants used words such as ‘beautiful’, ‘peace’, the ‘sea’, the ‘bars’\textsuperscript{124} and ‘sunbathing’, to illustrate the attributes and activities that made the beach their favourite place. Although all the immigrant groups enjoyed the beaches, they were more important to the Brazilian and Ukrainian respondents; they mentioned more names of beaches and described them with greater enthusiasm than the Cape Verdeans.

\begin{quote}
W6 - Oh! Costa da Caparica beach is beautiful... all that sea! I just love it.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{beach.jpg}
\caption{Costa da Caparica Beach on a Saturday day in June (source: author)}
\end{figure}

Only the Ukrainians mentioned forests (which are outside Lisbon’s urban boundaries) as one of their favourite places. Monsanto (an urban forest), located closer to Lisbon’s city centre, was another favourite place for Ukrainians and also Brazilians. The reason they said it was a favourite place was because it offers scope to have a barbecue.

\textsuperscript{124} All the beaches mentioned have bars which sell drinks, ice-cream and food, and play music on the esplanade, which has tables and chairs and overlooks the beach. The bars also offer toilet facilities.
All the respondents described a considerable number of parks and gardens as being among their favourite places. From the list, two spaces stand out as favourites for all the immigrant groups: Belem’s garden and Expo\textsuperscript{125}. These are two of the most important green spaces in Lisbon and both have unique characteristics, such as greenery and their closeness to the river. Expo is a modern park, while Belém is surrounded by historic buildings. The respondents discussed why those were their favourite places but they did not all agree about their respective merits and different arguments arose, which helped to understand their perceptions of and preferences for the two places.

\begin{quote}
W5 – I like to go to Expo in the evening … (laughs) it has lots of bars!! (laughs)
W3 - Expo… it’s a place like this… it’s marvellous to go for a walk at the weekend. It’s nice to go on the cable car, or just stay sitting there … it’s so peaceful.

\textit{(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)}

W2 - In Expo, everything is done so well… I don’t know… it is. (...) It makes you feel well. I think the river also helps to calm down people’s souls… and everything is very tidy.

\textit{(Interview 3 with Ukrainian participants)}

W3 - We go to the outdoor cafés. They also have very beautiful outdoor cafés. We like to sit and look at the river... see the river… I really enjoy looking at the water.

\textit{(Interview 1 with Cape Verdean participants)}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{125} The official name is Parque das Nações, however, people refer to it as Expo, since it was the place for the exhibition in 1998.
All the respondents had different views on what makes an outdoor space special. The dichotomy between a place being lively, with different facilities and where it offers social interaction possibilities versus tranquillity was a particularly interesting finding. All the respondents were encouraged to describe why particular venues were their favourite spaces. Table 6:8 presents a summary of the characteristics all the respondents appreciated in their favourite green spaces.

Table 6:8 - Characteristics of green spaces in Lisbon that the respondents in the three immigrant groups particularly appreciate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Spaces</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families and children (6)</td>
<td>Green (4)</td>
<td>Green (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (5)</td>
<td>Monuments and architecture (2)</td>
<td>Water (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty (5)</td>
<td>River’s proximity (2)</td>
<td>Bars and outdoor cafés (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbecues (4)</td>
<td>Good design (2)</td>
<td>Trees (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (4)</td>
<td>Different types of gardens (1)</td>
<td>Openness and scale (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of people and activities (3)</td>
<td>Pine trees (1)</td>
<td>Animals(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexible (2)</td>
<td>Silence (1)</td>
<td>Distance (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosy (2)</td>
<td>Animals(1)</td>
<td>Features (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monuments (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed to make a noise (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for children (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get together with other Brazilians (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranquillity (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See the cruises (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three immigrant groups particularly appreciated physical attributes such as the presence of, or proximity to, water and the existence of green elements such as trees, or simply the presence of ‘greenery’. Not only were these attributes important to the participants per se, but the conjunction of water and green elements had a therapeutic value for them; it encouraged feelings of wellbeing and made them think of ‘beauty’.
The respondents’ comments revealed cultural differences. The Ukrainians’ descriptions were more focused on the ‘natural’ appearance of places, or a connection with nature (trees and animals), and they acknowledged too the surrounding architecture and the space’s design. The Brazilians and Cape Verdeans valued those aspects but also the presence of people and social interaction possibilities. These latter two groups cherished other features such as outdoor cafés and bars which supported their social activities. Brazilian participants also valued being able to continue doing activities they had enjoyed in their home country, even if infrequently, such as having barbecues. Despite the fact that spaces had the potential for users to engage in lively activities or to make a noise, Brazilians also regarded tranquillity as a positive characteristic.

### Ideal public open spaces

All the respondents were asked more about their perceptions and preferences, and if they could describe what attributes and features their ideal public open space would have.

#### Table 6.9 - Description of what an ideal place would have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Sea (10)</td>
<td>Sea (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of water</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Big open spaces (3)</td>
<td>Green (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Trees (3)</td>
<td>Light sun (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Shade (1)</td>
<td>Fresh air (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Tranquillity (1)</td>
<td>Music (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut trees</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Good weather (2)</td>
<td>Beach (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Presence of water (2)</td>
<td>Warm (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Rivers (2)</td>
<td>Big open spaces (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Blue sky (1)</td>
<td>People (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside (1)</td>
<td>Presence of water (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again, all three groups had a preference for water and green elements such as trees and plants, or just the general description of ‘green’. The respondents from Cape Verde and Ukraine clearly saw a difference between the ‘sea’ and the presence of water (it was unspecified what type of water - river, pond, lake, fountain, etc.). Cape Verdeans’ preference for the ‘sea’ is understandable, given their close cultural connection with it, however, Ukrainians, who had little contact with the sea in their home country, also referred to it. Brazilians, as well, made a distinction between the general presence of water and its other manifestations such as lagoons and waterfalls, which were mentioned while describing the places and activities they enjoyed back home.

For the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians, there was a consistent dichotomy between their preference for environments with natural characteristics that they associated with relaxation, and their preference for the presence of movement, people and bars. It was the inclusion of all these characteristics that made these places special for them.

Cape Verdeans and Brazilians preferred hearing music in public open spaces. They made a number of references to music during the interviews, mainly associated either with having a barbecue (in the Brazilians’ case), or with bars and amusements (in the Cape Verdeans). Its importance as an independent element of outdoor spaces, appreciated per se, was only noticed in the focus group conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big open spaces</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue sky</td>
<td>Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural events</td>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense trees</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td>Guincho126</td>
<td>Rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon</td>
<td>Horizon sunset</td>
<td>Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunlight</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W3 - It has to have water nearby... maybe a lagoon.  
(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

H2 – For me, it would be a place with rocks, trees and the sea.  
(Interview 1 with Cape Verdean participants)

W1 - The sea! Also the fresh air...air... looking at the horizon.  
(Interview 3 with Ukrainian participants)

126 Name of a beach close to Lisbon.
All the respondents referred to other characteristics such as enjoying a comfortable climate (shade, warmth, sun) as being aspects that made up their ideal place. One uncommon characteristic that one respondent mentioned was work, however, the research did not explore this preference fully. It may be that work was a main priority for this respondent and only once it was completed, could they appreciate the space.

6.3.3. Barriers to the use of public open spaces

6.3.3.1. Reasons for infrequent use of the outdoors

Participants mentioned that although they would visit outdoor spaces, they did so infrequently.

Table 6.10 - Reasons for infrequent use of outdoor spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time (11)</td>
<td>Lack of time (7)</td>
<td>Lack of time (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to adapt - don't know many places (6)</td>
<td>Tiredness (5)</td>
<td>Tiredness (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiredness (4)</td>
<td>Lack of public spaces (1)</td>
<td>Lack of good public transport (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid to be caught by police (2)</td>
<td>Lack of good public transport (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't like to go alone (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three immigrant groups cited lack of time and general tiredness as the main reasons for not going often to outdoor places. The Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians also mentioned having limited access to outdoor places. As mentioned in Chapter 3 (section 3.5.1), immigrants from these two communities live outside the city centre, therefore, if they want to go to the main green spaces, beaches and other places, they have to use public transport.

The Brazilian participants also said that their immigrant status and the time they had lived in Portugal influenced their frequency of use of outdoor spaces. Being in the country illegally increased participants’ fear of being caught by the police and they might run the risk of being deported. Consequently, this affected which places they chose to visit, and they avoided heavily policed places. The short length of time some immigrants had been in the country and
the little free time they had after work seemed to affect their discovery of the city and its surrounding public open spaces.

**W2 -** Free time is rare. We hardly have it... we have to study. I don't know... we need to give attention to our children because... poor them... they also need it. Well... from time to time there is a cultural programme.

(I Interview 3 with Ukrainian participants)

**W4 -** I worked very hard there (Ukraine), I never stopped. But here... I've never worked so much in my life.

(I Interview 2 with Ukrainian participants)

**W3 -** Weekends are a time to rest. I have only visited Sesimbra, because my boss went there and I went with her, and Estrela's Garden. Those are the only two places I know.

(I Interview 3 with Brazilian participants)

**M1 -** You are always afraid. Because when you go... for instance, to the zoo, the vans (police vans) leave full of people that the police have grabbed and taken away. Every place we go to is like this: if there's police around, we don't go.

(I Interview 3 with Brazilian participants)

**6.3.3.2. Perceptions of safety**

As described in the literature (Chapter 4, section 4.5.4), perceived safety was likely to influence ethnic minorities' use of outdoor spaces. However, in the focus group interviews, perceived safety in the host country was never a topic of discussion. When all the respondents were asked how safe they felt, they all said they felt safe. According to the Brazilian respondents, they had faced higher levels of violence in their everyday life in Brazil (see 6.3.1.3), therefore, safety in the host country was not of much concern. The Ukrainian participants also drew comparisons with lower levels of safety in their home country. Even though many Cape Verdeans lived in deprived neighbourhoods in Lisbon (see Chapter 3), they reported feeling safer in those places.

**W4 -** Violence is coming (to Portugal). But, here, we still feel very safe. Sometimes I have a nap in Belém. I put my bag under my head and sleep a little bit. But if this was in Brazil... (laughs)

W3- They would cut your head!!

W1- And take your bag!!

(I Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)

**W4 -** Portugal is quieter. Ukraine is a country which is a little bit more nervous... you have to think about life.

(I Interview 2 with Ukrainian participants)

**W3 -** I live in Amadora district and people say it is dangerous because of other neighbourhoods such as Amadora and Buraca and those places, but nothing has ever happened to me since I've been here.

(I Interview 3 with Cape Verdean participants)

**6.3.3.3. Cultural barriers**

Throughout the discussions, the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents gave examples of conflicts arising over their behaviour because it clashed with the culturally
accepted norms in Lisbon. All the respondents felt that the main restriction were being free to express themselves and being able to listen to loud music and ‘make a noise’. On the other hand, the Ukrainians, who did not always agree with Portuguese norms and values, appeared to try to follow the new cultural norms.

W1 – At the beach.
W2 – The beach especially is a space which should have more bars, there should be more freedom to be in that space, to play football near the sea, to feel free…
W1 – And when we make a little bit of noise…
W2 – No! You can’t make noise!
W1 – Everyone looks at you…
M1 – You can’t have loud music playing in the car. It is difficult to use the spaces. In Brazil the disco business is not doing well anymore. Each person who has a good car installs a sound system, which is even louder than the disco. Then, he goes to a space, opens the car’s doors and everyone starts to drink and you already have a party.

(IInterview 3 with Brazilian participants)

W1 – We like the noise!
M1 – We like to move!
W2 – We like to express ourselves, what we are feeling. But them [the Portuguese], no!! They do not show emotions and when they see us expressing ourselves and setting ourselves free… it looks like… I don’t know…

(IInterview 3 with Cape Verdean participants)

H2 - You arrive in our country, there also rules that you don’t like. And you can’t even say that. We need to become… we need to get used to becoming Portuguese.

(IInterview 1 with Ukrainian participants)

The quotations above show how the Brazilians felt restricted in expressing themselves freely in Portuguese public spaces (e.g. listening to loud music). This raises questions about cultural differences between immigrant communities and the host population. Moreover, immigrants were unlikely to engage in activities with the local population. They either visited outdoor spaces with people from their own home country or visited places where they could see people of their own nationality, or just by going around their own well established cultural groups. However, the respondents felt that the native population was not always welcoming and open to interacting with them.

W2 - I believe that a Cape Verdean here in Portugal, feels very close to his culture. If you want to dance, you have a disco; if you want to speak, you have people that speak your language; if you want to eat, you have a restaurant; if you want to listen to music, you have places. He’s very close to his culture.

(IInterview 2 with Cape Verdean participants)

W7 - Here, I also find it difficult. I think the Portuguese don’t mix very much with the Brazilians. In terms of friendship, for instance … a Portuguese and a Brazilian friend, it is hard.

(IInterview 2 with Brazilian participants)
6.3.4. **Elements from the home country that the respondents missed**

All the respondents made comparisons continuously between the two environments (home and host), and referred to the elements they missed the most.

**Table 6:11 - Elements that participants missed in outdoor spaces in the host country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathering together and socialising (4)</td>
<td>Green (3)</td>
<td>Sea (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human side (3)</td>
<td>Children playing outside (2)</td>
<td>Gathering together and socialising (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The barbecue (3)</td>
<td>Open spaces (2)</td>
<td>Flora (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking in bare feet (3)</td>
<td>Nature (2)</td>
<td>Human side (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness (2)</td>
<td>Fishing in the rivers (1)</td>
<td>Beach (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate (2)</td>
<td>Flora (1)</td>
<td>Walking in bare feet (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling free (1)</td>
<td>Landscapes (1)</td>
<td>Climate (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rock, soil (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvising (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horizon (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting outside (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They all missed many diverse attributes they had enjoyed in the home country’s outdoor environment. The Brazilian respondents missed mainly the social aspect and having barbecues, and other things such as feeling happy, feeling free and being spontaneous. Spontaneity and freedom may be related to having the chance to do different activities (see Table 6:8), though what participants meant by ‘happiness’ was not truly made clear. The Ukrainian participants emphasised how they missed their home environment’s greenness, contact with nature and other natural elements, and they cited the lack of opportunities for children to play outdoors. The Cape Verdean respondents struck a middle ground between the other two groups, missing the social side and contact with the sea, the beach and natural elements, such as the rocky and dry landscape and the soil. Cape Verdeans and Brazilians mentioned missing one unusual thing, being able to walk in their bare feet.

*W1 - Because we have so much green in the Ukraine, we kind of are used to it... but here, we miss it.*

*(Interview 1 with Ukrainian participants)*

*W2 - I miss walking in my bare feet. I like to step outside the house, feel the soil because... the streets do not have pavements like here...I like to walk along to street to the bakers, to my neighbour’s home.*

*(Interview 2 with Brazilian participants)*

*M3 – I miss the rocks. The brown colours, the naked rocks.*

*(Interview 2 with Cape Verdean participants)*
6.3.5. Aspect of outdoor space in Portugal which reminded the participants of home

In an attempt to explore further the role of memory, all three immigrant groups were asked if there were any elements in Portugal which evoked memories of outdoor places back home.

Table 6:12 - Elements which reminded the respondents of their home country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Brazilians</th>
<th>Ukrainians</th>
<th>Cape Verdeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Willow (5)</td>
<td>Damaia and Buraca (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Pine trees (4)</td>
<td>Seeing other Cape Verdeans (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Calçada”</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Stone (3)</td>
<td>Architecture (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Trees (3)</td>
<td>Houses and neighbourhood (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Paredão”</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Architecture (2)</td>
<td>Music (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beach</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Forest (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar with Brazilian music</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Green (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor cafés</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Flora (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Urban fabric (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sea</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all three immigrant groups, architecture was a physical element which evoked memories for them. Both Brazilians and Cape Verdeans mentioned the colonial architecture, while Ukrainians referred to the architecture of older (historical) buildings, especially when comparing Lisbon with the Ukrainian city of Lviv (the respondents’ home city).

For Cape Verdeans, the built environment, especially neighbourhoods such as Damaia and Buraca which have a high percentage of immigrants from Cape Verde, were the main memory triggers, while only the Brazilians and Ukrainians mentioned natural elements as the elements which evoked memories for them. Once again, music was cited as being particularly important for Brazilians and Cape Verdeans, evoking memories of their previous lives in the home country.

Although they were all able to list aspects which would trigger memories of home, they were not particularly nostalgic about them.

6.4. Summary

The focus groups allowed me to engage, for the first time, with the immigrant groups. Throughout the discussions, the different opinions and narratives revealed cultural influences
(immigrants’ respective cultural backgrounds and values) in terms of their perceptions and use of public open spaces. However, the focus-group discussion also offered insight into some common ground for the three groups.

- **Past experiences**

  For the majority of the respondents, outdoor spaces played a significant role in their childhood. The street was one of the most used types of public open space that was common to all three immigrant groups, suggesting its cross-cultural significance. The street was the meeting point where children interacted and played different games. Those respondents, especially from the Ukraine and Brazil, who lived in rural areas or suburbs in their home countries had close contact with natural elements such as water and trees. Cape Verdeans, apart from playing on the street, also spent much of their childhood at the beach.

  As adults, differences and similarities became apparent between the three nationalities’ respective leisure and recreation patterns in the home versus the host country. Cultural activities appear to have played an important role in the Brazilian and Ukrainian participants’ lives, but little for the Cape Verdeans. Social activities seem to be particularly important to the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians. Gathering with others, having parties, and family meals were more common among the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans than the Ukrainians. This suggests they attach a different importance to such activities. Other activities, such as sports, were more common among the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents than for the Ukrainians. The Brazilians liked going to church and it was particularly important to them.

  All the respondents’ respective engagement with the outdoor environment reflected the characteristics of their own country and its norms and cultural values. For the Brazilians, having a barbecue was a common type of activity, offering them the chance to socialise. On the other hand, barbecues were also part of Ukrainians’ recreation, however, they implied that it was secondary to the key activity, namely, visiting the forest, which is one of the most important outdoor spaces for them. It offers them the chance to enjoy contact with nature and water, as well as to socialise with friends and family. For the Cape Verdeans, spending time at the beach was a major recreation and is something that is deeply culturally engrained. Visiting green spaces in the cities or villages, such as parks and gardens, was only a part of Brazilians’ and Ukrainians’ recreation. Walking, potentially another cross-cultural activity, revealed differences between the three nationalities in terms of the type of space where they liked to walk. The use of outdoor spaces for socialising was common to all groups; however, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians were more likely to use the built environment, such as streets.
and squares, to meet their friends. Social class appeared to be particularly relevant in explaining the differences in recreation patterns among the Brazilian participants, but not among the other groups.

All the respondents acknowledged the barriers to recreation in the host country. Lack of free time was common to all three immigrant groups. The Brazilian participants, though, described also how their financial situation and violence in outdoor places affected their recreational habits and patterns.

- **Immigrants’ experiences in the host country: recreational patterns**

  As suggested in the literature (see Chapter 4), the new environment and circumstances allowed activities previously undertaken back home to continue but it inhibited others, or even offered new opportunities. The respondents’ leisure and recreational patterns in the host country varied across the three immigrant communities.

  In their engagement with the outdoor environment, the Brazilians continued to attempt to have barbecues in outdoor places around the city. However, participants’ accommodation, with no access to the outdoors, the lack of facilities in open public spaces and different cultural traditions when using such spaces inhibited them from having barbecues as often as they used to in their home countries. Cape Verdeans continued to go to the beach but less frequently. For the Ukrainian migrants, visits to forests became less common than they had enjoyed back home but they continued to have barbecues on their visits to natural environments whenever possible.

  For some Ukrainians, visiting the beach was a novel activity as well as for some of the Brazilian participants. Going for coffee, which is very much an activity embedded in Portuguese social life, was mentioned only by Brazilian and Ukrainian participants.

  With regard to more passive activities (resting, watching TV, sleeping), all the respondents seemed to be less physically active than they had been back home. Also, their engagement in social activities appeared to have decreased. Among social activities, having or going to parties were common to all three groups. For all three immigrant groups, cultural activities in Lisbon remained relatively stable when compared with past patterns in their home countries.

- **Immigrants’ favourite places in the host country**

  Immigrants’ favourite places revealed commonalities and differences across the three immigrant groups. Brazilians had the widest range of favourite places; they were spread across various types of places, and suggest their preference for variety. Ukrainians’ favourite
places, were mostly natural and green spaces, with few references to the urban built environment, demonstrating their preference for close links with nature. Occupying the middle ground, Cape Verdeans preferred places either with urban characteristics, or green and natural, such as the beach and parks and gardens.

Within urban spaces, waterfront promenades were a favourite place, common to all immigrant groups. Brazilians and Cape Verdeans revealed their preference for neighbourhoods and ‘miradouros’.

With regard to natural spaces, all groups considered the ‘beach’ a favourite outdoor/natural space. In particular, they cited most of the beaches around Lisbon as favourite places and thus demonstrated the importance of this outdoor/natural space in their lives. On the other hand, only the Ukrainians mentioned a forest close to Lisbon as a favourite place, thus showing their deep connection with the ‘forest’ as a natural setting, possibly due to their familiarity with this type of environment in their home country.

All groups showed their appreciation of parks and gardens (although not all groups felt the same for Monsanto, an urban forest). Belém’s garden and Parque das Nações park (Expo) were cited the most and commonly appreciated by all three immigrant groups.

- **Preferred attributes of space**

  The presence of or closeness to water and a place’s greenness were attributes valued by all three groups, suggesting their cross-cultural importance. Spaces with water, however, were categorised in ways intrinsic to each nationality, with the exception of the Ukrainian respondents for whom the sea gained an extraordinary importance once they were living in Portugal.

  Music as a part of the outdoor environment was particularly important for the Brazilian and Cape Verdean participants.

  There was a divergence of opinion between lively environments versus peaceful ones (associated with the presence of natural elements). The Ukrainians preferred tranquil places, while Cape Verdeans and Brazilians appreciated both environments.

- **Barriers to the use of public open spaces**

  Lack of time and feeling tired were mentioned by the three immigrant groups as the main reasons for not using public open spaces more often. The poor public transportation system was another barrier, especially for those living in Lisbon’s outskirts (Cape Verdeans and some Ukrainians). Interestingly, among the Brazilians, what influenced their visits to
outdoor spaces depended on their immigrant status - if they were an illegal immigrant and the length of time they had been in the country, this had a negative impact on their frequency of use.

Generally, immigrants felt safe in most places in the city and safety was not seen as an issue that had an impact on the use of outdoor spaces.

For the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents, the different cultural values and norms in Portugal, and how one should behave outdoors were cited and it accounts for some of the clashes with the native population.

- **Missed elements**

  Brazilians and Cape Verdeans missed the social component of outdoor spaces, especially being able to gather together to socialise with their peers. Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians missed the beach and contact with green spaces respectively. Although Cape Verdeans continued to go to the beach, their relationship with it suggests it was different, possibly influenced by social factors which are out with the scope of this research. In addition, other influences were some of the barriers described above and the physical characteristics of the Portuguese beaches.

  Even though throughout the interviews contact with nature seemed more relevant to Ukrainians as part of their leisure activities, it was interesting to note how Cape Verdeans and Brazilians mentioned missing nature in their daily lives, such as walking in their bare feet to feel the soil.

- **Elements which triggered memories**

  Some elements of Portuguese public open spaces were able to trigger memories from home, however, this did not appear to be of great significance in making connections with respondents’ present lives and what they had left behind.

  As mentioned in the methodology chapter (see Chapter 5), the focus groups served to uncover the topics that were very important to the respondents from all three immigrant groups. The themes that arose from the focus group discussions framed the subsequent questionnaire. The next chapter describes the findings of the questionnaire, the design of which was based upon the main focus-group findings described in this chapter.
Chapter 7: Findings from the questionnaires: understanding the use of public open spaces

7.1. Introduction

The findings of the focus groups, described in the previous chapter, shed some light on immigrants’ experiences of public open space and served as the basis for the design of the questionnaire. This chapter describes the findings from the questionnaires which were designed to explore immigrants’ uses, perceptions and preferences of public open space in Lisbon. Firstly, there is a descriptive analysis, followed by a summary of the variations based on demographic characteristics and finally, some regressions are presented to predict the relations between variables.

As explained in Chapter 5 (section 5.5.1), ‘facet theory’ was applied when designing the questionnaires, based on the information gathered during the focus group sessions.

Table 7.1 - Summary of the main issues raised by the focus group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of place</th>
<th>Physical attributes of spaces</th>
<th>Activities that occur in public open spaces</th>
<th>Immigrants’ perceptions of public open spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brazilians     | Green elements: trees; trees and lawns  
Presence of water (lagoons, lakes, waterfalls)  
Urban characteristics | Walking in the city  
Barbecues  
Meeting and Socialising  
Outdoor cafes  
Walk near the water  
Sports  
Music | Movement/music/ different activities/people  
Tranquility  
Lack of freedom  
Safety |
| Ukrainians     | Sea  
Presence of water (rivers)  
Green elements | Walking  
Walking near the water  
Barbecues  
Going to the beach  
Going to gardens and green areas  
Sports | Relaxation  
Tranquility  
Safety |
| Cape Verdeans  | Sea  
Green elements: trees, plants, Presence of water  
Open spaces (scale) | Walking in the city  
Going to the beach  
Outdoor cafes  
Picnic  
Music | People/movement  
Lack of freedom |

A mapping sentence structure was applied for each category of place. A variety of questions that arose from that exercise were then used in the questionnaire. Nevertheless the questionnaire included other questions which had not been asked previously in the focus groups. Their inclusion was intended to generate a fuller response from immigrants in terms of their uses and perceptions of public open spaces. As described in the methodology (see Chapter 5), the research set up a control group (of Portuguese people) to allow comparisons to be made between people who migrate to Portugal with those who are born in there.
This chapter presents a descriptive analysis of the findings, and unveils the significant differences and similarities between the three immigrant groups, and between those groups and the control group. Factor analysis provides a better understanding of the latent structure of the data and unveils clusters of preferences and perceptions (see Appendix 5 for the factor analysis’ findings). The findings also reveal variations based on demographic characteristics and immigrants’ experiences of public open space in the host country. Finally, the findings from the regression models are presented, followed by a summary of the findings.

7.2. **Descriptive analysis**

This section of the chapter describes the results of the data, and compares the findings within the three immigrant groups and the general results for those groups, and the comparison with the control group.

7.2.1. **Profile of the respondents**

This section of the questionnaire provides the respondents’ demographic data.

The total number of valid questionnaires collected was 252 \((n=252)\), including the control group. The number of respondents in each group was approximately 25%. However, the number of respondents in the Portuguese control group was slightly bigger than the other three \((n=68)\).

The total number of valid questionnaires collected from the three immigrant groups was 184 \((n=184)\). The number of participants from each nationality was approximately 33% with \(n=59\) Brazilians; \(n=64\) Cape Verdians; \(n=61\) Ukrainians (Figure 7:2.)

![Figure 7:1- Respondents' nationality: total sample](image-url)

Table 7:2 shows the number of respondents from each nationality.
According to official 2008 statistics (SEF, 2009) - the year in which this research’s data was collected - the total number of immigrants from Ukraine was 52,494 (24.9%); Cape Verde 51,353 (24.1%); Brazil 106,961 (50%). The proportion of questionnaires I collected did not echo official national immigration statistics for these three groups however I achieved a balance between the three groups.

7.2.1.1. Gender

The total number of female respondents was higher than the number of male respondents. Females represented 54% of the sample, while males constituted 46%.

In 2008 (SEF, 2009), there was a higher proportion of female immigrants from Brazil (54%) than males; the same was true for Cape Verdean immigrants, where women made up
51.5% of the incoming population. For the Ukrainians, this pattern was inverted, with males representing 57.3%, however, the gender ratio did not differ significantly\(^\text{127}\) across the three nationalities (Kruskal-Wallis Test \(\chi^2=0.613, p=0.736\)).

In the sample population for this study, the proportion of females from Brazil was 54%; from the Ukraine, 51%; and from Cape Verde, 58% (Figure 7.3). The gender ratios in the sample are relatively similar to the official immigration statistics for 2008, apart from the Ukrainian participants, where there was nearly a balance between males and females.

In the control group, the number of male participants was also lower (43%) than the number of female participants.

7.2.1.2. **Age**

40% of the respondents were between 35 and 54 years old. The number of young people was also significant, representing approximately one fifth of the total sample, however, the number of older participants was lower.

The respondents over 65 years old were all Cape Verdeans, explained by the fact that this group was among the first wave of migration to Portugal. In all three groups, the percentage of individuals over 55 years was relatively small. Approximately half of the Brazilians and Ukrainian respondents were between 18 and 35. The Cape Verdean group presented the higher number of respondents between 18 and 24 years old. There were no significant differences between the three groups (Kruskal-Wallis Test \(\chi^2=0.376, p=0.828\)).

---

\(^{127}\) For the purpose of this study \(p<0.05\)
In the control group, nearly one third of the participants were between 18 and 24 years old, possibly due to the fact that university students were asked to participate in the study. No significant differences were found between the control group and each immigrant group (see Appendix 6).

7.2.1.3. Education\(^{128}\)

Figure 7:5- Level of education, by nationality

The three nationalities showed marked differences with regard to levels of education (Kruskal-Wallis Test \(\chi^2 =20.618, \ p<0.0001\)). The level of education contrasted between Ukrainians and the other two groups. The majority of the Ukrainian respondents (59%) had a university degree and even the percentage of respondents with a Masters and/or a PhD (9.8%) was higher than the lower level of education of 5-9 years old (6.6%).

Among the Cape Verdeans, nearly one fifth (18.8%) just had a primary education 1-4 years, but 39% had a university degree or higher.

The same was true for the Brazilian immigrants, however, the percentage of respondents with a university degree or higher was the lowest of the groups (at 33.2%).

The Portuguese control group presented a high number of respondents with university degree (38.2%) and high school education (41.2%). The control group’s level of education of education was significantly different from the Ukrainian group (U=1582,000, p=0,012). The Ukrainians were more likely to have a university degree (see Appendix 6).

\(^{128}\) The different categories of education were based on the Portuguese system of education, which is similar in Brazil and Cape Verde.
7.2.1.4. **Number of years respondents had been living in Portugal**

One third of the immigrant respondents had been living in Portugal between 1 and 5 years and another third between 6 and 10 (Figure 7.6). A small percentage had been living in Portugal for less than 1 year and nearly 10% for more than 20 years. The number of years an immigrant has been living in Portugal is linked strongly to the different waves of migration to the country, described previously (see Chapter 1).

![Figure 7.6- Number of years respondents had been living in Portugal](image)

**Figure 7.7- Number of years respondents had been living in Portugal, by nationality**

The distribution of immigrants along the years differed significantly (Kruskal-Wallis Test $\chi^2 = 33.145$, $p<0.0001$). Immigrants from Cape Verde account for those who had been living the longest in Portugal and they are distributed along the different year intervals. The majority of the Ukrainian respondents had been living between 6-10 years, which corresponds with the start of the strong wave of emigration from the home country, and none for no more than 10 years. Although migration from Brazil started earlier than from the Ukraine, more than 50% of the participants had been living in the country for between 1 and 5 years. This also
confirms the actual tendency of this group’s continuous strong immigration into Portugal in recent years.

7.2.1.5. Immigrants living with family vs. Immigrants living alone

Figure 7:8- Immigrants living with family vs. Immigrants living alone, by nationality

The percentage of Cape Verdean respondents living in Portugal with members of their family was higher than for those from the Ukraine, which is in accordance with the general characteristics of these two immigrant groups (see Chapter 1). With the longest history of residence in the country, Cape Verdeans have strong family networks to support the arrival of new family members. Although the majority of male Ukrainian immigrants arrived alone, family reunion has been increasing among this community. The majority of Brazilians initiate their migration process alone, and some family reunions have been taking place. The differences among the groups are also significantly different (Kruskal-Wallis Test $\chi^2 = 9.855, p=0.007$).

7.2.1.6. Occupation in Portugal

Figure 7:9- Occupation in Portugal, by nationality, including the control group
Each immigrant group’s professional type was significantly different (Kruskal-Wallis Test $\chi^2=10.203, p=0.006$).

Based on the Portuguese National Classification of Professions\textsuperscript{129}, the majority of Brazilian respondents (37.3\%) had cleaning jobs or worked in service-related jobs (18.2\%). Approximately 10\% had intellectual and scientific professions (researchers, engineers, dentists), and the same percentage was unemployed.

Among Cape Verdeans, a large number (23.4\%) were students\textsuperscript{130} and, in line with the Brazilian group, had elementary occupations (such as cleaning jobs) (18.8\%) or service and sales work (12.5\%). Since some of the respondents from this group were above 65 years of age, this was the only group with retired respondents. The percentage of unemployed was also higher than for the other two groups (10\%).

The majority of the Ukrainians (34.1\%) worked in the category: ‘Plant and machine operators and assemblers’ (working in factories; construction sites). This group consisted of men, mainly, while women had elementary occupations (cleaners) (14.6\%) and were in service and sales work (waitresses) (9.8\%). A significant percentage worked as ‘technicians and associate professionals’ (22.2\%)\textsuperscript{131}.

Assessment of the control group presented a different scenario from the three immigrant groups given that students represented 25\% of the control-group sample, technicians and associate professionals (25\%) and intellectual and scientific professionals (20.6\%). However, significant differences were just found between the Portuguese and Cape Verdeans ($U= 1564,500, p=0.010$) (see Appendix 6). The respondents in the control were more likely to occupy high skilled professions than the Cape Verdeans immigrants, and none of the Portuguese respondents was unemployed.

\textsuperscript{129} http://cdp.portodigital.pt/profissoes/outros-recursos (accessed July, 2008)

\textsuperscript{130} This high number might be influenced by the way respondents were recruited – questionnaires were distributed at universities and among young acquaintances.

\textsuperscript{131} This number is possibly not a true representation of the reality and it was influenced by the way data was collected, among those who worked in the embassy and NGO.
7.2.1.7. **Previous place of residence**

![Bar chart showing place of residence by nationality](image)

More than 50% of participants from all three groups lived in an urban environment back home, and a few lived in the countryside. However, significant differences emerged in relation to the other types of places (Kruskal-Wallis Test $\chi^2 = 40.228, p<0.0001$).

The Cape Verdeans had the highest percentage of people who used to live in the countryside, while, conversely, 47.5% of the Brazilian respondents used to live in metropolis (e.g. Brasília, São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro); and more than two-thirds of the Ukrainian respondents lived in a city (68.9%), while only 14.9% lived in the countryside.

7.2.1.8. **Respondents’ location in Lisbon**

In order to better understand the participants’ geographical distribution, I drew a schematic map.

![Map of Lisbon respondents from Brazil and Cape Verde](images)
Figure 7:11 shows the three communities’ different settlement patterns. Although just a sample, the distribution patterns of the three groups in the Lisbon area matched fairly closely the literature described in Chapter 3. A high number of Brazilian and Ukrainian immigrant respondents lived in Lisbon city centre, as well as in the outskirts (Amadoura, Sintra, Cascais, Oeiras, Almada, Sacavém). No significant concentration of immigrant respondents from these two nationalities was identified. However, the immigrants from Cape Verde lived mainly on Lisbon’s outskirts, with a higher concentration in specific locations such as Buraca, Cova da Moura (see Chapter 3, Figure 3:7), Catujal and Montijo. All these locations are known for their higher concentration of immigrants from Cape Verde.

7.2.2. Leisure activities

This section of the questionnaire aims to understand participants’ leisure activities. As Chapter 4 (section 4.3) describes, immigrant communities tend to have different leisure patterns and preferences. This section explores not only the activities the three immigrant groups enjoy in public open spaces but also in private areas. All the activities questions included in the questionnaire were based on participants’ responses in the focus group sessions (see Chapter 6).

7.2.2.1. Type of activities

Respondents were asked how often, in their free time, would they engage in several activities.
Figure 7.12- Immigrants’ frequency of uptake of leisure activities (scale: 1 never; 2 rarely; 3 sometimes; 4 many times; 5 always).

‘Go for a walk in outdoors spaces’ was the activity respondents did most frequently (mean = 3.42). Social activities such as ‘spend time with family’ (mean=3.29) and ‘visit friends’ (mean=3.27) also occurred frequently.

Respondents also reported that indoor activities such as ‘Stay at home and watch TV’ (mean=3.20), or simply ‘rest at home’ (mean=3.12) were also part of how they spent their free time. ‘Go to the shopping centre’ (mean=2.9) was cited too as a recurrent activity, while ‘read in outdoor spaces’ (mean=2.32) and ‘go to a museum/cultural event’ (mean=2.26) occurred less frequently.

- Differences between the three immigrant groups

Table 7.2 - Kruskal Wallis Test - Significant differences between nationalities in relation to activities (p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay at home and watch TV</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.2011</td>
<td>6.227</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>U+,B + CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.4293</td>
<td>6.695</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>U+,B + CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest at home</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.1257</td>
<td>13.662</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>U+, CV +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the shopping centre</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.9457</td>
<td>3.232</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the beach</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.6467</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the church</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.5489</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit and meet friends</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.2935</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with family</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.2787</td>
<td>16.900</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>U+, CV +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend parties</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.6793</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a barbecue and/or picnic</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.6848</td>
<td>18.878</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>U+, B+ CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to a museum/ cultural events</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.2609</td>
<td>9.198</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>U + B-, CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do sports</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.6885</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.3224</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a coffee in an outdoor café</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.8370</td>
<td>11.908</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>U+, B+ CV-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U – Ukraine; B- Brazil; CV- Cape Verde

There are clear differences between the three nationalities in terms of their frequency of engagement in various leisure activities. Respondents from Brazil and Ukraine were more likely and frequently to ‘stay at home and watch TV’ ($\chi^2 =6.227, p=0.44$) than the Cape Verdean group.

Nevertheless, these two groups were also more likely to participate often in outdoor activities, such as: ‘go for a walk in outdoor spaces’ ($\chi^2 =6.695, p=0.035$); ‘have a barbecue and/or picnic’ ($\chi^2 =18.787, p<0.0001$), and ‘have a coffee in an outdoor café’ ($\chi^2 =11.908, p=0.003$). Cape Verdeans participated in these activities less frequently.

Social activity patterns also differed significantly. Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians were more likely to ‘spend time with family’ ($\chi^2 =18.787, p<0.0001$) more often than the Brazilian respondents, who recorded a lower frequency. This tendency is possibly related to the results obtained in the demographic question (Figure 7:8), where the findings showed that a lower percentage of Brazilian respondents live with a family member compared to the other two groups.

Ukrainians respondents were more likely to engage in cultural activities more regularly, such as ‘Go to museum/cultural events’ ($\chi^2 =9.198, p=0.010$).
Table 7.3: Leisure Activities - Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between immigrants and the control group (p<0.05) regarding their respective leisure activities patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest at home</td>
<td>1579,500</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the shopping centre</td>
<td>1015,500</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the beach</td>
<td>1347,000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the church</td>
<td>1390,000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with family</td>
<td>1357,500</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a barbecue and/or picnic</td>
<td>1310,500</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the museum/ cultural events</td>
<td>1326,500</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>1524,500</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay at home and watch TV</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit and meet friends</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a coffee in an outdoor café</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portuguese respondents in the control group were more likely to ‘go to the beach’ and ‘read in outdoor spaces’ compared to the immigrants in the other three groups. Conversely, immigrants from the three immigrant groups were more likely to ‘go to the shopping centre’ than the control group.

Portuguese respondents were less likely to ‘have a barbecue and/or a picnic’ than the Brazilian and Ukrainian respondents. Ukrainian, on the other hand were more likely to ‘stay at home and watch TV’ and ‘rest at home’ than the control group.

In comparison with the Cape Verdean respondents, the Portuguese respondents in the control group were more likely to ‘go for a walk in outdoor spaces’ and ‘have a coffee in an outdoor café’.
7.2.2.2. Going for a walk - where?

During the focus group discussions, walking and/or simply going for walk was an activity favoured by most participants, and was mentioned several times. Respondents were asked to rank the places they liked to walk in.

Table 7:4 – Ranked results: the respondents’ preferred locations when going for a walk, Friedman Test ($\chi^2=34.898, p<0.0001$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the gardens and parks in the city</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk near the water</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green spaces, such as ‘parks and gardens’, were the favourite places to go for a walk. According to the Wilcox Test\(^\text{132}\) (see Appendix 6), the difference between the first and second place was significant ($z=-3.617, p<0.0005$). Walking in ‘the city’ and walking ‘near the water’ achieved the same score, in second place. In a city such as Lisbon, with its proximity to the river and the sea, many walks in the city can include views over the river. It is difficult, therefore, to assess if ‘walking near the water’ also includes places outside the urban area. Visits to ‘natural places’ were ranked in last place, and the differences between ranks was also significant (Wilcox test, $z=-2.341, p=0.019$).

- Differences between the three immigrant groups

Table 7:5 - Ranked results: the respondents’ place preferences when they go for a walk, by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the gardens and parks in the city</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk near the water</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test ($\chi^2=28.510, p&lt;0.0001$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the gardens and parks in the city</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk near the water</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test ($\chi^2=20.031, p&lt;0.0001$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{132}\) The Wilcox test verifies if the differences between two variables are significant. In this case, when there are significant differences, it would be likely that the variables would occupy the same ranking if the questionnaire was distributed again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Verde</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the gardens and parks in the city</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk near the water</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test ($\chi^2 = 1.264, p = 0.738)^*$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three groups of respondents ranked gardens and parks in the city as their first choice when they wanted to for a walk. The first and second place rankings were only significant for the Ukrainian group (Wilcox test $z = -3.699, p < 0.0001$), reaffirming the preference for parks and gardens in the first place. The Brazilians and Ukrainians ranked walking around ‘the city’ and ‘near the water’ in second and third place, with no significant differences between the ranked variables. The ranking between going for a walk ‘near the water’ vs. ‘a natural place’ was significant for the Brazilian group (Wilcox test $z = -2.153, p < 0.0001$).

The Cape Verdaen group produced different rankings – they put a location ‘near the water’ in second, and a ‘natural place’ in third place. However, there were no significant differences between the rankings, and the Friedman Test was also not significant.

- Differences between immigrants and control group

Table 7.6 - Ranked results: the respondents’ preferred locations, in the control group, when going for a walk ($\chi^2 = 15.601, p = 0.001$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the gardens and parks in the city</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk near the water</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control group’s results were different from the Brazilians and Ukrainians. Although the ranking order was the same as the Cape Verdeans, no direct comparison can be made, due to the fact that the differences between the ranking variables were significant in the Cape Verdaen group. Among the Portuguese respondents in the control group only the ranking between going for a walk ‘near the water’ and ‘a natural place’ was significant (Wilcox test $z = -2.452, p < 0.014$).

---

$^{133}$ The result is not significant, therefore, the differences between spaces are not ranked consistently higher or lower than the others.
7.2.2.3. **New and previous leisure activities**\(^{134}\)

The immigrant respondents were asked about activities they would have undertaken previously in their home country and which they are no longer able to continue in Portugal and if there were new types of activities they had engaged in Portugal. The aim of this section was to establish if the participants continued the activities they had undertaken back home or whether they had embraced different activities offered by the host country.

**Figure 7:13-** Respondents’ activities in home country which no longer took place in Portugal ('In your home country, did you do different outdoor activities which you enjoyed, that you can't do anymore in Portugal?)

**Figure 7:14-** Respondents’ activities in Portugal which respondents did not do in their home country ('In Portugal, do you do any different outdoor activity that you enjoy, which you could not do in your home country?)

\(^{134}\) This question was exclusive to the immigrants’ version of the questionnaire.
The majority of respondents (41.3%) used to take part in activities that they can no longer do in Portugal. A small percentage (11.4%) stated that they had engaged in new leisure activities in Portugal.

The respondents were asked (via an open-ended question), to list the old and new activities.

Table 7.7 - Activities in home country, by nationality

| Activities participants used to do in their home country and can no longer do in Portugal |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Brazil          | Ukraine        | Cape Verde    |
| fishing; swimming; capoeira; football; BBQ | farming; gardening | going to the beach; sports; fishing; BBQ |

The differences between the activities that Cape Verdeans and Brazilians enjoy are not too dissimilar. However, the Ukrainian group enjoyed a different type of activity, linked to contact with nature, soil and plants. The Ukrainian participants’ had a higher proportion of participants who said that they did not engage in leisure activities in Ukraine but they no longer did in Portugal (KW \( \chi^2 =11.461, p=0.003 \)).

Table 7.8 - Activities undertaken in Portugal, by nationality

| Activities in Portugal which respondents did not do in their home country |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Brazil          | Ukraine        | Cape Verde    |
| cultural activities; walking | going to the beach | sports on top of grass; visit forests |

The type of activities immigrants engaged in were different for all the groups, however, no significant differences were found. Ukrainians and Cape Verdeans mentioned activities which are enjoyed, typically in the Portuguese environment and which are ‘new’ to them.

7.2.3. Outdoor environment preferences

Using David Canter’s ‘theory of place’ (see Chapter 4), this section of the questionnaire was designed to explore respondents’ preferences (physical attributes), to investigate what activities they preferred and engaged in (activities) and their perception of public open spaces. Based on analysis of the focus groups (see Chapter 6), a list of variables was created that represents the different characteristics of outdoor environments that the immigrants enjoyed. The majority of the questions and were developed using the ‘fact theory’. However, some of the variables used, instead, a ranking scale (see Chapter 5) (natural physical attributes and the facilities).
7.2.3.1. **General attitudes to activities and physical attributes**

Participants were asked to respond to the statement ‘I prefer an outdoor space:’

![Bar chart showing respondents' attitudes to activities, appearance, and presence of water.](chart)

**Figure 7.15** - Respondents' attitudes to: activities, appearance, and presence of water (5-point scale: 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree)

A place ‘close to the sea’ (mean=4.1250) and ‘natural in appearance’ (mean=3.9457), were the two favourite categories. Proximity to the ‘sea’ seemed to be more important than to the ‘river’ (mean=3.7337), but closeness to water was suggested as a strong preference. Respondents also prioritised an outdoor space where it is possible to ‘do different activities’ (mean=3.9293). Among the range of possible activities that respondents enjoyed in open space, socialising was very important, ‘where I can meet my friends and socialise’ (mean=3.7500), followed by a space where ‘children can play’ (mean=3.6957), or simply a space

---

135 Constructed based on the ‘facet theory’.
where they could ‘rest’ (mean=3.5978). The least liked characteristics included spaces ‘where I can see many people’ (mean=3.2880) and ‘where I can be alone’ (mean=3.0435), however, the latter was less favoured. Space ‘which has urban characteristics’ (mean=3.1196) was also not a very strong preference.

- **Differences between the three immigrant groups**

**Table 7:9 - Kruskal Wallis Test. Significant differences between the three nationalities (p<0.05) in relation to attitudes in response to activities, appearance and the presence of water**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity, appearance and water</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where I can meet my friends and socialise</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>2.689</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can rest</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.5978</td>
<td>8.246</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>U+, B-, CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can be alone</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.0435</td>
<td>8.029</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>B+, U-, CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children can play</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.6957</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I see many people</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.2880</td>
<td>6.850</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>B#, U- , CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can see or be close to the sea</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can see or be close to the river</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.7337</td>
<td>15.639</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>U+, B +, CV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That is natural in appearance</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.9457</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has urban characteristics (built environment)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.1196</td>
<td>2.891</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have the possibility to do different activities</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.9293</td>
<td>18.536</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>B+, CV +, U-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting friends and socialising with them was important for the three nationalities with no significant differences to report. Respondents from Brazil were more likely to prefer a place where they could ‘see many people’ ($\chi^2 =3.2880$, p=0.033) as opposed to Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians. However, for Brazilians, being in a place where they could ‘see many people’, does not exclude the possibility of being ‘alone’ ($\chi^2 =3.0435$, p=0.018). The Ukrainian group was more likely to prefer an outdoor space where they could ‘rest’ ($\chi^2 =3.5978$, p=0.016) than the other two groups. The Ukrainian group was also less likely to prefer a place where ‘different activities’ ($\chi^2 =3.9293$, p<0.0001) could occur.

Regarding the presence of water, proximity to the ‘sea’ was important for the three groups, and significant differences arose only in relation to the presence of a ‘river’ ($\chi^2 =3.5978$, p=0.016). The Ukrainian and Brazilian respondents were more likely to prefer proximity to a river, in comparison to the Cape Verdean group.
### Differences between the immigrants and control group

Table 7:10 – Preferences. Activities and presence of water: Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between the control group and immigrants (p<0.05) in relation to attitudes in response to activities, appearance and the presence of water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferences</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can rest</td>
<td>1446.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I see many people</td>
<td>972.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That is natural in appearance</td>
<td>1612.50</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have the possibility to do different activities</td>
<td>1478.50</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can meet my friends and socialise</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td>1655.00</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can see or be close to the river</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td>1345.50</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigrants from all three groups were more likely to prefer spaces where they could ‘see many people’ than the Portuguese group. Supporting this tendency, the Portuguese group was more likely to prefer an outdoor space that was ‘natural in appearance’ than the respondents from all three immigrant groups.

The control group was more likely to socialise outdoors than the Ukrainian group, but less likely to prefer places where ‘the possibility to do different activities’ existed, than the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents.

Portuguese respondents were also more likely to prefer being close to the ‘river’ than the Cape Verdean group.

### General attitudes to natural elements

Respondents were asked to rank which natural elements and features they would prefer in an outdoor space:

Table 7:11 Ranked results: natural elements - Friedman Test ($\chi^2=69.069$, p<0.0001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees and a lawn</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has water features</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has many plants</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In first place, the presence of ‘trees and a lawn’, followed by ‘water features’ and ‘trees’. The combination of ‘trees and a lawn’ was more appealing to the respondents than just the simple presence of ‘trees’, and even more important than the presence of water features. A place that had ‘many plants’ was ranked fourth, and in last place, the scale and openness of the space seemed less relevant than the previous features. The Wilcoxon test (see Appendix 6) was significant for the difference it revealed between the following variables: ‘which has trees’ and ‘which has many plants’ (z=-4.160, p<0.0005).

- Differences between the three immigrant groups

Table 7:12 - Ranked results: natural elements, by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has water features</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees and a lawn</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has many plants</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test (χ²=56.000, p=0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has water features</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees and a lawn</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has many plants</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test (χ²=58.000, p&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees and a lawn</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has water features</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has many plants</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Test (χ²=62.000, p&lt;0.0001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attributes that the respondents preferred the most (from the three immigrant groups) varies for each nationality. Although the order of the variables was different for the three groups, they all placed ‘water features’, ‘trees’ and ‘trees and a lawn’ in the top three positions while they put ‘scale’ and ‘many plants’ in the bottom two.

The Brazilian group ranked ‘water features’ and ‘trees’ in first place, distinct from them putting ‘trees and a lawn’ and ‘many plants’ (Wilcoxon Test z=-2.19, p=0.029) in third and fourth places respectively.
The Ukrainian respondents gave more importance to ‘water features’, putting this variable in first place, followed by ‘trees and lawns’ and then ‘trees’ in third place. Similarly, for the Brazilian group, the differences between third and fourth places in terms of the variable ‘many plants’ was also significant (Wilcox Test $z=-2.254$, $p=0.024$), while they ranked a space’s scale and openness in last place.

The Cape Verdean group ranked ‘trees and lawn’ in first place. The difference between this variable and ‘trees’, in second place, was significantly different (Wilcox Test $z=-3.035$, $p=0.002$). They put ‘water features’ in third place, which was a lower ranking than the other two groups, followed by ‘scale’ and lastly, the presence of ‘many plants’.

- Differences between the immigrants and control group

Table 7:13 - Ranked results: natural elements and features – control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements and features</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees and lawn</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has trees</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has water elements</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has many plants</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control group’s rankings were similar to the Cape Verdeans and even the difference between first and second places was significant (Wilcox Test $z=-2.329$, $p=0.020$), as it was in the latter group. The control group ranked ‘water elements’ third but no significant differences were found between this variable and their ranking of a space ‘which has trees’.

In fourth place, ‘scale’, was also distinct (Wilcox Test $z=-2.515$, $p=0.012$). The presence of ‘many plants’, in fifth place, seemed less relevant to the control group. The order of ranking of the last two variables was different for the control and immigrant groups respectively.

7.2.3.3. General attitudes to facilities

In order to understand what facilities were important to the respective groups, and based on the facilities described during the focus groups, respondents were asked to rank which facilities they would prefer to have in an outdoor space:
Table 7.14 - Ranked results: Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which have music</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a barbecue</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can do sports</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has an outdoor café</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friedman Test ($\chi^2 = 37.252, p<0.0001$)

In first place, the respondents ranked having ‘music’ in an outdoor space. Although the focus groups gave a great deal of comment about this element, it is very interesting to note it gained first place, especially after the significant difference between first and second places (Wilcox Test $z=-3.363, p<0.0005$). A place to ‘have a barbecue’ was ranked second, followed by a place to ‘have a picnic’. ‘Sports’ appeared in fourth place and lastly, the presence of ‘an outdoor café’. No significant differences were found between the last four variables.

Differences between the three immigrant groups

Table 7.15 - Ranked results: Facilities, by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which has music</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a barbecue</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can do sports</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has an outdoor café</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friedman Test ($\chi^2 = 53.000, p<0.0001$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a barbecue</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has music</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can do sports</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has an outdoor café</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friedman Test ($\chi^2 = 51.000, p<0.0001$)

The variables ‘barbecue’ and ‘picnic’ were considered as separate since the facilities for having a ‘barbecue’ are different from those for a ‘picnic’.
The Brazilian respondents ranked in first place having ‘music’ in outdoor spaces and in second, the chance to have a ‘barbecue’. The ranking of these two variables was significantly different (Wilcox Test \( z = -2.860, p = 0.004 \)), suggesting the overall importance of music to the Brazilians. They put ‘sports’ in third place, followed by ‘an outdoor café’ and having a ‘picnic’ in fifth place.

The Cape Verdean respondents ranked ‘music’ in first place. The difference between the first and second position was significant (Wilcox Test \( z = -4.370, p < 0.0001 \)). The differences between all the other variables were not significant, and respondents from this group ranked activities that involved having food outdoors in the last places.

The Ukrainian group’s choices revealed different preferences, however, no significant differences were found between the variables. This group ranked outdoor activities which involved having food in the first two places, they scored ‘music’ in third place, ahead of ‘sports’ in fourth place and an ‘outdoor café’ in fifth.

- **Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group**

Table 7:16 - Ranked results: natural elements and features – control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has an outdoor café</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has music</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can do sports</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a barbecue</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friedman Test \( (x^2 = 43.000, p < 0.0001) \)

The three immigrant groups had a less strong preference for having an ‘outdoor café’ in public space than the Portuguese control group. The difference between their first and second rankings for the control group was also relevant (Wilcox Test \( z = -3.704, p < 0.0001 \)). The control group’s preference for the presence of ‘music’ was also high (ranked in second place), but less so than for ‘an outdoor café’, demonstrating some similarities between the
Cape Verdean and Brazilian group. Like all the other groups, the Portuguese control group ranked ‘sports’ in third place. Another significant difference was Portuguese respondents’ preference for being able to have a ‘picnic’, in fourth place, and a ‘barbecue’, in fifth (Wilcox Test z=-2.684, p=0.007).

7.2.3.4. Respondents’ perceptions of outdoor space

Finally, respondents were asked about their perceptions of outdoor space, using a 5-point Likert Scale to identify their perceptions by asking them to agree or disagree with statements such as: ‘I think of outdoor spaces as’:

![Perceptions of an outdoor space (5-point scale: 1, strongly disagree ... 5, strongly agree)](image)

Figure 7:16 - Perceptions of an outdoor space (5-point scale: 1, strongly disagree ... 5, strongly agree)

The immigrant respondents’ perceptions of an outdoor space show they were more likely to have a stronger preference for a ‘calm and relaxing’ space than a place ‘full of happenings, people and movement’.

The perceptions of the respondents in the three groups with regard to outdoor spaces did not differ considerably (see Appendix 6). This view reinforces the idea that an outdoor space is more likely to be regarded as a ‘calm and relaxing space’ by people from all different cultures (see Chapter 8 for the elements which the participants said made them feel relaxed).

- Differences between the immigrants’ group and the control group

137 Constructed based on the ‘facet theory’.
Although the Portuguese respondents were more likely to perceive outdoor spaces as ‘calm and relaxing’, their perceptions differed from the Ukrainian and Brazilian respondents (see Appendix 6).

Table 7.17 – Perceptions: Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between the control group and immigrants (p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being calm and relaxing</td>
<td>1583.500</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being full of happenings, people</td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
<td>1587.500</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portuguese respondents were more likely to perceive outdoor spaces as ‘calm and relaxing’ than Brazilian immigrants. However, the Portuguese respondents were more likely to perceive outdoor spaces as ‘full of happenings, people and movement’ than the Ukrainian respondents.

7.2.4. Which spaces were used, and how

The intention behind this section of the questionnaire was to explore respondents’ use of public open spaces in the Lisbon area.

7.2.4.1. Favourite places

Table 7.18 - Favourite places, by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of favourite places (top 5)</th>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazilians:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Parque das Nações (n= 24)(A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Belém’s Garden (n=23) (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Costa’s Beach (n= 16)(C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Linha’s Beach (n=15)(D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Shopping Centre (n=15) (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Ukrainians:**                  |                     |
| 1st Belém’s Garden (n= 27)(B)   |                     |
| 2nd Costa’s Beach (n= 19) (C)   |                     |
| 3rd Monsanto (n=17) (F)         |                     |
| 4th Parque das Nações (n=15) (A) |                     |
| 5th Guincho’s Beach (n=13) (G)  |                     |
Two green spaces, an urban park (Parque das Nações) and a garden (Belém’s Garden), were the top two favourite places in the Lisbon area for all three nationalities. These two spaces were also among the Portuguese respondents’ favourite places.

The respondents from all three groups also mentioned Costa’s beach, on the southern margin of the River Tagus, as one of their favourite places. The Brazilians, however, mentioned other beaches such as Linha’s beach, close to Lisbon, while the Ukrainians referred to Guincho’s beach, which is located in a natural area. However, only the latter group mentioned Monsanto (an urban forest in Lisbon) as their favourite place. The Cape Verdean respondents then added to the list of favourites one of Lisbon’s city-centre neighbourhoods, known for its commercial characteristics (e.g. shops, cafés and pedestrian streets).

The Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents said that ‘shopping centres’ were among their favourite places. They did not name any specific shopping centres but examples were cited in the focus group discussions (see Chapter 6).

The Portuguese respondents also mentioned other places such as the waterfront (Beira Tejo) and Alfama/Castelo which had not been mentioned by the three immigrant groups.

---

138 Although shopping centres are not public open spaces, this type of place was included in the questionnaire since it was cited so frequently by participants during the focus-group interviews. As discussed previously (see Chapter 3), this type of space can be considered oppositional to the use of outdoor spaces.
7.2.4.2. Types of places most and least frequently used

Figure 7:17 - Types of (public) spaces most frequently used, by nationality

Figure 7:18 - Types of (public) spaces less frequently used, by nationality
All three immigrant groups chose ‘parks and gardens’ as one of their most frequently visited types of places. For the Ukrainian group, this type of space was surpassed by the ‘beach’. For the other two communities, they frequented the ‘beach’ much less than the Ukrainians. ‘Waterfronts’ scored positive values for all three groups; with slightly higher scores given to this feature by the Brazilians respondents, while it was ‘neutral’ for the Ukrainians.

Cape Verdeans and Brazilians frequently visited ‘markets’; while the Ukrainian group’s respondents did so much less frequently. The same tendency was observed in terms of the respondents rating of ‘streets’, which were more likely to be used by the Cape Verdean and Brazilian respondents than by the Ukrainians.

The Brazilians were the only group more likely to use ‘squares’ on a regular basis; while Ukrainians were the only group to mention ‘forests’ as among the places they used frequently.

Common to all the groups, ‘cultural places’, ‘the countryside’ and ‘miradouros’ were the three types of public spaces which the respondents did not visit frequently.

All three nationalities reported that ‘shopping centres’ were places they would visit frequently; however, the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians found this type of place more popular than the Ukrainians.

- Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group

The Portuguese respondents also cited ‘parks and gardens’ as one of the places most frequently used by the two groups, followed by the ‘streets’ and ‘waterfronts’. Although the Portuguese respondents also referred to the ‘beach’ as among the places they visited most frequently, the Ukrainian respondents scored ‘the beach’ more highly than the Portuguese respondents. A large number of Portuguese respondents mentioned ‘markets’ as places they would not visit. In addition, they referred to the ‘forest’ much less frequently than the Ukrainians.

However, the Portuguese respondents were more likely to visit the ‘countryside’ compared with the immigrants from all three groups. The Portuguese respondents were also less likely to visit ‘shopping centres’ than all three immigrant groups.

7.2.4.3. Frequency of use

The majority of immigrant respondents used an outdoor space on a weekly basis (40.2%) or everyday (21.7%). Monthly visits accounted for 17.4% of the answers, followed by ‘rarely’ (14.1%), then ‘never’ (1.1%).
Differences between the three immigrant groups

Figure 7.19- Frequency of use of public open spaces, by nationality

The three groups’ use of open space recorded different levels of frequency of use (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 37.045$, p<0.0001). Ukrainians and Brazilians had higher levels of use than the Cape Verdeans, with more than 50% of the respondents reporting they used an outdoor space at least on a weekly basis or ‘everyday’. The percentage of Ukrainian participants who stated they would go to an outdoor space ‘everyday’ (47.5%)\(^{139}\) was very high indeed. The Cape Verdeans recorded the lowest levels of frequency. More than 50% of the Cape Verdean respondents used an outdoor space just ‘once a month’ (26.6%) or ‘rarely’ (25%), and a small percentage (3%) claimed they had ‘never’ used an outdoor space.

Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group

The majority of the Portuguese respondents (71%) said they would use an outdoor space on a weekly basis.

---

\(^{139}\) This percentage might raise some questions as to how accurate this result is. Possibly the previous question on the ‘type of places’ might have influenced this result, since ‘street’ was one of the categories, and respondents might have included this category in their answer.
Significant differences were found between the control group and the three immigrant groups (see Appendix 6). The Portuguese respondents were more likely to use a public space on a regular basis ($U=1057.000, p<0.0001$) than the Cape Verdean respondents, but less frequently than the Ukrainian respondents ($U=1650.500, p=0.025$).

### 7.2.4.4. Timing of respondents’ visits

Most of the respondents from the three immigrant groups visited an outdoor space all year around (55.4%). In summer, there was a higher percentage (24.5%) than for ‘spring and summer’ (19%). Winter and autumn only represented 1.1% of the seasonal visits.

- **Differences between the three immigrant groups**
The seasons when immigrants visited outdoor places varied significantly (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2=33.068$, $p<0.0001$).

Most of the Brazilian respondents visited outdoor spaces all year (49.2%). However, they preferred to make their visits during the summer (32.2%) than during ‘spring and summer’ (18.6%).

The Ukrainian respondents were more likely to use outdoor spaces all year around (86.9%) and only a small percentage would visit them in a specific season such as ‘spring and summer’ (6.6%) or ‘summer’ (3.3%). Nevertheless, the Ukrainians were the only respondents to mention ‘winter and autumn’ (3.3%) as seasons when they would visit open spaces.

The Cape Verdean respondents’ highest frequency of use occurred in ‘summer’ (37.5%) followed by all-year visits (31.3%) and spring and summer (31.2%).

- **Differences between the immigrants and control group**

  The Portuguese respondents are more likely to use outdoor spaces all year around (85.3%) than the three immigrant groups.

![Figure 7:22: Seasonal visits to public open spaces: significant differences between the control group and other immigrant groups](image)

The Portuguese respondents, however, were more likely to use outdoor spaces all year round compared with the immigrants from Brazil ($U=1346,000$, $p<0.0001$) and Cape Verde ($U=1076,000$, $p<0.0001$) (see Appendix 6).
7.2.4.5. Visits made to open spaces with other people (friends and family) or alone

The majority of the immigrant respondents visited outdoor spaces with family members (42.4%), or with friends from their home country (35.3%). 13% of the respondents would go alone and an even smaller percentage would go with Portuguese friends (9.3%).

- Differences between the three immigrant groups

![Graph showing visits with others](image)

Figure 7.23- Participant visits to outdoor spaces – visits with others (friends and family) or alone

No significant differences were found between the three nationalities (Kruskal Wallis test $\chi^2 = 2.665, p=0.264$), indicating a fairly similar pattern for all the immigrants groups, with visits to open space made either with family members or friends.

7.2.4.6. Transport

With regard to the means of transport the immigrant participants used, public transport (40.1%) accounted for the highest percentage, followed by the car (33.3%), ‘on foot’ (21.3%), while only a small percentage of respondents used bicycles (3.3%).

---

140 The questionnaire’s Portuguese version included different variables. It is not possible, therefore, to make a direct comparison between the groups.
Differences between the three immigrant groups

Although the differences between the three groups were not significant (Kruskal Wallis test $\chi^2 = 0.161$, $p=0.923$), nearly 50% of the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans said they used public transport as their means of getting to public spaces. However, for the Ukrainians, public transport came second (31.1%), with the ‘car’ (32.8%) their most used mode of transport. The percentage of Ukrainian and Brazilian users who referred to using a ‘bicycle’ to access public space was low, while it was not mentioned as an option by the Cape Verdean participants.

Differences between the immigrants and control group

The Portuguese control group reported that their principal means of transport was the car (36.8%), followed by going ‘on foot’ (33.8%). There were no significant differences between the Portuguese group and each of the three immigrant groups (see Appendix 6).

7.2.4.7. Distance to outdoor spaces

More than one third (37%) of the immigrant respondents indicated they would visit an outdoor space that was within 15-30 minutes distance of their home or that was up to 30+ minutes (32.8%) away. Visits to outdoor places closer to their homes (within 5-15 minutes’ distance) accounted for one quarter of their visits (25.1%). Visits to nearby outdoor spaces only accounted for 4.1% of visits.
Differences between the three immigrant groups

Although there were no significant statistical differences between the nationalities (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 1.636, p=0.441$), the Brazilians immigrants were the group with a higher percentage of respondents who travelled longer to get to an outdoor space (42.4%).

In terms of visits made to an outdoor space within 0-5 minutes of their respective homes, the percentage recorded for the Ukrainian participants was higher, (6%), compared with the Brazilians (3%) and Cape Verdeans (3%).

Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group

Figure 7:25 - Distance from place of residence to outdoor spaces, by nationality

![Bar chart showing distance from place of residence to outdoor spaces by nationality.]

Although there were no significant statistical differences between the nationalities, (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 1.636, p=0.441$), the Brazilians immigrants were the group with a higher percentage of respondents who travelled longer to get to an outdoor space (42.4%).

In terms of visits made to an outdoor space within 0-5 minutes of their respective homes, the percentage recorded for the Ukrainian participants was higher, (6%), compared with the Brazilians (3%) and Cape Verdeans (3%).

Figure 7:26 - Distance from place of residence to outdoor spaces: significant differences between the control group and the three immigrant groups

![Bar chart showing distance from place of residence to outdoor spaces by nationality and group.]

Although there were no significant statistical differences between the nationalities, (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 1.636, p=0.441$), the Brazilians immigrants were the group with a higher percentage of respondents who travelled longer to get to an outdoor space (42.4%).

In terms of visits made to an outdoor space within 0-5 minutes of their respective homes, the percentage recorded for the Ukrainian participants was higher, (6%), compared with the Brazilians (3%) and Cape Verdeans (3%).
There was a significant difference between the control group and the three immigrant groups in terms of the distance travelled to gain access to an outdoor space (see Appendix 6). Immigrants tended to have to travel longer (30+ minutes) to get to such places. At the other end of the scale, a higher percentage of Portuguese respondents were closer to a public open space they would use compared to the immigrants (Brazilians: $U=1364.500$, $p=0.001$; Ukrainians: $U=1486.000$, $p=0.05$; Cape Verdeans: $U=1712.000$, $p=0.024$).

7.2.4.8. Barriers to immigrants’ use of outdoor space

This set of questions aimed to explore the reasons why immigrants do not go to outdoor spaces more often.

![Figure 7.27 - Reasons for immigrants not going to outdoor spaces more often](image)

Respondents were more likely to disagree that the lack of public transport (mean=2.25), not being familiar with many places (mean=2.36) or financial problems (mean=2.68) could interfere with how often they would use outdoor spaces. However, respondents were more likely to agree that tiredness (mean=3.15) and lack of time (mean=3.40) were reasons that stopped them from going outdoors.
Differences between the three immigrant groups

Figure 7:28- Reasons not to go out more often, by nationality

Although there were no significant differences between the three immigrant groups, their levels of agreement for each variable varied. Ukrainians were more likely to agree that lack of time and being too tired to go out (mean=3.61) sometimes explained their infrequent use of outdoor spaces. The Cape Verdean respondents also cited lack of time (mean=3.56) as a reason as did the Brazilians (mean=3.25). These latter two groups were neutral when it came to their agreeing that if they felt tired, that kept them from going outdoors (Cape Verdians: mean=3.08; Brazilians: mean=3.04).

Even though all the respondents were more likely to disagree that economic problems could be a barrier to them visiting outdoor spaces, Brazilians (mean=2.69) and Cape Verdians (mean=2.81), the respondents from these two nationalities had a higher mean than the Ukrainian group (mean=2.52), suggesting that economic problems were a greater difficulty for the first two groups.

Respondents from Brazil (mean=2.34) and Ukraine (mean=2.23) were more likely to disagree with the suggestion that unfamiliarity with a place stopped them from visiting outdoor spaces. By contrast, the Cape Verdean group – which has been living the longest in the country - had a slightly higher mean (2.5), compared with the other two immigrant groups.
The lack of public transport seems less important for the Brazilian (mean=2.10) and Ukrainian (mean=2.24) immigrants, than for the Cape Verdeans (mean=2.37).

- Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group

Table 7:19- Respondents’ reasons not to go out more often: Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between immigrants and the control group (p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public transports</td>
<td>1378.500</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have the money</td>
<td>p&gt;0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were only two significant differences between the Portuguese and each of the immigrant groups (see Appendix 6). The Portuguese were more likely to agree that the ‘lack of public transport’ could be a barrier to them visiting public open spaces. However, the Portuguese, compared to the Cape Verdeans, were less likely to agree that financial problems could be a barrier.

7.2.4.9. Behaviour

Participants were asked how they felt in outdoor spaces, whether they felt free to do what they wanted or they felt, somehow, inhibited. These questions are also based on the findings from the focus groups and the ‘facet theory’ was also used to construct the questions.

![Figure 7:29- Behaviour](image-url)
Participants were more likely to disagree/be neutral (mean=2.70) in relation to ‘feel inhibited’ about doing what they wanted in an outdoor space. They were also more likely to be neutral/agree that they ‘feel free’ (mean=3.43) to do what they wanted outdoors.

- **Differences between the three immigrant groups**

  There were significant differences between the three groups in regard to their experience and behaviour outdoors.

  ![Bar chart showing differences in feelings between groups](image)

  Figure 7:30- Behaviour: differences between the three groups

  In comparison with the other two immigrant groups, the Ukrainian respondents were more likely to ‘feel free’ to do what they wanted outdoors (mean=3.88); it was the significant difference between the groups (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 19.696$, $p<0.0001$). The Brazilian respondents were less likely to agree (mean=3.29); while the Cape Verdeans (mean=3.12) tended neither to agree nor disagree.

  The Cape Verdeans (mean=2.88) and Brazilians (mean=2.78) were also more likely to ‘feel inhibited’; they neither agreed nor disagreed with the sentence, in contrast with the Ukrainian group (mean=2.43) which was more likely to disagree (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 19.696$, $p<0.0001$).
- Differences between the three immigrants and the control group

Table 7:20 - Behaviour: Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between immigrants and the control group (p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel free to do what I want</td>
<td>1587.00</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited to do what I want in an outdoor space</td>
<td>1606.500</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Portuguese respondents were more likely to disagree that they felt ‘inhibited’ from doing what they wanted compared with the Brazilians (and Cape Verdeans). The Portuguese were more likely to agree that they felt ‘free’ to do what they wanted outdoors compared with the Brazilian and Cape Verdean respondents. There were no significant differences between the Portuguese and the Ukrainians (see Appendix 6).

7.2.4.10. Safety

Participants were asked about their perceptions of safety. Since the questionnaire was not focused on a single public open space, the questions were general.

Figure 7:31 - Respondents’ attitudes to safety in public spaces
Figure 7.32 - Respondents’ attitudes to safety in public spaces ‘alone’ or ‘with others’

Generally, the respondents’ perceptions of safety were high for all three immigrant groups; there were no significant differences between them (see Appendix 6). Respondents were more likely to feel safe in places they were familiar with (mean=3.81) and which were in their neighbourhoods (mean=3.64). Their sense of safety in the city was also high (mean=3.42).

Although safety did not appear to be a problem for the respondents, being in the company of others seemed to increase their sense of it (mean=3.77), while being ‘alone’ was more likely to decrease it (mean=3.35).

- Differences between the three immigrants and the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most places in the city</td>
<td>1615.500</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>1416.500</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>P-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portuguese respondents in the control group were less likely to feel safer when ‘alone’ and ‘most places in the city’ compared with the Brazilian respondents.
7.2.5. Immigrants’ memories and experiences

7.2.5.1. Childhood and outdoor spaces

Since childhood memories seemed to play an important role in how individuals relate to the environment (see Chapter 4 and 6), participants were asked how often they would play outdoors in four different types of places.

Figure 7.33 – Respondents’ frequency of use of outdoor spaces in childhood, by nationality

The majority of respondents used to play in the ‘streets’ on a regular basis (weekly/daily). 72.9% of Brazilian, 73.4% of Cape Verdean and 60% of the Ukrainian respondents played every day in the street.

Cape Verdeans used to play on the beach on weekly basis (48.2%) compared with the Brazilians who never, or rarely, used the beach when they were children. Although a
higher proportion of the Ukrainians responded they never or rarely used the beach, they were still more likely to use it than the Brazilians (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 21.942, p<0.0001$).

The respondents reported they used parks and gardens in childhood less frequently than the streets. 39% of Brazilians used them on a week/daily basis; 44% of the Ukrainians; and only 31% of the Cape Verdeans. The percentage of Cape Verdeans who never, or rarely, used parks and gardens when they were children was significantly higher than for the other two groups (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 21.367, p<0.0001$).

The Brazilian (47.5%) and Ukrainian (47.5%) respondents used natural places regularly when they were children, while, 67.9% of Cape Verdeans never used these types of places (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 17.445, p<0.0001$).

- Differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group

Table 7:22- Respondents' frequency of use of outdoor spaces during respondents' childhood: Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between the three immigrant groups and the control group (p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood memories</th>
<th>Brazilian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Ukrainian vs. Portuguese</th>
<th>Cape Verdean vs. Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play on the beach</td>
<td>U 1420.000, p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U 1588.000, p&lt;0.024, P+</td>
<td>U 1584.50, p&lt;0.006, P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play in the street</td>
<td>U p&gt;0.005, p&gt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U p&gt;0.005, p&gt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U 1801.00, p&lt;0.005, P-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In city’s gardens and parks</td>
<td>U p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U 1296.00, p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In natural place</td>
<td>U p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U p&lt;0.005, P+</td>
<td>U 1545.50, p&lt;0.004, P+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Portuguese respondents played on the 'beach' more frequently than the Brazilians and Ukrainians. However, the Portuguese played less frequently on the 'beach' and in the 'street' than the Cape Verdeans. However, the Cape Verdeans played less frequently in 'parks and gardens' and 'natural areas' than the Portuguese respondents.
7.2.5.2. Missing elements

Figure 7:34- Elements that the respondents’ miss from their home country, by nationality
In comparison with the new environment, the Brazilian and Ukrainian respondents (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 23.460$, $p<0.0001$) were more likely to miss the presence of more green spaces compared with the Cape Verdean respondents, however, there were no significant differences between the three groups. The Brazilians missed seeing some green elements from their flora but in general, missing contact with nature was common to all three groups.

The three immigrant groups also missed the social component that outdoor spaces could offer. All three groups missed having barbecues outdoors (the Brazilians missed this the most – their scores were significantly higher than for the other two immigrant groups) (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 14.390$, $p=0.001$), followed by the Cape Verdean respondents and then the Ukrainians. The Cape Verdeans (mean=3.84) and Brazilians missed having the opportunity to gather outdoors with friends; while this was less relevant for the Ukrainians (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 23.677$, $p<0.0001$).

The Cape Verdeans greatly missed the sea; while the other two immigrant groups were much less likely to miss it (Kruskal Wallis $\chi^2 = 86.338$, $p<0.0001$).

7.2.5.3. Respondents' experience as immigrants in Portugal

The respondents' experience as immigrants in Portugal was mainly positive across all three groups. 62.7\% of the Brazilian respondents affirmed they had had ‘positive’ experiences; 36.1\% of the Ukrainians also reported having positive experiences and 14.8\% ‘very positive’; while 43.8\% of the Cape Verdeans also described having had a positive experience.

A small percentage of immigrants reported having had a less positive experience: 6.8\% of Brazilians mentioned having had a ‘negative’ experience, while this value was lower
for the Ukrainians (3.3%). The Cape Verden respondents had had a negative experience (9.4%) and 3.1% mentioned having had a 'very negative' experience.

7.2.5.4. Reasons for respondents' migration to Portugal

Respondents' reasons for emigrating were, mainly, entirely down to personal choice (69.5% of Brazilians; 54.1% of Ukrainians; 48.4% of Cape Verdeans). Only a small percentage of immigrants migrated against their will (1.6% of the Cape Verdeans and 3.3% of the Ukrainians), while 11.5% of Ukrainians and 9.4% of the Cape Verdeans said it was not their choice either.

7.2.5.5. Elements that reminded respondents of their home country

Participants were asked which elements in Portugal reminded them of home.

Table 7:23 - Elements in Portugal which reminded the respondents of home by nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Cape Verde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Baixa’s neighbourhood</td>
<td>- Family (8x)</td>
<td>- Being close to the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Warm climate</td>
<td>- Football stadiums</td>
<td>- Parties and discos (2x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food (2x)</td>
<td>- People from country</td>
<td>- People from my country (5x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Culture (2x)</td>
<td>- Pine trees</td>
<td>- Food (3x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- History (2x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cape Verdean culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language (5x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People (3x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- My neighbourhood (4x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tv programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sun in the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Old house (architecture)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Walks along the coast during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Going to friends’ houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7:36- Immigrants’ reasons for migrating to Portugal, by nationality
The historical links between Portugal and its ex-colonies played an important role. The respondents from Brazil and Cape Verde mentioned cultural aspects, food, language, and architecture as being things they found familiar and which reminded them of home. They also mentioned natural elements such as the sea, sun, the warm climate and trees.

Meeting up with other people of the same nationality evoked memories of home and this was common to all three groups.

Bearing in mind earlier descriptions (see Chapters 1 and 3) of the settlement of the Cape Verdean community, the respondents from that group also referred to ‘my neighbourhood’ as a place which reminded them of home.

7.3. Variations based on demographic characteristics

As described above, ‘nationality’ revealed significant differences between the groups. This section explores how other demographic factors affected the different variables.

7.3.1. Gender differences

The literature describes the different preferences of male and female respondents. This section of the research aims to reveal whether any significant gender differences exist in relation to public open spaces in Lisbon for the respondents from the three immigrant groups.

Table 7.24 - Gender differences (Mann-Whitney test p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p values</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Outdoor Space</td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>-2.856</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Female + Male -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children can play</td>
<td>2728</td>
<td>-4.292</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Female + Male -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can be close to the sea</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>-2.627</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Female + Male -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being calm and relaxing</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>-2.595</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Female + Male -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety: Alone</td>
<td>2463</td>
<td>-2.212</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Male + Female -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements that are missed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss gathering outdoors</td>
<td>3448</td>
<td>-2.249</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Female + Male -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female respondents from all three immigrant groups were more likely to perceive public open spaces as being calm and relaxing, compared with male respondents. In terms of activities, the female respondents from all three immigrant groups, were more likely, in their free time, to use outdoor spaces in which to read and they also had a higher preference for spaces where children could play, than the male respondents. The female respondents also had a stronger preference for being close to the sea than the males.

141 Only the three immigrant groups were included in this analysis
The female respondents missed having the opportunity to socialise when going outdoors, and that aspect had been special in their home countries, but this was missed less by the male respondents.

7.3.2. Age differences

The range of respondents’ ages was from 18-85 years. The Kruskal Wallis test was undertaken in order to disclose the most significant differences.

Table 7:25 - Age differences (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in Portugal</td>
<td>37.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>[18-24] – &gt;65 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>10.111</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>&gt;65 - [35-54] + [25-34]+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with family</td>
<td>10.788</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>[25-34] – &gt;65 + [35-54] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in a natural place (forest; countryside, national park, etc.)</td>
<td>11.381</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>&gt;65 - [35-54] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children can play</td>
<td>10.271</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>&gt;65 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a barbecue</td>
<td>9.601</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>[18-24] –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>12.376</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>[18-24] –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most used types of places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests, pinewoods, natural parks</td>
<td>9.748</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>&gt;65 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those respondents who had been living in Portugal the longest were over 65 years old. This group was also more likely to have had a lower level of education; while those between ages 25 and 54 were more likely to have had a higher level of education.

The variable ‘spend time with family’ was more likely to be a leisure activity for those respondents over 65 years old and between 35 and 54, while less likely for younger participants between the ages of 25 and 34. Older participants, over 55 years old, were also more likely to engage in ‘cultural events’ and activities, rather than the youngest group of participants (18-24 years old). Visits to ‘natural areas’ were more likely to be made by respondents who were between the ages of 35 and 54 but unlikely by those over 65 years old. A finding that corroborated this last result was that ‘forests, pinewoods, natural parks’ were also less likely to be used by this latter age group.
Older participants were more likely to prefer an outdoor space where children could play, compared with the other age groups. The youngest respondents were least likely to rank in first place an open space that was suitable for having a ‘barbecue and/or a picnic’.

### 7.3.3. Level of education – differences

This section aims to show the extent to which levels of education affect the relationship the three groups of immigrants have with public open spaces.

Table 7:26 - Differences in levels of education (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$P$-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession/Occupation in Portugal</td>
<td>17.609</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Masters/PhD: + qualified University: less qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the museum/cultural events</td>
<td>25.340</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>University + Masters/PhD +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>13.617</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>University + Masters/PhD +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I see many people</td>
<td>13.181</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>[1-4 ] + ; [5-9] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can see or be close to the river</td>
<td>10.487</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>[1-4 ] – ; [5-9] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of places</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>13.578</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>[1-4 ] + Masters/PhD -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of POS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of use</td>
<td>10.547</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>[1-4 ] – ; [5-9] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have money</td>
<td>17.464</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[1-4 ] + ; [5-9] + Masters/PhD -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know many places</td>
<td>13.289</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>[1-4 ] + [5-9] + Masters/PhD -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel free to do what I want</td>
<td>14.795</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>University + Masters/PhD +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited to do what I want in an outdoor space</td>
<td>12.539</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>[1-4 ] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements that are missed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss gathering together outdoors with friends</td>
<td>10.189</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>[1-4 ] + [5-9] +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant differences were found between those immigrants with a higher level of education (Masters/PhD) and those with lower levels (primary and basic education).

Those respondents with a Masters/PhD were more likely to be in more qualified professions. However, this was not usually the case for those respondents with a degree, who were less likely to be in a profession that matched their educational attainment.

Those with a middle (high school) level of education were more likely to ‘stay at home and watch TV’, while those with less years of education (1-4) were less likely to take part in this activity.
Respondents with a higher level of education (university degree and a Masters/PhD) were more likely to take part in cultural activities and read outdoors.

Education was also likely to have an impact on respondents’ preferences. Those with 1 to 9 years of education were more likely to prefer places where they could see ‘many people’ and less likely to prefer being close to the river. Those with the lowest level of education were more likely to use ‘markets’ regularly.

Respondents’ frequency of use of public open spaces was also likely to be affected by low levels of education. Those with 1 to 9 years of education were less likely to visit outdoors spaces on a regular basis.

Barriers to the use of outdoor spaces were also likely to differ. Again, those respondents with a few years in education were more likely to agree that ‘money’ and poor knowledge of places were reasons which deterred their use of public open spaces. Conversely, those with a Masters/PhD were less likely to agree with these variables as reasons not to go out often.

The same finding occurred in relation to respondents’ attitudes towards their behaviour. Those with a higher level of education were more likely to feel ‘free’ and to do what they wanted in outdoor spaces, while those with just a primary education were more prone to feeling ‘inhibited’.

The social role of outdoor spaces was more likely to be missed by those, again, with a lower level of education.

### 7.3.4. Occupation

As discussed in Chapter 2, immigrants do not always have a job in the profession they used to have in their home country. Usually, they take the less well paid jobs and their levels of education do not always correspond to the profession they have in Lisbon. The Kruskal Wallis test results were relevant for only a few variables.

**Table 7.27 - Occupation in Portugal (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the museum/ cultural events</td>
<td>36.806</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Intellectual and scientific professionals +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technicians and associate professionals +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>26.477</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Intellectual and scientific Professionals +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technicians and associate professionals +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For respondents with high end jobs, cultural leisure activities and reading outdoors are among the things they are likely to do in outdoor spaces. This reinforced the results, obtained above, in relation to respondents’ levels of education.

Unemployed respondents were less likely to use outdoors spaces due to their lack of knowledge of different places in the city, while economic problems, were likely to be a barrier for those respondents who had poorer-paid/low-status jobs (craft and related trades workers and those in elementary occupations).

### 7.3.5. Respondents’ number of years living in Portugal

As Chapter 4 (section 4.5.3) showed, the number of years immigrants had been living in the host country may influence their engagement in outdoor activities. This section, therefore, aims to explore the extent to which this variable might influence other aspects of their relationship with public open spaces.

Table 7.28 - Differences in the number of years respondents had been living in Portugal (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with family</td>
<td>14.034</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>≤ 5 years –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can rest</td>
<td>13.766</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>≤1 year –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children can play</td>
<td>15.077</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1-5 years + 6-10 years + &gt;20 years +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can see or be close to the sea</td>
<td>12.828</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>≤1 year –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have the possibility to do different activities</td>
<td>13.546</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1-5 years + 6-10 years + 16-20 years +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have a picnic</td>
<td>13.150</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1-5 years + 6-10 years + &lt;1 year - 11-15 years - 16-20 years -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of places ‘Miradouro’</td>
<td>14.364</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>16-20 years +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of places parks and gardens</td>
<td>13.855</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>≤1 year + 1-5 years + 6-10 years + 16-20 years -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of years which the respondents had been living in Portugal was influenced by the different waves of migration.

Those respondents who had been living in Portugal for less than 5 years were less likely to engage in family activities since many of them had possibly initiated the migration process alone, and a reunion with their family in Portugal was unlikely to take place.

In the preferences' category, some variables were affected by the respondents' length of stay in Portugal. Being able to 'rest' was less important for those who had only been in the host country for a short time (less than one year); while those who had been there for between 6-10\(^{142}\) and 20+ years were more likely to prefer an outdoor space where they could ‘rest’. Having facilities where children could play was more important for those who had been in Lisbon for more than 11 years, compared with those who had been there for less than one year. Proximity to the ‘sea’ was less likely to be significant for those respondents who had been living in Lisbon for less than one year, but not for those who had been there for many years. An outdoor space which could provide engagement in different activities was more likely to be appreciated by those with 1-5 years and 16-20 years of residency, than for those between 6-10 years. The variable ‘have a picnic’ showed the exact opposite, with the exception that the group of respondents who had been living in Portugal for less than 1 year was also included.

The length of residency was also likely to influence the types of places used by the respondents. ‘Miradouros’ were among the spaces less used, nonetheless, those who tended to use them were the respondents in the 16-20 year group. ‘Parks and gardens’ were likely to be used by immigrants from most residency intervals, with the exception being those in the 16-20 year interval.

\(^{142}\) This period of 6-10 years correspond to the Ukrainian wave of migration.
In relation to the use of public open spaces, those respondents who had been living for less than one year were also more likely to go ‘alone’ to outdoor spaces.

From the variables related to the missing elements, only two were likely to be influenced by respondents’ length of residency. Missing the presence of more green spaces was more likely to be the case for those respondents in the 6-10 years residency group and not for those living in Portugal for 20+ years; while missing the ‘sea’ was more likely to be something the respondents who had been living in Lisbon longer mentioned, rather than the 6-10 year residency group.

7.3.6. Previous types of places in the home country where respondents used to live prior to their migration – differences

In order to understand if previous life experiences affect immigrants’ relationship with open spaces in the host country, this section explores the possible influence on respondents of places that they used to live in their home country.

Table 7:29 - Previous types of places (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leisure activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>9.169</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>Metropolis +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which has urban characteristics (built environment)</td>
<td>8.328</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>Metropolis +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I can have the possibility to do different activities</td>
<td>11.612</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>Metropolis +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements that are missed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss the presence of more green spaces</td>
<td>9.934</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>Countryside +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss the contact with nature</td>
<td>11.195</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>Countryside +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss gathering together outdoors with friends</td>
<td>9.227</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>Countryside +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who used to live in urban areas, especially in large cities were more likely to engage in going outdoors for a walk. For the respondents in this category, their perception of outdoor spaces included environments with more built-up characteristics, rather than natural; and they were also more likely to prefer outdoor spaces where they could engage in different activities.

Respondents who used to live in the countryside or villages were more likely to miss contact with nature and the presence of green spaces.
### 7.3.7. Participants’ experience as immigrants

Table 7:30 - Migration experiences (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in outdoor spaces</td>
<td>15.208</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>Very negative –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the beach</td>
<td>13.556</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>Very negative -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go for a walk in the city</td>
<td>10.417</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>Very negative -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which are big (scale) and open</td>
<td>11.003</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>Very negative -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of places: waterfront</td>
<td>8.269</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>Very negative -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of places: shopping centres</td>
<td>20.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Very negative +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of POS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of use</td>
<td>16.687</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Very negative +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of the year: all year</td>
<td>11.268</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>Very positive +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don‘t have money</td>
<td>9.821</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>Very negative +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most places in the city</td>
<td>10.976</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>Very negative +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for the migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reason why the participant left their country: their choice</td>
<td>16.684</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Neutral/negative –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three leisure activity variables were affected by respondents’ migration experiences. Respondents who had a very positive experience were more likely to go for a walk, mainly in the city, and to visit the beach. On the other hand, those who had a very negative experience were more likely to dislike big open spaces, visited shopping centres more often and were less likely to go outdoors, and were more likely to see financial problems as a barrier to their making visits to spaces. If respondents had a positive experience that was also likely to influence them in making frequent visits to outdoor spaces throughout the year, and they reported feeling a sense of safety for most places in the city.

### 7.3.8. Respondents’ reasons for migrating to Portugal

Table 7:31 - Reasons for migrating to Portugal (Kruskal Wallis Test, p<0.05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest at home</td>
<td>11.958</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>Not their choice +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places I know well</td>
<td>10.794</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>Not entirely their choice -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants’ experience in Portugal: positive</td>
<td>21.471</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Entirely their choice +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons why the respondents emigrated did not seem to influence their use of public open spaces. Those who had not chosen to migrate were more likely to feel unsafe, even in the places they knew well, and were more likely to spend their leisure time resting in
their homes. Those who chose to migrate were more likely to have an overall positive experience.

7.4. Predictions

A series of logistic regression was used to explore further relations between variables and to answer, in more detail, some of the research questions.

7.4.1. Frequency of use

The regression model tried to identify what variables could predict respondents’ frequency of use. In detail:

- Would demographic variables influence frequency of use?
- Would leisure and recreational patterns influence frequency of use?
- Would frequency of use be influenced by preferences, activities and perceptions?
- What barriers decreased the frequency of respondents’ visits to public open spaces?
- Would safety be a predictor?
- Would respondents’ precious memories, including childhood memories, influence the number of visits to spaces?
- Would their experience as an immigrant and the reason(s) for migrating be predictors of frequency of use?
- Would nationality be a key predictor?

Appendix 7 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, which revealed the variables which had a significant effect (p<0.05) on the frequency of use of outdoor spaces. A series of binary logistic regression was executed in order to predict respondents' frequency of use, which included the variables identified by the Mann-Whitney U test. Each regression tested for multicollinearity, indicating that the analysis was valid since the VIF (variance inflation factor) was lower than 10.

The answers to the questions above are included in the section below, apart from ‘Would the experience as an immigrant and the reason for migrating be predictors of frequency of use?’

143 A binary logistic regression was carried out, instead of a linear regression due to the fact that the variable ‘frequency of use’ did not follow the normal distribution.
frequency of use?’, since the Mann-Whitney U test did not identify those variables as significant, suggesting, therefore that there were no significant relationships between them and frequency of use.

7.4.1.1. **Predictors from the demographic section**

A set of three variables ‘nationality’, ‘previous type of place’ and ‘education’ were added to a binary regression, improving its accuracy to predict frequency of use from 67.4% (block zero) to 73.9% (block one) (see Appendix 8). Only the respondents’ nationality remained significant. Among immigrants, the Ukrainians were predicted to be more likely to visit frequently outdoor spaces (Wald=17.103, p<0.0001, Exp(B)=7.101), followed by the Brazilians (Wald=3.925, p=0.048, Exp(B)=2.282) and finally, the Cape Verdeans, who were the reference category (Wald=17.686, p<0.0001).

Since nationality was identified as a key predictor for the frequency of use, a further regression was carried out, which included the Portuguese control group. The findings revealed that from all four groups the Portuguese (who were the reference category) were more likely to visit public open spaces (Wald=37.772, p<0.0001). On the other hand, Brazilians (Wald=8.892, p=0.043, Exp(B)=0.196) and Cape Verdeans (Wald=26.559, p<0.0001, Exp(B)=0.066) were less likely to use outdoor spaces. No significant prediction was established between the Portuguese and the Ukrainians (see Appendix 8).

7.4.1.2. **Predictors from the leisure activities section**

The variables ‘go for a walk in outdoor spaces’, ‘go to the beach’, ‘have a BBQ/picnic’, ‘stay at home and watch TV’, ‘visit and meet friends’, ‘spend time with family’, ‘go to museums and cultural events’, ‘do sports’, ‘read in outdoor spaces’ and ‘have a coffee/visit an outdoor café’, were added to block one of a binary regression, improving the model’s accuracy to predict frequency of use from 67.4% (block zero) to 76.8% (block one) (see Appendix 8). The variables ‘going for a walk in outdoor spaces’ (Wald=7.119, p=0.008, Exp(B)=1.927), ‘have a BBQ/picnic’ (Wald=8.799, p=0.003, Exp(B)=1.924) and ‘have a coffee/visit an outdoor café’ (Wald=4.842, p=0.028, Exp(B)=1.451) remained significant, suggesting that those who engage in these activities are more likely to visit outdoor spaces frequently.

7.4.1.3. **Predictors from the outdoor environmental preferences section**

The variables ‘where children can play’, ‘where I can see or be close to the river’ and ‘which has music’ were included in the regression, improving the model’s accuracy from 67.4% (block zero) to 71.8% (block one) (see Appendix 8). All the variables ‘where children
can play’ (Wald=5.472, p=0.019, Exp(B)=1.438); ‘where I can see or be close to the river’ (Wald=7.309, p=0.007, Exp(B)=1.544); ‘which has music’ (Wald=5.651, p=0.017, Exp(B)=1.414)) proved to be significant, suggesting that those spaces which match immigrants’ preferences are more likely to be used by them.

7.4.1.4. Predictors from the barriers section

The variables included in this regression were: ‘do not have money’, ‘do not have time’ and ‘do not know many places’. The model’s accuracy changed from 67.4% (block zero) to 73.9% (block one) (see Appendix 8) with the inclusion of these set of variables, from which two were proven to be significant when determining the frequency of use. The variables ‘do not have money’ (Wald=6.230, p=0.013, Exp(B)=0.670144) and ‘do not have time’ (Wald=4.203, p=0.040, Exp(B)=0.737) were likely to influence the immigrants’ frequency of use in an inverse way. Respondents’ frequencies of use of public open spaces decreased with an increase whenever time and financial problems were recognised as barriers.

7.4.1.5. Predictors from the safety section

Although the variable ‘feel safe in most places in the city’ was identified as significant by the Mann-Whitney U test, however, further analysis via binary regression showed that this variable was not significant in predicting frequency of use (Wald=3.140, p=0.076).

7.4.1.6. Predictors from the memories section

The set of variables included in the memories section incorporated the variables from the childhood section and those from the elements that the respondents missed from their home country. The model’s ability to predict increased from 67.4% (block zero) to 70.7% (block one). Only the variable related to the frequency of use of parks and gardens’ during childhood (Wald=5.590, p=0.018, Exp(B)=0.722) was significant. This indicated that those respondents who did not play frequently in parks and gardens in childhood were less likely to visit outdoor spaces regularly, having retained their childhood habits into adulthood.

7.4.1.7. Block regression

In this section, a binary regression was conducted using all the variables identified as significant predictors in the previous regression. The regression was set up using five different blocks corresponding to: activities – block 1; preferences – block 2; barriers - block 3;^

^

144 When the Exp(B) value is lower than one the binomial regression indicates an inverse relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable.
memories – block 4; demographics – block 5. Overall, these blocks improved the model’s accuracy to predict frequency of use, from 67.4% (block zero), to 80.7% (block 5). Some of the variables which were significant when analysed within their sections were less significant once incorporated into this model. The variables which continued to be significant were:

- **Block1 – activities**: ‘going for a walk in outdoor spaces’ (Wald=5.626, p=0.018, Exp(B)=1.784) and ‘have a BBQ/picnic’ (Wald=8.122, p=0.004, Exp(B)=2.010);
- **Block2 – preferences**: there were no significant variables;
- **Block3 – barriers**: ‘do not have time’ (Wald=5.241, p=0.022, Exp(B)=0.648);
- **Block4 – memories**: there were no significant variables;
- **Block5 – demographics**: ‘nationality’ (Cape Verdeans) (Wald=11.826, p=0.003) and ‘nationality’ (Ukrainians) (Wald=11.707, p=0.001, Exp(B)=8.381)

The integrated model suggested that respondents’ key leisure activities were likely to increase their frequency of use of outdoor spaces. On the other hand, not having time was identified as a key barrier linked to respondents’ poor frequency of use. Even though nationality was inserted in the last block it continued to explain the frequency of use, however, being a Brazilian national was no longer a significant predictor.

### 7.4.2. Respondents’ preference for music being played outdoors

Since the preference for music seemed to be relevant to users, especially to Brazilians and Cape Verdeans (see Chapter 6), further regression was conducted in order to investigate what else was associated with this preference.

The regression included a variety of variables which were revealed to be significant (p<0.05), according to the Mann-Whitney U test (see Appendix 6). The binary regression (see Appendix 9) revealed the following:

- The variable ‘feel inhibited’ (Wald=4.684, p=0.030, Exp(B)=2.496) suggested that those respondents who felt inhibited in outdoor spaces were more likely to prefer hearing music outdoors;
- The variable ‘an environment ‘full of happenings, people and movement’ (Wald=4.209, p=0.040, Exp(B)=1.953) suggested that those respondents who
perceived an outdoor space as being lively were more likely to prefer music outdoors;

- The variable ‘season(2)’ (summer and spring) (Wald=5.07, p=0.025, Exp(B)=5.741) suggested that those who visited outdoor spaces during the warm seasons, spring and summer, were more likely to prefer music outdoors;
- The variable ‘miss barbecues’ (Wald=4.746, p=0.029, Exp(B)=1.881) suggested that those immigrants who missed having barbecues, were more likely to prefer music outdoors.

7.5. Summary

7.5.1. Demographic variables

The number of respondents in the sample from each of the three nationalities was balanced. This did not, however, give a true representation of the entire Portuguese situation, since, in fact, the proportion of Brazilian immigrants is higher among the total immigrant population. In terms of gender, the sample achieved a balance and it was representative of the Portuguese reality in 2008. Significant differences between the groups were found in:

- Levels of education: The Ukrainian respondents had, generally, a higher level of education than the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians; while the Cape Verdeans were the least highly educated;
- Number of years living in Portugal: The Cape Verdeans were the immigrant group who had been living longest in Portugal; while more than half of the Ukrainian respondents had been living between 6 and 10 years; and more than half of the Brazilians had been living between 1 and 5 years;
- Living with family vs. alone: Cape Verdeans had the highest proportion of immigrants living with family members;
- Occupation in Portugal: the majority of respondents worked in low skilled jobs,
- Previous place of residence in the home country: the majority of immigrants lived in urban environments; nearly half of the Brazilian respondents had lived in metropolis. Only a small percentage of immigrants from all three groups used to live in a village or in the countryside.
7.5.2. Leisure activities:

For all three immigrant groups, going for a walk outdoors was the most common leisure activity for the three groups of immigrants, followed by social activities, such as spending time with family and friends. On the other hand, reading in outdoor spaces and attending cultural events were the activities with lower levels of engagement. Nevertheless, there were some significant differences within the groups.

- Going for a walk in outdoor spaces, having a barbecue and going to an outdoor café, were more likely to be leisure activities for Ukrainian and Brazilian respondents.

- Cape Verdeans and Ukrainians were more likely to spend time with their families; this finding was supported by the demographic data (see section 7.2.1.5). These same groups were also more likely to rest at home during their free time.

There were also differences between the leisure and recreational patterns of the three immigrant groups and the control group. Portuguese were more likely to ‘go to the beach’ and ‘read in outdoor spaces’. On the other hand, immigrants were more likely, during their free time, to have barbecues and/or picnics and visiting shopping centres was more likely to be part of immigrants’ leisure patterns than it was for Portuguese.

When going for a walk, the three immigrant groups and the control group all said they would, in first place, go to parks and gardens in the city.

The majority of immigrant respondents did not engage in new activities in Portugal. Nevertheless, those who did engaged in activities offered by the new environment. Ukrainian immigrants cited the beach; Cape Verdeans referred to visits to the forest and ‘sports on top of the grass’ and the Brazilian respondents mentioned walking.

7.5.3. Outdoor environment preferences

7.5.3.1. Respondents’ general attitudes to activities and physical attributes

Immigrant respondents had a greater preference for being close to the sea and a space which had a ‘natural appearance’. There were no significant differences between the groups. In addition, the social component of space was valued by all three groups.

The significant differences found between the three groups were:
- Respondents’ general preference for being close to the river was least favoured by the Cape Verdeans.

- Ukrainians were least likely to prefer a space where users could engage in different activities and where they could see many people. Conversely, Brazilians and Cape Verdeans were more likely to prefer lively spaces.

Preferences did not vary significantly between the control group and the three immigrant groups, however, the Portuguese were more likely to value open spaces natural in appearance.

7.5.3.2. **Natural elements**

The respondents all appreciated enormously green elements (trees and lawns) and water elements. However, the Cape Verdean respondents ranked water features lower than the other two groups. This group was also more likely to prefer trees and lawns rather than just trees on their own.

The Portuguese respondents in the control group were also more likely to prefer trees and lawns, ranking them in first place.

7.5.3.3. **Facilities**

The three immigrant groups’ preferences for facilities varied across the groups:

- Cape Verdeans and Brazilians had a very strong preference for hearing music being played outdoors

- The Ukrainian respondents ranked having picnic facilities in first place followed by having barbecues. This contradicts the focus group findings, where barbecues were mentioned more frequently than picnics. However, the Wilcoxon test revealed no significant differences between the variables.

There were strong differences between the control group and the three immigrant groups. The control group ranked having an outdoor café in first place; while the immigrant groups put it in last place. However, having a barbecue was ranked last by the control group and second by the immigrant groups.

7.5.3.4. **Perception**

The perception of outdoor spaces as ‘being calm and relaxing’ was the same for all three immigrant groups, with no significant differences, suggesting that this perception might
be a cross cultural one. There were no differences, either between the immigrant groups and the control group.

7.5.4. Use of outdoor spaces

7.5.4.1. Favourite places

The three immigrant groups cited green spaces - Expo and Belém’s Garden – as among their favourite spaces in Lisbon. They also liked the beaches. However, the Ukrainians had a higher preference for the beach than the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians and only they cited a forest (Monsanto) as among their favourite places. Shopping was also part of the Brazilian and Cape Verdeans’ favourite activities in Lisbon. The control group referred to the same places as the three immigrant groups, apart from the shopping centre.

7.5.4.2. Types of places

Parks and gardens were the public open spaces that were visited the most by all three immigrant communities and the respondents in the control group. Brazilians and Cape Verdeans had similar frequency of visit profiles for: streets, markets and shopping centres (all visited frequently); while visiting forests, and the countryside, were not included in their visits to outdoor spaces. Forests were mostly visited by Ukrainians. The beach was frequently visited by Ukrainians and the Portuguese. The control group respondents were also more likely to visit the countryside and ‘miradouros’ than any of the immigrant groups. However, immigrants were more likely to visit shopping centres than the control group.

7.5.4.3. Frequency of use

The Brazilian and Ukrainian respondents visited outdoor spaces frequently; the lowest frequencies were among the Cape Verdeans, and the differences between the groups were significant.

The Portuguese respondents in the control group were more likely to visit outdoor spaces than the Cape Verdeans but less likely than the Ukrainians.

7.5.4.4. Other characteristics of visits to spaces

- While Cape Verdeans and Brazilians appeared to visit outdoor spaces during the warmer seasons, the Ukrainian respondents were likely to visit all year around. The Portuguese respondents in the control group were also more
likely to visit outdoor spaces all year round than the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans.

- Visits to outdoor spaces were mostly made either with family members or with friends from the home country and a few respondents referred to going with Portuguese friends.

- For immigrants, public transport was the means of travel they used most frequently when they visited outdoor spaces; while for the control group, it was the car.

- The great majority of respondents lived more than fifteen minutes away from an outdoor space. There were significant differences between the control group and each of the three immigrant groups, where the latter tended to travel longer (for more than 30 minutes) to access outdoor spaces.

7.5.4.5. **Barriers**

Overall, a ‘lack of time’ and being ‘too tired’ were cited as the main reasons that stopped the immigrant respondents from visiting outdoor spaces. The Portuguese respondents were more likely to say that the ‘lack of public transport’ was a barrier, than any of the immigrant groups. For the Cape Verdeans, they also cited financial problems as likely to affect their use of outdoors.

7.5.4.6. **Behaviour**

The Ukrainian respondents were more likely to feel free to do what they wanted and to feel less inhibited than the other two groups. Both the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans were more likely to say they felt neutral about their feelings of freedom and their inhibitions outdoors. Nevertheless these two groups had different perceptions of outdoor space than the control group.

7.5.4.7. **Safety**

Generally, respondents felt safe in Lisbon, either alone or with others and familiarity with places was likely to add to people’s sense of security. The Portuguese tended to feel less secure when alone than the Brazilians.
7.5.5. Memories and experiences

7.5.5.1. Childhood memories

All groups were likely to have used the streets as their main outdoor space for recreation in their childhood. There were significant differences for other types of places:

- Natural places and parks and gardens were more commonly used by Ukrainians and Brazilians;
- Cape Verdeans used the beach on a more regular basis.

The Portuguese were more likely to have played on the beach than the Brazilians and Ukrainians, but less than the Cape Verdeans. Also, the Portuguese played more often in city gardens, parks and natural places than the Cape Verdeans, who played more often in the street.

7.5.5.2. Elements that were missed

The Cape Verdeans missed the sea the most, Brazilians and Ukrainians missed the presence of more green spaces than the Cape Verdeans.

All groups said they missed having barbecues outdoors, but this was particularly true for the Brazilians. Although the Cape Verdeans did not particularly miss having barbecues, although they expressed a small sense of loss, however, they (and the Brazilian respondents) particularly missed the social aspect offered by outdoor space; while the Ukrainian respondents were less likely to miss it.

7.5.5.3. Respondents’ experiences as immigrants in Portugal

Immigrants’ experiences in the host country were generally positive. Only a small percentage of Cape Verdean participants considered it very negative.

The reasons for respondents’ migrating were mainly down to personal choice; only a small number of Ukrainians and Cape Verdeans said that it was not their choice.

7.5.5.4. Elements that reminded the respondents of home

The number of respondents who mentioned elements which triggered memories was not high. Of those who did mention it, the cultural and historical links between the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians were key since several elements were mentioned, i.e. food, culture, language, architecture.
7.5.6. Demographic variations

7.5.6.1. Gender:
There were significant differences between the male and female respondents:

- Women were more likely to prefer: a space where children could play; where they could be close to the sea; being able to read outdoors; and they perceived outdoor spaces as being calm and relaxing;
- Male respondents were just more likely to feel safer when alone.

7.5.6.2. Age
Although some age differences were significant, the most influential, in terms of frequency of use and respondents’ attitudes to public open spaces, were: participants over 65+ were less likely to visit natural places and preferred places where children could play safely.

7.5.6.3. Levels of education
Levels of education seemed to influence respondents’ use of public open spaces. Those with the lowest levels of education were more likely to feel inhibited in public spaces, preferring spaces where they could see many people, with markets among the favourite places. They were also more likely to cite financial problems as reasons for not going out so often.

7.5.6.4. Occupations
Respondents’ occupations were likely to influence their reasons for visiting outdoor spaces. Those who were unemployed were less likely to visit outdoor spaces due to their unfamiliarity with the city. Financial problems were also a constraint for those in lower paid jobs.

7.5.6.5. Respondents' number of years living in Portugal
Although frequency of use of outdoor space was unlikely to be altered by the number of years respondents’ had been living in the host country, some other variables were affected. These variations were strongly linked with different periods of migration which reflected, in many cases, the respondents’ nationality. Those who had been living in Portugal for more than 10 years were more likely to value spaces which offered the opportunity for children to play; while the opposite was true for those who had been living there for less than one year.
7.5.6.6. **Previous types of place**

Those respondents who came from rural areas were more likely to miss having contact with green spaces, with nature and gathering outdoors with friends. On the other hand, those who had lived in large urban areas were more likely to go for a walk outdoors, and preferred built environments where they had the chance to engage in different activities.

7.5.6.7. **Immigrants' experience and the reason to migrate**

The results revealed a strong connection between immigrants' experience and the reasons for migrating, with those who had chosen to migrate being more likely to have a positive experience and therefore use outdoor spaces more frequently, throughout the year, especially by going for a walk outdoors, visiting the beach and waterfronts. Conversely, those who had a negative experience were less likely to visit outdoor spaces, to feel safe and were more likely to perceive money as a barrier.

7.5.7. **Predictions:**

7.5.7.1. **Frequency of use:**

Binary regressions provided the following information:

- Nationality was the only significant demographic variable. It revealed that Ukrainians were more likely to visit outdoor spaces, followed by Brazilians and Cape Verdeans.
- The immigrants who engaged in outdoor activities in their leisure time, such as going for a walk, having a barbecue and/or picnic and spending time in an outdoor café, were more likely to visit outdoor spaces frequently.
- Those respondents who preferred being close to the river, enjoyed having music outdoors, and using places where children could play, were more likely to visit outdoor spaces regularly.
- Lack of time and financial difficulties were likely to decrease the frequency of use of outdoor spaces.
- Safety was not a significant predictor when studying frequency of use.
- Childhood memories were a significant predictor of frequency of use. Those who did not visit parks and gardens as children in their home country were less likely to use outdoor spaces as adults in the host country.
In the block regression, nationality was included in the last block (block 5) and was a significant predictor for the Ukrainians and Cape Verdeans.

7.5.7.2. **The preference for hearing music in outdoor spaces:**

The binary regressions suggested that the preference for music was linked to:

- Those who preferred music being played outdoors were more likely to feel inhibited.
- Those who preferred music being played outdoors were more likely to visit outdoor spaces during the summer and spring.
- Those who preferred music were more likely to perceive outdoor spaces as being lively spaces
- Those who preferred music were more likely to miss having barbecues in their home countries.

The next chapter presents the findings from the last method applied in this research, the ‘go-along’ interviews. This qualitative method aimed to explore some of the research questions which had not been fully discussed during the focus groups interviews and the questioners. Immigrant participants were taken for ‘a walk’ in two specific locations in Lisbon to underpin how ‘place’ influenced immigrants’ experiences.
Chapter 8: Findings from the ‘go-along’ interview: immigrants’ in-depth discussions of public open spaces in Lisbon

8.1. Introduction

The findings discussed in the previous two chapters revealed immigrants’ views, experiences and perceptions of various public open spaces in Lisbon. So far this research has not described how ‘place’ can influence immigrants’ experiences, perceptions and activities. During the focus groups, however, the respondents in all three immigrant groups mentioned several of the place characteristics which they particularly appreciated, how these influenced their choice of location and why they liked to visit certain places. However, it was still unclear how they constructed bonds with their favourite places. What are, for example, the underlying attributes they ascribe to the physical environment that affects their experience of a particular place and shapes their liking or disliking it and therefore, their use or non-use of it?

In addition, other research questions remained unanswered, such as, in what way do the three immigrant groups feel emotionally attached to new places in the host country? Do they develop (new) emotional bonds (see Chapter 4)? Does any particular place or physical element in the built environment trigger memories? What is the role of memories in shaping their like/dislike of a place?

To address these questions, this research used a third method, ‘go-along’ interviews. As described in Chapter 5, the places that I walked through with the immigrants encouraged a more relaxed atmosphere and in so doing, it prompted them to discuss, in greater depth, their views about place (including place attachment and their sense of place). Topics arose naturally that had not been touched on in the focus-group interviews. It seems that away from the formality of the rooms where the focus groups took place, the respondents relaxed visibly and also benefitted from enjoying multi-sensory experiences in natural landscapes. Being embedded in the environment stimulated their senses: touch (their desire to touch features, to feel the wind and the ‘fresh air’), smell (the smell of the water, food), sound (the sound of the sea and of music) and vision (the colours, textures and shapes that they saw in open space).

This chapter, therefore, investigates the spatial characteristics of place that have a special meaning for the three immigrant groups, as well as the emotional bonds that tie them to those places.
8.1.1. The locations of the ‘go-along’ interviews

As described in Chapter 5, nine participants were involved in this method. During one afternoon, I accompanied three participants from each immigrant group on a ‘walk’ to two places in Lisbon. I invited the participants to choose two places from a list of their favourite places that had been generated from the questionnaire results:

Table 8:1 - Favourite places, by nationality: results from the questionnaire (see Chapter 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Cape Verde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expo (Parque das Nações)</td>
<td>Belém’s garden</td>
<td>Belém’s garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belém’s garden</td>
<td>Costa’s beach</td>
<td>Expo (Parque das Nações)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa’s beach</td>
<td>Monsanto</td>
<td>Chiado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linha’s beach</td>
<td>Expo (Parque das Nações)</td>
<td>Shopping centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping centre</td>
<td>Guincho’s beach</td>
<td>Costa’s beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I asked the participants to choose from a list of their ‘favourite’ places because I wanted to take them to a familiar place which had meaning for them, and where they would feel comfortable to talk with me and share their experiences of those.

All three groups chose the Expo Park (Parque das Nações) and Belém’s garden as their favourite public open spaces in Lisbon. Soares (2006), in her study of Lisbon’s green spaces, indicates that these two spaces are among the most used green spaces by the native population. Both places have good public transportation links, are located within Lisbon and are near the River Tagus.

Expo is in east Lisbon and has 5km of riverfront. The park’s chief characteristic is that it offers long promenade walks along the riverfront; it also has themed pocket gardens representing different parts of the world (an allusion to Portugal’s colonial past). The park offers very diverse flora; restaurants and bars overlooking the river; it is surrounded by cultural venues, hotels and a shopping centre; and it has a large area of lawn at the north end of the park which creates informal areas for different types of activities.

145 The reason for examining two places was to compare the interviews. This comparison was helpful in identifying patterns and principles which underlay the immigrants’ preferences and attachments.
Belém is located in south-west Lisbon near the sea. It is dotted with historical and cultural monuments, and is a place well known for its historical importance\textsuperscript{146}. The gardens have a simple design, with areas of lawns, and they are punctuated with mature trees which provide areas of shade. They are divided by a major road and a railroad, creating almost two separate gardens.

8.1.2. The structure of the ‘go-along’ interviews

The structure and content of the go-along interviews varied from group to group. Although all walks began at the same location, participants chose the routes (see Appendix 10 for details). In particular, they had to negotiate, as a group, the route they intended to take. In all cases, one or two participants suggested the initial direction, and the route was then adapted, depending on the flow of the conversation. That is, it would change direction, normally, if a participant wanted to show me a specific location/feature. The final route taken by each group might not represent the one each individual would normally take on their visits, but it represented a collection of places with special meaning for the group as a whole.

\textsuperscript{146} It is where ships left on exploratory missions during the Portuguese ‘discovery period’ (the fifteenth century).
Throughout the walks, conversation flowed naturally when the participants discussed their surrounding environment. This easy flow of conversation helped them to explore different topics, as the literature had suggested might be the case. The participants focused mainly on their perceptions, spatial practices and personal biographies that they associated with these two places. Nevertheless, I had prepared a set of questions to discuss with all three immigrant groups. These questions were structured around three main themes:

- Preferences – what space characteristics of Belém and Expo did they prefer?
  What made them special; what would they normally do there?
- Memories – did Belém and Expo evoke memories of their home countries?
- ‘Place attachment’ – did those places have a special meaning for them?

8.1.3. Participants

All the participants had been to these two places previously but some were more familiar with those locations than others. Belém was well known and frequently visited by all the participants, with the exception of one Ukrainian male. Expo was also regularly visited by Ukrainians, Brazilians and one Cape Verdean participant. The other two Cape Verdean participants had been just a few times to the gardens, although they had visited the adjacent shopping centre often.

8.2. Findings

8.2.1. Preferences – physical attributes

At the beginning of the walks, I asked all the participants if they would comment, along the way, on the elements that they liked or disliked. Since participants were in places of their choice, and in locations with which they had a special affinity or knew reasonably well, their responses to the places were generally positive. While en route, the majority of participants stopped at features they liked and talked enthusiastically about them. Some paused, just for a few seconds, pointed at something (e.g., trees, walls, buildings and rivers) and continued walking; while others paused nearby and some took a photograph and reflected on their feelings and thoughts about it. At other times, some participants engaged physically with a feature (e.g., trees, grass and stones) – that is, apart from describing it to me, they also touched it.
8.2.1.1. **Natural elements**

The main focus of the discussion for the participants centred on the physical attributes of the place and in what way (if at all) they aroused certain feelings and emotions. The elements that the participants preferred were: water (i.e. mainly the river, fountains and the sea) and green elements (trees, plants and grass). As earlier findings of this research show (see Chapters 6 and 7), these elements were relevant and common to all three immigrant groups.

When one participant from Brazil was walking along the walkway close to the river, away from buildings, she described how peaceful she found this natural environment. At that point, everyone in the group paused and looked at the river. A second participant then said that she also felt relaxed and at peace beside the river. Although both participants keenly described the impact of this natural environment on them, the rhythm of the conversation was disrupted for a few minutes and I had to wait for one of the participants to start talking again before we could resume the walk.

\[ W1 \text{ - For me... I think the good thing is that this space gives me a sense of peace, so much peace. It makes me feel calm on the inside.} \]
\[ W2 \text{ – If you walk close to the river you feel relaxed. All the water... it gives you a sense of peace. And while you walk along... you just enjoy it.} \]

(Brazilian participants - Expo)

In Belém, while pointing to the horizon, the Ukrainian female participant mentioned the importance of the river in Expo, but she stressed that in Belém, while looking at the river and to the horizon, the open and infinite views over the sea gave her a greater sense of freedom. To make sure that I fully understood her, she used the Portuguese word for ‘freedom’ (‘liberdade’) and then she repeated it again, using the English word.

\[ W1 \text{ - The river, here... well, the river in Expo is very important but here [Belém] it gives this sense of freedom (...) I adore the openness of the sea, the unlimited views.} \]

(Ukrainian participant - Belém)
While walking along the river promenade in Expo, one Cape Verdean participant asked me if I would take a photograph of the group because, she said, the views over the river were so ‘beautiful’ that it would make a ‘nice’ photograph. I duly took the photograph as requested, while the three of them posed for the camera, with the river in the background.

The participants also liked other water elements, such as the colourful water fountains147 in Expo. However, as opposed to the river and sea, they appreciated these elements mainly as a source of entertainment and curiosity, since they are different from normal fountains and they offer multi-sensory experiences (the sound of water, and drops of water that land on their skin). In all three groups, participants stood by the fountain and waited expectantly and enthusiastically for the moment when the water rushed out. When it did, there was a common reaction – all the participants burst out laughing.

In Belém, the Cape Verdean participants pointed out how the greenness of the space, being outdoors and the river gave them a sense of wellbeing. In particular, one participant revealed the importance that place played in her life, how it helped her to relax whenever she had a ‘problem at home’.

W3 - I feel good in this place, because is a very green space and I adore nature, that is why I feel good.

W2 - I also like to come here because it is an open space, it make us feel good, it is green and also, close to the river and I feel free (...) It is a very good place to come, if you have a problem at home. You come here and you feel relaxed.

(Cape Verdean participants - Belém)

Although Ukrainians criticised the lack of green spaces in Portugal, particularly in Lisbon, places like Expo still contributed to their general sense of wellbeing. They preferred areas of the park further away from buildings and where they could be surrounded by trees, plants and water. During the ‘go-along’ walk, we did not go to this part of the park because it was too far away and we had still to visit Belém, however, participants made it clear to me that the further away from the built environment they were, the better.

W1 - You can come for walk to this place and you can rest. Close to the river, it has green spaces. In Kiev, and in Ukraine, all the parks are full of trees. Here in Portugal, you don't find that so much; they are not as full of trees as in Ukraine. And truly, in Lisbon, it is something you really miss. So when there is a space with many plants, flowers and trees, I feel good.

(Ukrainian participant - Expo)

147These fountains mimic volcanoes by expelling water at regular intervals. During the summer, the splashes of water from them are mainly used as a way for people to feel refreshed. These elements splash water in irregular intervals, not being, therefore, predictable when the explosion of water is about to happen.
In Belém, the vast areas of grass were appreciated by all the participants; they felt it contributed to their perception of ‘greener’ space. Participants said they regretted that there were not many more grassy areas in Expo.

They also said that their passion for nature and the pleasure of being in contact with it were reasons why they enjoyed green elements. They used words such as ‘beautiful’ and ‘pleasure’ mostly in association with trees, any other form of greenery and nature.

8.2.1.2. Activities and facilities

For most participants, simply going for a walk around the gardens and spending quality time there were among their reasons for visiting Belém and Expo. All participants would go, most of the time, either with friends or family members. Occasionally, they would go alone if, for instance, they were working nearby, but not as often as some participants did when they first arrived (sometimes alone) in Portugal.

One characteristic of Belém and Expo that participants greatly appreciated was the play opportunities they offered children. For those with younger children, living in flats in dense urban areas and without access to nearby open spaces, these two places presented an opportunity to escape from busy lives and offered, both children and parents, the chance to enjoy the openness of the spaces. While walking in Belém, towards the end of the interview, one Cape Verdean participant wanted to take a photograph of the playground located on the vast lawn. For her, the playground was a feature she appreciated in that particular part of the garden. I asked her why she was taking the photograph, and she replied that the area would give her son the chance to run, ‘feel free’ and engage in different games/activities.

Although facilities are part of the physical attributes of a space, the distinction between the activities themselves and the facilities which support them, was not always differentiated in the participants’ discourse.
W2 - I like to bring my son, usually on a Sunday because it is my day off. We come here and he can play and run till he’s tired. Here he feels free.

(Cape Verdean participant - Belém)

Figure 8:5 - Facilities for children (Belém) (photograph: participant)

Expo also offered the chance to combine indoor and outdoor recreation for children. Visiting places such as ‘Oceanário’ and the Science Museum, and then riding a bike and running, were typical activities for one male participant when he came with his children. These two buildings are located further away from the gardens (see the schematic drawing of the route - see Appendix 10). The Ukrainian group was the only one whose route included that southern part of Expo. Participants wanted to show me how much they enjoyed ‘Oceanário’ by taking photographs.

The social aspects and opportunities that Expo offered was rated positively by both the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians. In Expo, the row of bars and restaurants along the gardens was appreciated particularly by the Brazilian participants. They saw them as offering further recreational opportunities in Expo. All the participants took me to the path adjacent to the row of bars to illustrate how in summer, mainly, they are a meeting point where they can catch up with other people of the same nationality, a place to sit enjoying the fine weather, and even the cooling breeze from the river. While we were passing by the bars, the weather was cloudy and at a one point it started to rain. One participant suggested that we could stop in one of the small cafés and have a coffee while waited for the weather to improve. We all sat around a table outside the café (it was covered by a roof) and continued our discussion about the importance of the bars and cafés.

W3 - In the summer, I like to come here at the end of the day and sit in a bar, drink something fresh... a beer [laughs], chat, listen to the music, enjoy the good weather, the environment... enjoy the bohemian life [laughs].

(…)

149 Marine exhibition - the large glass fish tank with species from all over the world is the main attraction.
W2 – During the summer this is amazing. There are many Brazilians, and we gather together in the bars. You have so many different Brazilian bars: the “Cenoua”, “Cuba”, Hawaii”… and we sit outside enjoying the conversation. Also it is cooler, because of the breeze that comes from the river.

(Brazilian participants - Expo)

However, the Ukrainians did not appreciate these facilities. One Ukrainian participant pointed to a bar/restaurant and referred to how those structures were ‘spoiling’ the landscape. That particular bar was an example of what spoiled their perception of what a green space should be, i.e. closer to nature. The participant continued pointing out the bar’s negative aspects and even mentioned how the smells of cooking that came from the restaurants and bars affected her sensory experiences in open space, negatively (although at that precise moment, none of us could identify any particular smell of food in the air).

M2 - That [pointing to the bars] spoils the space. The music and the bars. Oh well… But in Lisbon there is a lack of contact with nature, we prefer to see more greenery, a more natural environment. We miss nature.  

(…)

W1 - The smell of the river is mixed with the smell of food from the restaurant. But over there [pointing to end of the park] it is much more relaxed, it is just nature and fresh air.

(Ukrainian participant - Expo)

Apart from the bars and outdoor cafés, all the respondents used both Expo and Belém for more informal types of recreation with friends and/or family. Simply sitting down on the grass, or on the beach, facing the river, talking with friends, having a picnic or even celebrating a birthday (see below 8.2.4) were activities that the Brazilian and Cape Verdean participants all mentioned.

Another characteristic of the spaces that both those communities appreciated was the chance to be surrounded by other people and just to observe them.

W2 - I prefer this part of the garden, and do you know why? Because there are more people, because on weekends you can see all the people playing football, lying on the grass, kids running around. I like to see all those people...hmmm... the movement.

(Cape Verdean participant – Belém)
Conversely, Ukrainians preferred more secluded spots: they enjoyed the tranquility of certain places in Expo and Belém and avoided crowded areas. All the participants chose particular locations in both places which met their wish to be away from crowds.

*M1* - I talk from personal experience but we do not like spaces with many people...they cut into the space. It seems we are all in the same box [laughs]. That is why I prefer the other end of the park next to the bridge, because there is more space, more tranquillity.

*W1* - There are also few people, more trees... [laughs].

(Ukrainian participant - Expo)

8.2.1.3. **Music played outdoors: its significance to the immigrant groups**

As the findings from the previous two research methods show, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians valued music being played outdoors, however, up to this point, there was no clear information about this preference. During the 'go-along' walks, the participants began to talk about music in a natural way. The Brazilian and Cape Verdean participants discussed, with great enjoyment and spontaneity, the value of music and their preference for it being played in particular outdoor places as much as any other spatial characteristic. While I was sitting with the Brazilian participants at the café in Expo, one respondent referred to how she enjoyed going there and listening to live music, while showing me where outdoor concerts take place. Another participant then spoke about the importance of music in her everyday life. She would listen to different types of music all day long, depending on the occasion and therefore, having music outdoors was a delight. In the café, another participant mentioned the existence of a ‘music garden’ in Expo. On the way back, she made sure we stopped in this thematic garden to play some of the instruments. The participants spent a few minutes trying all the instruments, playing and laughing with each other and inviting me to join them in this activity. I was taking photographs and observing them, but one of the participants just held my hand and took me with her to try one of the instruments.

*W1* – Oh! One thing I really like is to sit and listen to live music. Sometimes when you come here there are concerts, and people playing... it is so nice!

*W2* - Music is everything! Without music it doesn’t work! I listen to music from the moment I wake up, till the moment I go to sleep. A space with music is a joy!

*W3* - If I have to choose between a space with music or a space without music, I prefer the one with music.

*W2* – It is nice to have music to relax or loud music if there is a party.

(Brazilian participants - Expo)
In Belém, the rectangular shape of the space nearby the old buildings reminded one Cape Verdean participant of the main square in her home city. Apart from the shape, the participant focused her description on the activities which normally took place, such as live music and children playing outdoors. This reference was confirmed by another Cape Verdean participant, who added that vast numbers of people would go to that particular square on Cape Verde to enjoy the music. The third participant corroborated this tradition of having music outdoors, explaining that music was played every Sunday in the main square of her city (on another island).

W1-This reminds me of the public square/plaza in São Vicente, the shape of it. We have music, we listen to music, we have music being played, children playing.
W3 – Exactly, there is music and many people....
W2 -For me, it is the same on my island, at the weekends, especially every Sunday - they go and play music. And the square is surrounded by bars, restaurants, hotels, the court of justice. It is where everyone goes, it is very beautiful.
(Cape Verdean participants - Belém)

These quotes reveal that, especially for the Cape Verdeans, live music in public open spaces is an intrinsic aspect of outdoor spaces in their home environment, and it is perceived by them as being part of their culture. Although participants enjoyed attending musical events in outdoor spaces and/or simply enjoyed live music in outdoor cafés (as mentioned above by the Brazilian participants), the sporadic nature of these events in Lisbon led one participant to relay on her ‘iPod’ to listen to music when she was outdoors.

W1 – I love to come here especially when there are groups of university students having parties and playing songs.
W3- I cannot talk about music in this space because I have never been lucky enough to hear music in this space. That is why I always bring music with me.
(Cape Verdean participants - Belém)

In Expo, while walking along the river promenade and commenting on the row of bars and cafés, the Ukrainian participants also mentioned music, however, they viewed it much...
less positively. They described the music played in the outdoor cafés (see section 8.2.1.2) as ‘being annoying’, that it disturbed the tranquillity of the space.

8.2.2. Novelty

Although the ‘go-along’ interviews did not offer first-hand place experiences (most participants had already been in those two locations), participants still talked enthusiastically about all the elements that were ‘new’ to them, that is, which had not been part of their lives in their home country and they made constant comparisons between their ‘new’ and ‘old’ environments.

Participants were curious about their new environments, especially at Expo. All the media attention that this place received during the 1998 exhibition had generated a level of participant interest even before their migration had begun, especially for participants from the ex-colonies. One Cape Verdean participant mentioned how she had seen Expo on TV and that had made her wish to go there on her first visit to Portugal.

W3 – I love Expo. It’s truly a beautiful place. The first time I saw it I was still on Cape Verde, I saw it on TV. I said then that it would be the first place I would like to visit in Portugal.

(Cape Verdean participant - Expo)

The new and diverse flora was referred to by participants as one of the main novelties of Lisbon’s green spaces. Even though the degree of greenery was not the same as in their home countries (for some it was more, for others less), they described seeing new trees, flowers or even the grass as delightful. Although there was an element of nostalgia (see below) in relation to the landscapes which they had left behind, they appreciated new elements; they recompensed, somehow, for their losses and the participants embraced the differences between the countries positively.

In Expo, one Ukrainian participant stopped near to a tree (Erythrina crista-galli) while taking a photo of the red flower. While she did that, she revealed how overwhelmed she was, especially in her first year, and how she used to take photographs of different trees and flowers to document their uniqueness.

M2 – I like this [pointing to an Erythrina crista-galli]. I like the colours, the mixture between the red and the green. We don’t have these trees, neither in Ukraine nor in Russia. Perhaps in Crimea, because the climate is closer to the Algarve’s. But these trees do not grow in our cities.

W1 - That is true. During the first year I was amazed. I used to take pictures of everything, everything. All the little flowers (...) and the palm trees! They are very strange trees.

M2 - But it is exactly because there is nothing similar to the Ukraine. I like the trees and plants in Ukraine but I also like these ones. But I like these ones because they are different. It doesn’t mean it is worse or better, it’s just different, which is good.
The Brazilian participants were similarly positive. They also talked enthusiastically about the differences between the fruit trees, vastly common in their country and the more ornamental ones, or even new species that they had encountered in Portugal, such as pine trees. One participant pointed to the pine trees and with her hands, she drew in the air a silhouette of the canopy and started laughing with the other participants at the trees’ ‘umbrella’ shape.

W2 – Over there [Brazil] we see more fruit trees. Well, you have orange trees, but you cannot eat them [laughs]. They are very sour! Here there are more trees with flowers, beautiful trees. And the pine trees... I had never seen these pine trees before! [laughs] They are a funny shape [laughs].

(Brazilian participant - Expo)

The Cape Verdean participants said that the grass was among their favourite elements and they spoke positively about the differences between their home country’s drier environment and the new host environment. In Belém, one of the participants stopped in the middle of the lawn and bent down to touch the grass. While doing that, she described how a greener environment could almost be described as being idyllically beautiful, and that it was something that she was not used to seeing very often.

W3 – You know... My island is just volcano [laughs]. It is not like theirs [the other two participants], it is just rock. So all these trees and the grass... it is very green. My cousin told me this year everything is very green [on her island] because it rained a lot, he said it is beautiful.

W1 – Well, ours is greener than yours, but it is not as green as this. It has more mountains. We are not used to all the grass, this is very different. Portugal is a green country.

(Cape Verdean participants - Belém)

---

150 *Pinus pinea*
The sea was another novel element for the Brazilians and Ukrainians. They described enthusiastically the positive feelings this element evoked in them (see 8.2.1.1). In Belém, all the participants from the three immigrant groups spent time looking at the sea and to the horizon. For the Brazilians and Ukrainians, their perceptions of its immenseness and its scale were the surprising elements. As one participant reported, she was aware of the vastness of the sea but it was not until she experienced it that she realised how vast it actually was. A Ukrainian participant also enjoyed watching the strong ocean waves hitting the rocks and seeing how powerful nature could be.

W1 - Over there is the sea! I love the sea! It gives me this feeling of immensity. It seems that I want to have it all but I cannot. I knew it was big... but never this big.

(Brazilian participant - Belém)

Apart from natural elements, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians appreciated the surrounding built environment. Once we all arrived in Expo, and at the beginning of the interview, participants from these two countries commented on the surrounding architecture. They saw Expo’s new and modern architecture, the glass façades and shiny buildings as signs of a sophisticated urban atmosphere and of progress. As one participant said, for someone coming from a rural area, the contrast was immense, and fascinating.

W2 - This is totally different from my city. My city is in the centre of Brazil, there are beautiful rivers, fresh water... but the city is not very developed. (…)

W1 - All the facades with glass... It is beautiful.

W2- For someone who comes from a rural area, this is the world!

(Brazilian participants – Expo)
One Ukrainian participant also took a photograph of Expo’s surrounding buildings, but for him, the buildings were too close to the natural environment, therefore, they were intrusive and interfered with nature. The monuments in Belém, however, were not seen as a problem because of Belém’s history, and the gardens also served as a background setting.

Although the participants had been living in Portugal for a few years, taking photographs of the surrounding environment was still part of their activities. It was not only a way to document new things, but they could share them with family and friends back home, to show them how ‘beautiful’ the spaces in Lisbon were.

W1 - I like to come and take pictures. I like to come and play with my kids. I also like to come with my friends, we sit down, we may even have something to eat and we just chat, or we go to McDonald’s and sit in, outside [laughs].

W3 - I also like to take pictures to send to my family back home, to show them where I am and how beautiful the places are (…)

(Cape Verdean participants - Belém)

8.2.3. Evoking memories of the past

During the ‘go-along’ walks, the participants talked about some memories of their home countries, as a response to particular physical elements of the (natural) environment in Lisbon. Although the sites were, in most cases, very distinct from their home countries, some physical elements in the landscape were triggers for the participants to start telling stories of their homeland, family, childhood, recreational habits, and they narrated amusing episodes of their life back home. They talked about their memories joyfully, mostly related to childhood (as suggested in Chapter 4), and they revealed the strong connections they had had with the outdoor environments back home.

8.2.3.1. Childhood memories

In Expo, while strolling around one of the ‘thematic’ gardens which was designed to represent arid landscapes, including those from Cape Verde, one participant from that country pointed to a stone wall and nearby tree. While touching the wall and the leaves of the tree, she
described, in a nostalgic and emotional way, how those materials reminded her of the house she had grown up in. She had taken a ‘good’ photograph of it, and wanted me to touch the stone so I could ‘feel’ how different the stones and leaves were from all the other materials. Another participant remembered that her grandmother would not let her touch a bush in the garden because some poisonous animals would normally live in it. A discussion then ensued about other plants in Cape Verde, the different types in their garden, Cape Verdeans’ use of them to make roofs, etc.

W1 - Oh look! I want to take a picture here. Do you know why? Because the houses in St. Antão Island are made with this, not with concrete, but with these stones. And the little house where I was born was exactly like this, and I was very proud of it. Walls were made of stone and the roof was made with those leaves.

(Cape Verdean participant - Expo)

In Expo, a themed garden purposefully created to evoke a specific environment, was likely to trigger participants’ memories, given the (dis)similar landscape features between the home and host countries. However, other features elsewhere also triggered memories. A sculpture, located in another part of Expo, reminded one female Cape Verdean participant of the boats on her island. From that, she made the connection with other islands, and how, as a child, she would go with her parents to the pier and wave to the boats. In Belém, a small strip of sand that borders the historical monuments, reminded one participant of a small beach where she used to go to learn how to swim. After her comment, the conversation then focused on the role that the beach used to have in participants’ lives.

Apart from the physical elements in the gardens, other aspects of the green spaces triggered memories. While I was with the Ukrainian group, strolling around the museum area so they could see ‘Oceanário’, two police horses appeared. The female Ukrainian participant became very enthusiastic and said she ‘had’ to take a photograph of the horses. This was not the first time she had seen the police horses riding through the park. In fact, they were one of the attractions she particularly liked to see at Expo. When she was a child, she used to ride
horses, and in Lisbon, she was still passionate about them. Visiting Expo, and seeing the horses, was a strong way for her to recall the past and to keep alive her love of these animals.

W1 - For me, the best thing in this place are the horses. It is true! There is no other place in Lisbon where you can see the horses (...) But for me Expo is all about the horses, and the greenery, as well. (...) When I was a child, I used to play in the forest, not inside the forest but on the border, always surrounded by trees. (...) I also used to have horses. I loved my horse!

(Ukrainian participant - Expo)

Figure 8:12 - Police horses (Expo – Parque das Nações) (photograph: participant)

How participants felt in the spaces, the sensations the spaces aroused in them also added to the discussion of childhood memories, particularly in the Brazilian group. While walking, participants mentioned different spatial aspects which would take them back to their childhood. It was not only particular features that would trigger memories, but also spatial aspects. One participant reported that the scale of the space, the openness and green elements, contributed to her feelings of freedom, reminding her of the freedom she had enjoyed as a child while playing on a farm.

W2 - I grew up on a farm. I was far away from the city, perhaps around thirty-five minutes by bus. There were lots of trees and a lot of space to play in. Here it is the same... it is a place with space. It reminds me of the freedom I used to have. Here, we feel free. We have space to walk, to cycle... We don't feel confined. I feel relaxed.

(Brazilian participant - Expo)

8.2.3.2. Elements which reminded immigrants of their home country

A few other elements also triggered participants’ general memories of their home country.

The pebbles and water in Expo drew Cape Verdean participants to allude directly to the beaches on their island. They were very nostalgic for contact with the beach, but especially with the sea. These elements reminded them of how much they missed their home country. However, in Belém, participants discussed how, at the same time, the sea gave them a sense of ‘comfort’. It bridged the gap between the host and home countries, knowing that
the sea that they viewed in Lisbon was the same sea they had left behind. The sea, therefore, served to anchor their memories.

```
W2 - Look, over there. That reminds you of the beach, does it not?
W1 - Yes, that’s true, it really does remind of that. On our island, it’s like that.
W2 - You have the pebbles and then the water, just like this [pointing to the lake]. How I miss it...[sighs].

(Cape Verdeans - Expo)
```

![Figure 8:13 - Water and pebbles - Expo (photograph: participant)](image)

```
W1 – Do you know what I feel when I look at this river and sea? That I’m in Cape Verde! [laughs].
W3 – Exactly! I also feel that I’m in my home country.
W2 – The sea... it has this connection. It is something we are always thinking about, the sea here is the same sea there. It can give us the feeling that we are there (...) It gives us comfort. We feel we are connected.
(...)
W1 – But also it reminds me of how much I miss my country.

(Cape Verdeans - Belém)
```

The numerous symbols from Brazil in the restaurants in Expo, or even the Brazilian names, were constant reminders of Brazilian culture. Although participants felt overwhelmed by those symbols, they did not have any special meaning for them. Other elements with less explicit connotations, such as the pavements, the typical Portuguese ‘calçada’

151 ‘Calçada’ is a typical pedestrian pavement using blocks of limestone or basalt stone. It can be laid out simply or in various patterns.

```
151 ‘Calçada’ is a typical pedestrian pavement using blocks of limestone or basalt stone. It can be laid out simply or in various patterns.
```

The Ukrainian group made very few references, either in Expo or in Belém, to elements in the landscape which reminded them, generally, of home, apart from those that triggered childhood memories (e.g. horses).
8.2.4. Special meaning and acquired memories

One of the questions I asked participants was if Expo and/or Belém had special meaning for them. Both the Cape Verdean and Brazilian respondents could recount events which had occurred in these places. They recalled these memories with enthusiasm and emotion. During our walks, participants showed me the exact places where those special moments had happened and they described them in detail. Most of the events had occurred during the participants’ early settlement periods in Portugal; they were part of their first experiences of these places. One participant mentioned how she had celebrated her birthday with a friend in Expo while her children were still in Brazil; that was a special day for her that she remembers to this day. For a Cape Verdean participant, Belém represented a mirror of her progress as an immigrant, from the first times when she would go there alone, to the present day, when she takes her family. More humorous stories included a Brazilian participant recalling a romantic encounter on a first visit to Belém. She showed us the exact spot where she had kissed a man, and while telling us the story, she took a photograph of this particular place.

W2 - For me, it [Expo] has a special meaning because many things have happened here. I celebrated my birthday once, next to that bridge. I came here with a friend, some of his friends and his family joined us… because I was here alone, my daughters were in Brazil. Everything was very nice. Every time I look in that direction I remember that year. It was cool.

W3 - I arrived in Portugal alone. I used to come here on Sundays and this was my place of solitude and solace. I would walk along this path, looking at the water… breathing and relaxing. But now… when I come here, I come with my family. It is like an evolution in my life! I come here with my son, because where we live there is not much outdoor space for him to play. So we come here for him to run and play.

(Brazilian participants - Expo)

W1 - Look over there! That’s where I kissed the most beautiful man in all my life. He was the one who showed me this place for the first time. And we used to sit over there, on that lawn.

(Brazilian participant - Belém)

For a Cape Verdean participant, Belém also reminded her of her settlement period, when she used to visit the place with her cousin who had put her up and helped her to adjust to life in Portugal in her first few months.

W2 - I have a special affection for this place, more than Expo, because when I moved to Portugal, I stayed with my cousin who lives close by. And we used to come here very often, that is why I like this place. (…)

(Cape Verdean - Belém)

Participants recalled these events as episodes firmly embedded in those memories which belonged solely to their time in the host country. They were independent of their home memories and they were already a reflection of their emotional ties with the spaces in Portugal.
Apart from memories, participants attributed a special meaning to how well they knew the places, and how often they visited them. Places they visited more frequently were more likely to be recalled because of the events that had happened there.

W2 -I know Belém much better than Expo. There were many things I did in Belém’s space, so... because I don’t know Expo so well, Belém has more meaning, and not this one.
W1 – Yes, for me... because I have to go the embassy, I always stop in Belém. So I’m very used to Belém. Expo... I do not know it so well. I know the shopping centre [laughs]. So Belém, is more special.

(Cape Verdeans - Expo)

When asked whether Belém or Expo had a special meaning for them, none of the Ukrainian participants reported any particular strong emotions or memories that then led them to describe the spaces as ‘special’. As one participant explained, she appreciated the beauty of Belém but she felt they had not been long enough in the country to have created bonds with it. However, the same participant revealed her passion for the sea, and it was the sea that was likely to have a special meaning for her in relation to this place.

W1 -No... there is no special meaning. It is a very beautiful place where it is nice to come for a walk. But a special meaning?! I don’t think there is any place with meaning in Portugal. How come? We have only been here for five years (...)
W1 - The only place where I feel more... how can I say? I really like is being close to sea. The sea is my passion.

(Ukrainians Participants- Expo/Belém)

8.3. Summary

The ‘go-along’ method used in this part of the research gave a better and deeper understanding of the participants’ real uses of, and attitudes to, the places factors which have been considered so important throughout this research.

Participants’ preferences for natural elements were explored in Chapters 6 and 7, however, this ‘go-along’ method added another dimension to understanding their importance. All the participants viewed water and green elements with enthusiasm and they always recalled them as being expressive of nature. The conjunction of both elements, but with a particular emphasis on the sea and river, contributed to participants’ overall sense of wellbeing, relaxation and peace.

The majority of them would visit Expo and Belém in the company of family members and/or friends. They would rarely go there alone, unless they worked nearby. They valued highly the opportunities that Expo and Belém offered them for family interaction, especially at the weekend when participants’ children could play outdoors and enjoy the open spaces.
The social opportunities the places offered were appreciated differently by the Ukrainian participants. They preferred parts of Belém and Expo where they could be away from the crowds, while the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians enjoyed being outdoors people watching, speaking with friends and families, celebrating events and enjoying the bars and outdoor cafés. The presence of bars/cafes in the parks was also perceived differently. The Ukrainians saw them as intrusive elements in the landscape, while the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians appreciated the social opportunities they offered. Music being played outdoors was appreciated most by the Brazilians. Their views confirmed earlier research findings but it highlights how culturally embedded this preference is and how this latter group almost assumes it should be an integral feature of these spaces.

Some characteristics of the new environment, especially flora, were seen as novel, and generated enthusiasm in all the participants. Other differences, such as greener environments, were welcomed by the Cape Verdean participants, while the sea was the major novelty for the Brazilians and Ukrainians. Expo’s new architectural style was also appreciated by those who had come from more rural locations and the glass facades were seen by them as a symbol of being in a truly cosmopolitan environment.

The parks and gardens’ landscapes triggered participants’ memories of their home countries, prompting their delight and nostalgia. Yet it was the memories from childhood that they described very emotionally and wistfully. Certain landscape features, including trees, horses and stones triggered lively and happy memories of other outdoor environments, revealing how strong these memories were.

For the participants, the significance of place was perceived differently by each of the three groups. The places’ special meaning was rooted in familiarity and frequency of use such that they had become part of immigrants’ memories attached to their time in Portugal. Although the Ukrainian participants enjoyed being in Expo and Belém and remarked on their beauty, they did not feel any particular attachment to them. However, for them, the sea was the only element which had a special meaning, reinforcing once again its importance.

In summary, in the ‘go-along’ interviews, the participants described different features of Expo and Belém which they felt created bonds with these places in Portugal. The reasons for their liking of these places were not only based on the positive aspects that the two spaces offered and which they appreciated (preferred physical attributes and activities) but also on the memories they evoked, either childhood memories or those memories they had acquired since they had been in Portugal. This ‘go-along’ method, contrary to the previous two research
methods, allowed a direct experience of two environments (Expo and Belém) in Lisbon with the participants from each of the three immigrant groups. By going there with the immigrant groups, it strengthened the research findings in terms of establishing the connections between people and place, and the particular space attributes and sensory experiences they enjoy the most in outdoor places.

The next chapter discusses the research findings of the three methods conducted in this study, and the conclusions reached.
Part III
Chapter 9: Discussion and Conclusion

The previous chapters described the findings obtained from the research methodology. This chapter discusses the research findings obtained by using the three research methods employed in this study (the focus group interviews, the questionnaires and ‘go-along’ interviews). It answers the main research question and hypothesis (see Chapter 1) and the research sub-questions defined in Chapter 4. This chapter also addresses the implications for policy, planning and design and ends with the research’s key conclusions, the limitations of the study and areas for future research.

9.1. Discussion

The analysis of the findings has confirmed some of the initial assumptions; at the same time, it has contradicted others while revealing some new findings. The discussion takes the findings from the different methods and compares them with the findings from the literature review.

9.1.1. Research question 1: What are the immigrants’ leisure and recreational patterns?

Generally, the findings from all the methods have revealed that for the three immigrant groups, after their migration to Portugal, their recreational patterns underwent some adjustments. This research finding corroborates what Stodolska (2000) described in the literature. As this research initially anticipated, the findings from all three methods revealed cultural differences in immigrants’ recreational behaviours/patterns, as was discussed in the literature (Carr & Williams, 1993). Nevertheless, the three immigrant groups also revealed common recreational patterns.

9.1.1.1. Outdoor recreational patterns

Overall, immigrants’ use of outdoor spaces for recreational purposes was something they enjoyed in both the host and home countries. The results from the questionnaire, however, suggested that migration tends to alter participants’ outdoor activity choices/patterns. That is, immigrants abandoned activities they had undertaken in their home country and they engaged, minimally, in new forms of recreation in the host country. However, there were significant differences among the three immigrant groups: the Ukrainians, notably, were less likely than the Cape Verdean and Brazilian immigrants to pursue those outdoor activities they had previously enjoyed in their home country.
The Brazilian and Cape Verdan immigrants no longer pursued sporting activities in Portugal but, in fact, all three nationalities recorded low levels of engagement in sport. As became apparent in the focus groups, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians engaged in fewer sporting activities in Portugal compared to their involvement in their home countries, especially in terms of playing football and swimming in the sea. The non-uptake of these activities was, possibly, directly related to their perceived differences between the home and host environments. As one Cape Verdan participant said, the temperature of the sea was much lower, and getting access to the beach was also significantly more difficult than back home. In addition, Lisbon does not offer as many public facilities for playing football as Brazil does and many green areas in the city have signs asking users not to step on the grass, limiting the use of spaces for different sporting activities. These findings echo Stodolska and Alexandris’ work (2004). They suggested that regardless of immigrants’ ethno-cultural or socio-demographic backgrounds, their initial post-settlement period in the host country is usually associated with low levels of physical activity in their leisure time, since they earn low wages, are in physically, and time-demanding jobs, which leaves them little time for leisure, and at the same time, they struggle to adjust to their new environment. These findings, however, cannot be generalised, since the Ukrainian group, for example, according to the focus group interviews, continued to go fishing, but they provided no further data about their engagement in outdoor sports. On the other hand, the Portuguese in the control group did not engage in sports frequently, and there were no significant differences between that group and the three immigrant groups.

The findings from the questionnaires indicated that, generally, immigrants engaged in, to an average degree, recreation which involved having food outdoors (barbecues and/or picnics). The questionnaire findings revealed that Ukrainians and Brazilians were more likely to take part in these types of social activities, a result which corroborates that from the focus groups. In Brazil, barbecues are a regular activity undertaken outdoors, but predominantly in private spaces (e.g. backyard, terraces). During the focus groups, the Brazilian participants mentioned the difficulty in continuing this activity in Portugal, the constraints imposed on them by the new housing facilities and the lack of facilities in Lisbon’s public open spaces. This explains, to a degree, why the Brazilian immigrants gave this activity a low level of frequency score. Conversely, for the Ukrainians, both the questionnaire and focus group findings suggested that they continue to have barbecues in Portugal. One possible explanation is that this group is more likely than the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans to visit Lisbon’s urban forest and other natural areas around the city, which are among the few places that provide barbecue facilities.
In general, the three immigrant groups were more likely to engage in barbecue activities and more often than the Portuguese in the control group. Research on the outdoor leisure patterns of the Portuguese population is minimal, making it difficult, therefore, to attempt to explain the differences. Nevertheless, native-born Portuguese do not regularly have barbecues in public open spaces (it occurs most frequently in private spaces and it is linked to particular seasons, spring-summer), however, they do enjoy having a picnic; a more common activity, especially in parks and natural areas, or even at the beach.

In the three immigrant groups’ leisure time, ‘going for a walk outdoors’ was a common activity in their home country. This pattern continued in Lisbon and it was among their most frequent outdoor activities. According to the focus groups, it was an even more frequent activity for the Brazilian participants, demonstrating their engagement in a ‘new’ type of activity in the host country. As anticipated, although the three immigrant groups would go for a walk, they were less likely to do so frequently, compared with the control group. Parks and gardens were the favourite spaces in which to ‘go for a walk’ for the three immigrant groups and the control group. The ‘go-along’ interviews also highlighted ‘walking’ as an activity undertaken in both parks (Belém and Expo) by the three immigrant groups. These findings echo the work of Peters et al. (2010), who suggested that in public parks in the Netherlands, walking was a common activity for all migrant groups and the native population, however, it was more common among the indigenous Dutch. The Brazilians and Ukrainians put going for a ‘walk in natural places’ in last place in the ranked questions; while the Cape Verdeans, and the Portuguese in the control group, ranked it in third place. One possible explanation for these findings is that many of these places are on the outskirts of the city and access to them by public transport may be limited, and, as the questionnaire results showed, car use was not readily available to most immigrants. Notoriously both the Portuguese and Cape Verdeans ranked walking ‘in the city’ in last place, compared with the Brazilians and Ukrainians, who gave it a higher ranking (second place). This result, however, must be interpreted cautiously since no significant differences were found between the rankings. Nevertheless, this result raises some questions, such as, just how is walking for recreation in Lisbon’s city streets perceived by the Portuguese and Cape Verdeans?

One unanticipated finding was that the three immigrant groups enjoyed using the beach. As the focus group interviews revealed, for each immigrant group, respectively, the geographic location of the beach in their home country seemed to influence their use or non-use of this outdoor space. For example, going to the beach was part of Cape Verdeans’ everyday life back home, especially among the youngest generation, but the focus group
findings highlighted a decrease in frequency of visits by them in Portugal. The fact that the beaches are located outside Lisbon, far from where the immigrant groups are living in the city, may explain this result. The Ukrainians, and some Brazilians, rarely went to the beach back home but, as focus groups and the questionnaires findings showed, their frequency of visits to the beach in Portugal was greater than when they were in their respective home countries. The pleasure they experienced from being close to the sea and the novelty of being at the beach may explain this finding. Interestingly, the questionnaires did not reveal significant differences between the three nationalities regarding their frequency of visits to the beach. It is harder, therefore, to generalise which group visited the beach more regularly. In comparison with the control group, however, immigrants were still likely to go to the beach less frequently than the Portuguese participants. Although the frequency of visits to the beach was higher among the native population, it is, notoriously, a seasonal activity. As pointed out by Soares (2006), the number of visits that Portuguese people make to green spaces in summer decreases significantly, while the number of visits they make to the beach rises significantly. However, this distinction was not found in this study. Nonetheless, the visits the respective immigrant groups make to the beach in Portugal may represent them becoming integrated, culturally and socially, such that they want to engage in the same mainstream activities as the native population.

The questionnaire findings showed that the three immigrant groups were involved in other activities such as reading and having a coffee in an outdoor café infrequently, compared with the control group, where it was a typical and frequent activity. Nevertheless, the findings from both the questionnaires and focus groups suggested that even although they were not usual activities, having a coffee in an outdoor café was a new activity for the Ukrainian and Brazilian participants, suggesting a degree of acculturation.

The literature (Juniu, 2000; Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004) suggests that social class plays an important part in immigrants’ recreational patterns. Although the findings from the questionnaires showed that immigrants’ levels of education and their occupations significantly influenced their recreation patterns, they had an impact on only a few activities. These results should be interpreted carefully, since the concept of social class can include different variables, for example, income, a topic not discussed in the research questionnaires.

9.1.1.2. Other recreational activities

- Passive activities: Stodolska and Alexandris (2004) suggested that when immigrants are very tired, and given the demanding jobs they do, this has an
impact on their uptake of activities outdoors when they have leisure time. The focus group findings for each of the three immigrant groups also echo this result. All the respondents mentioned they were involved in more passive activities in the host country than back home; while the questionnaires revealed that staying at home resting or watching TV, were also more common activities in the host country.

- Social activities: before the immigrants experienced the separation from family members and friends in their respective home countries, the focus group findings suggested that the social activities differed for the three nationalities. Ukrainians’ social activities seemed to be restricted more to family members and close friends, while Cape Verdeans and Brazilians seemed to engage more with family, friends and acquaintances and more often. The results from both the questionnaires and focus groups revealed that in the host country, social activities appeared to continue to play a major role in immigrants’ lives. The different types of migration and the push and pull factors (family reunion, or just one member of the family migrating, networks, etc.) described in the literature review (Chapter 2), seemed to influence with whom participants socialised in their leisure time.

- Shopping: visiting shopping centres was a new, common and cross-cultural leisure activity, according to the focus group and questionnaire findings. As suggested in the literature, shopping centres are extremely popular nowadays (see Chapter 3). The comparison between the three immigrant groups and control group suggested that immigrants are more likely to visit shopping centres and more often than the Portuguese population in the sample. Soares (2006) describes how, among the native Portuguese population, ‘shopping’ is a common activity, however, it is more frequent during autumn and winter.

9.1.2. Research question 2: What are immigrants' preferences in relation to public open spaces? (Canter’s ‘theory of place’)

9.1.2.1. Physical attributes

The three immigrant groups’ tendency to value the ‘natural’ appearance of public open spaces was confirmed in all the three methods. They reported that they felt an open space had a ‘natural’ appearance if it had a lot of greenery and if it evoked nature. Although
this aspect was highly relevant to the three immigrant groups, the questionnaire results show that the control group was more likely to prefer a place that was natural in appearance, than the immigrant groups, which raises the question as to the value of a ‘natural appearance’ for different cultures. Nevertheless, the results do not contradict the previous findings. Conversely, the three immigrant groups’ showed little preference for a built environment; the questionnaire findings did not reveal significant differences between the groups, however, the ‘go-alongs’ did not support, in full, the previous results. The Brazilian and Cape Verdean immigrants particularly admired the built environment surrounding Expo, which was ‘new’ to them but at the same time, they were delighted by the presence of trees, water and other green elements. Possibly the novelty effect of the architectural elements, in comparison with the physical characteristics of their respective home countries, was the reason for this preference. There is a degree of similarity between this research finding and Zube and Pitt’s (1981) work in which they describe the cultural differences that exist when it comes to people’s preferences for man-made structures in the landscape.

The three immigrant groups’ strong preference for the sea was a novel finding, especially since some immigrants had, prior to migrating, little or no contact with it. This outcome was reinforced by the findings from the focus groups and ‘go-alongs’, where the scale, vastness, sense of relaxation, newness of this element for the Brazilians and Ukrainians, and the nostalgia that the Cape Verdians felt, were among the key characteristics of the sea that they appreciated. Although this research’s findings were gathered in a different cultural context, and by different methods, they reinforce Herzog’s (1985) descriptions in relation to people’s keen preference for the sea’s spaciousness.

The three immigrant groups and the Portuguese control group also liked being close to the river. This finding, in conjunction with the cross-group preference for the sea, and their strong preference for ‘water elements,’ corroborates Yand and Kaplan’s findings (1990) regarding different cultural groups’ preference for waterscapes. However, in this research, the preference for this element varied, depending on nationality. The Cape Verdian immigrants were less likely to value the river than the Brazilian and Ukrainian immigrants, and the Portuguese in the control group, emphasising the importance of the sea to this community.

The interviews with the participants in the three immigrant groups in the ‘go-along’ revealed how important trees, lawns, greenery in general and water elements (river, sea, fountains) were to them. The questionnaires’ findings revealed there were few significant differences between the Ukrainians and Brazilians’ preferences for ‘water’ features, ‘trees’ and ‘trees and lawns’, showing that they valued all elements equally. The Cape Verdian
immigrants preferred seeing ‘trees and lawns’ together, more than the Brazilians or Ukrainians; it was their first choice. The data gathered from the ‘go-along’ explained the Cape Verdean immigrants’ first-place choice. It revealed that they saw the greener environment in Portugal as a novelty, particularly if they came from an arid area, and they viewed the presence of grass as sign of a green landscape. As the respondents in each of the immigrant groups reported, they viewed the flora in Portugal as a novelty and described it enthusiastically. Many of the interviewees in the ‘go-along’ reported, positively, that they were curious about the new plants and flowers they saw in Portugal. The Portuguese in the control group, like the Cape Verdean immigrants, also preferred seeing ‘trees and lawns’ together, rather than just trees.

The fact that water was not ranked in first place by any of the respondents in the immigrant groups may be explained by short description added to the questionnaire to explain that what was meant by water features was ‘lakes, ponds, rivers, etc.’ but that it excluded the sea. Another interesting finding from the focus groups and ‘go-along’ was participants’ spontaneous description of the overall sense of wellbeing and relaxation they associated with natural elements in general. This corroborates Kaplan & Kaplan’s finding (1989) that green elements in open spaces have aesthetic and psychological value for viewers.

9.1.2.2. Activities

The findings from the three methods undertaken with the three immigrant groups suggested the importance of spaces as places for social interaction, mainly because they allow people to meet friends and to socialise. The ‘go-along’ and focus groups illustrated how the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans, mainly, would meet other friends, celebrate birthdays, have barbecues, etc in outdoor space. Conversely, the Ukrainians, although they would have barbecues, were more likely to describe the intimacy of the group, suggesting they preferred things on a smaller scale. The research findings did not fully explore the size of the groups and how (or if) the number of people in a group impacts on individual and group responses to outdoor spaces. It is not possible, therefore, to establish solid comparisons with the literature (Loukaitou-Sideris, 1995; Jay & Schraml, 2009; Peters, et al., 2010), which showed that different immigrants and ethnic groups (Hispanics, Asians, Turkish, non-Western migrants) would visit spaces in large groups of family and friends; or in smaller groups or alone (Caucasians, Dutch). Also, the questionnaire did not fully explore this aspect with the Portuguese in the control group. It is difficult, therefore, to conclude how more or less important the size of a group visiting outdoor space is to the control group, just as it is for the
participants in the three immigrant groups. In fact, the qualitative methods also illustrated that Brazilians and Cape Verdeans, apart from socialising with their family and friends, also enjoyed watching other users in public open spaces, to observe the 'movement'. According to Seeland et al. (2009), meeting, communicating and observing others in public open spaces can contribute to establishing contact with the native population. However, in this research, interaction between immigrants and the native population was never discussed in detail. Apart from the focus groups, where immigrants from Brazil and Cape Verde expressed a difference in behaviours in the use of space (see below) and how interaction with Portuguese people was not always welcomed or made easy by the latter group, the other methods did not reveal any form of positive or negative interaction. It is difficult therefore, to generalise and to compare the research findings with other authors’ work (Burgess, Harrison, & Limb, 1988; Madanipour, 2004; Seeland, et al., 2009; Powell and Rishbeth, 2011) in which they have denoted public open spaces’ value in terms of promoting socialisation and, consequently, the social integration of minority and disadvantaged groups. Conversely, the results are closer to Peters et al. (2010) work who found that both native people and immigrants regarded urban parks as places to meet other people, stressing the role of public open spaces for social interaction. However, as mentioned by Peters et al (2010), this interaction meant, in some cases, immigrants were meeting people they already knew, and/or they were simply having short conversations with strangers and therefore, little real engagement with the native population. An exception to this tendency was suggested during the research focus group with the Brazilian participants, where they affirmed their appreciation of markets for the social interaction they allow. Although not representative, it corroborates Dines and Cattell’s (2006) suggestion of the importance of local markets as places for people to enjoy social encounters. However, the Portuguese respondents in the control group did not refer to visiting markets frequently; when they did it was much less frequently than the Brazilian immigrants. Also the role of outdoor spaces for socialising among the Portuguese was not fully explored, in this research.

Barbecues were discussed at length in the focus groups with the Brazilians and Ukrainians, and the questionnaire results confirmed their importance to them. On the other hand, Ukrainians in the focus groups valued having picnics less highly, however, the questionnaire findings showed that the Ukrainians ranked having picnics in first place, followed by having barbecues, unfolding a contradiction with the focus group findings. However, since there were no significant differences between the two variables, therefore, no firm conclusion can be drawn, apart from the importance of both activities to this community.
Another unforeseen finding is that the three immigrant groups rated eating outdoors and having social activities outdoors highly, compared with the Portuguese respondents in the control group who appreciated these activities much less. The Portuguese put having barbecues and picnics in the lower positions on the ranking list. It was more important to the Portuguese respondents to have a café in public outdoor space than to have a space where they could have barbecues and picnics. This reflects the cultural preferences of the control group since, for Portuguese people, outdoor cafés serve as both places in which they can socialise as well as where they can enjoy formal eating (as opposed to the informal-style of eating that picnics and barbecues encourage). All these findings support previous research into barbecuing and/or picnicking (Loukaitou-Sideris, 1995; Gobster, 2002; Low, Taplin, & Scheld, 2005; Jay & Schraml, 2009; Peters, et al., 2010), that is, that they are activities which immigrants enjoy, and much more frequently than the native-born Portuguese or Caucasian population. In the review of the importance of greenways for recreation, Ribeiro e Barão (2006) highlight creating public open space areas for picnicking, but barbecue areas were never mentioned, revealing that there are few barbecue facilities incorporated into Portuguese green spaces.

One new finding of this research was the preference (mainly of the Brazilian and Cape Verdean immigrants, but also the control group respondents) for having music played outdoors. The questionnaire results confirmed the focus groups findings, while the ‘go-alongs’ gave an insight into why this feature was important to these groups. The Cape Verdeans and Brazilians’ preference for music was strong – they ranked it in first place; while the Ukrainian immigrants put it third, before sports and outdoor cafés. The Portuguese respondents in the control group ranked music in second place. Immigrants’ preference for music was correlated with:

- their perception of their own behaviours outdoors, in that the findings suggest that those respondents who were more likely to feel inhibited outdoors preferred hearing music there. One possible explanation for this link may be that music helps people to overcome behavioural barriers and when they hear music outdoors, it is a way to express feelings or themselves, as was suggested in the focus groups;
- their perception of an outdoor space as being a lively place which offered the opportunity to engage in various activities; this was, as expected, linked with immigrants’ preference for hearing music played outside;
the fact they missed having barbecues in their home country was also linked with their preference for having music played outdoors in Portugal. This indicates that they played music when they had barbecues back home.

A possible explanation for this preference, and based on the results of the ‘go-alongs’, is that music is culturally rooted. That is, some of the immigrants from Cape Verde and Brazil reported that music was played in public open spaces in their home countries, especially on holidays; and it is also very much a part of some of the respondents’ lives. Some of the immigrant respondents expressed sadness for the lack of music being played outdoors, apart from live music in the outdoor cafés; they felt sad about that. The Portuguese respondents in the control group said that music was also relevant to them. In fact, as mentioned above, most music that is played outdoors in Portugal is played in outdoor cafés, however, in many parks, gardens and city-centre squares all over the country, there are old bandstands/pavilions, which might indicate that the potential for music to be played outdoors is latent. In addition, when religious celebrations are held in Portugal’s streets and the churches’ squares, traditional local bands still play music so music is an important part of Portuguese culture. However, it does not seem to be as important to native-born Portuguese as it is to the Brazilian and Cape Verdean immigrants. There is a gap in the literature regarding this preference; however, Rishbeth’s work (2001) mentions how electronic music broadcast in China is appreciated in the streets and public gardens, suggesting that music might have a greater significance and stronger cultural roots, than has been assumed up to now (see annex – DVD
152). Also, apart from the lack of references to this topic, the literature tends to focus on how people appreciate quietness (see Kyttä, no date). The Ukrainian participants, in the ‘go-along’ interviews, gave examples of how and in what way they felt music was a nuisance.

As described previously, the majority of the immigrants in the three groups participated less in sports than the respondents in the control group, but the preference for having sports facilities in outdoor spaces was ranked somewhere in the middle by the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans, suggesting they felt that provision of these types of facilities was somehow important. In comparison with the control group, each of the immigrant groups ranked sports in much the same way. This finding does not stand comparison with the

152 The CD contains two small videos which were recorded while the researcher visited public open spaces in Monsanto and Parque Gomes Freire to conduct her questionnaires in June 2008. The videos simply aim to illustrate some of the differences between the Cape Verdean and Ukrainian immigrants but they do not constitute a method in itself.
literature, where differences between native-born people and immigrant groups are recorded in terms of the respective groups’ opportunities to exercise and play sports outdoors. For example, Rishbeth (2004a) found significant differences between Asian/African and White users in terms of the opportunities they would take to exercise in urban parks; with the White users showing a far higher uptake, while Loukaitou-Sideris (1995) observed that African-Americans would engage in sports and White users in mobile activities (walking, cycling, etc.). Also, as was mentioned above, where and how immigrants include sports in their recreational activities is also influenced by immigrants’ integration into the host country.

As anticipated, the questionnaire results revealed that the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians appreciated an environment which offered the possibility of doing different activities more than the Ukrainians. This finding is supported by the immigrants’ narratives in the focus groups and ‘go-alongs’, and reinforces the idea of the importance of public open spaces to provide the opportunity to socialise, see others, have barbecues, listen to music, do sport, etc. However, significant differences were found between these two immigrant groups and the Portuguese in the control group, suggesting that the Portuguese might prefer more peaceful environments over the lively environments that the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians seemed to prefer; and this is possibly true too for the Ukrainian immigrants.

Finally, this research found that a public open space which offered opportunities for children to play in was more likely to be preferred by women than men. That finding is consistent with other research (Fu, 2008; Jay & Schraml, 2009; Rishbeth, 2004a) which found similar gender differences existed in other cultures, suggesting that this is more of a universal preference. Females were also more likely to perceive public open space as being calm and relaxing, than males. Rishbeth (2004a) also suggested the fact that women were more likely to prefer attributes such as ‘quiet’.

9.1.2.3. Perception

The findings from the questionnaires show that public open spaces are regarded as calm and relaxing environments by the native and immigrant cultures (from data obtained from the respondents in the three immigrant groups and the Portuguese in the control group). This finding accords with Peters et al’s (2010) work, in which the authors said that ethnic groups feel the need to use green spaces for relaxation. However, then a contradiction arises since the wish to relax in open space seems to counter the Brazilians’ and Cape Verdeans’ preference for a lively space. Nonetheless, the findings from the ‘go-along’ interviews indicated that the calmness and relaxation of a space were attributes given by specific
elements, such as green elements and water (river and sea) which all three immigrant groups rated highly. Arguably, a balance needs to be struck between having a space which offers the opportunity to relax but also offers the chance to engage in different activities. Clearly different space attributes make an open space ‘successful’ for certain cultures, in the research case, for the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians. Conversely, the Ukrainian immigrants always stressed their preference for, and their perception of, outdoor spaces as calm and relaxing; while they criticised what they saw as ‘excesses’, such as too many people, music played and sometimes, too many facilities (cafés). The differences between the perceptions of the immigrants in the three groups and the respondents in the control group also revealed degrees of variation. The control group tended to occupy the middle ground. On the one hand, the Portuguese respondents were more likely to perceive outdoor spaces as calm and relaxing than the Brazilians, but were more likely to enjoy places with movement than the Ukrainians.

9.1.3. Research question 3: How do immigrants use public open spaces?

9.1.3.1. Favourite places

Immigrants’ favourite places in Lisbon varied across the three groups, however, even though they gained different rankings, Expo and Belém (parks and gardens) and Costa’s beach were among all three immigrant groups’ favourite places. The Portuguese in the control group also preferred these places. As described in the ‘go-alongs’, the cross-cultural choice of these places suggests that not only did these spaces have similar attributes which were highly appreciated by immigrants, but also, in Lisbon, few other places offer the same attributes, thus that limits the choice of alternative places to visit when immigrants think about going outdoors. Another finding was that not only did the Ukrainians rank the beach higher than the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans, but they also chose it above the urban forest (Monsanto), suggesting the importance of this novel element to them. Conversely, and interestingly, the Cape Verdeans ranked the beach lowest of all the immigrant groups, suggesting they might consider that the beaches in Portugal have less value. On the other hand, Cape Verdeans also mentioned one of Lisbon’s historic neighbourhoods as one of their favourite places. This neighbourhood is known for its busy streets, it is full of shops and shoppers, and embodies the preference for ‘movement’, as described above.

The Brazilians and Cape Verdeans chose shopping centres as one of their favourite places, with the Cape Verdeans ranking them higher than the beach. The findings from the focus groups illustrated how much the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans appreciated this type of
private and indoor space, and the questionnaires confirmed this preference. In the case of the Brazilian respondents, as mentioned during the focus groups, another reason for this preference may be because, back home in Brazil, the shopping centres are considered very expensive and they exclude, therefore, those belonging to a lower class. In Portugal, the Brazilians’ use of shopping centres is easier and is widespread among all classes in this immigrant group. For Cape Verdeans, the novelty of going to shopping centres may explain this preference, but no conclusion can be drawn from the various methods used in this research as to why these spaces were among their favourites.

9.1.3.2. Types of places

Parks and gardens were types of places used most frequently by all three immigrant groups, indicative of participants’ choice of this type of place over all the other types of public open spaces available to them, and their high frequency of use of parks and gardens. The Portuguese respondents in the control group also chose parks and gardens as their favourite and most frequently visited type of place. However, overall, references to the beach exceeded the number of times that parks and gardens were mentioned and the Ukrainians had a strong preference for coastal areas, even higher than the Portuguese respondents in the control group. Contrarily, the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians visited the beach less than the Ukrainians. The Cape Verdeans and Brazilians also cited streets as among their most used types of public open space; the Ukrainians, much less so. This reflects, as was suggested during the focus groups, the use and importance of the street to the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians in their home countries. These results were similar to those obtained from the control group, where the Portuguese also mentioned the streets as one of their most visited types of places.

Another finding was the frequency of visits to markets, which was higher for the Brazilians and Cape Verdeans than for the Ukrainian group. It was even higher than for the Portuguese respondents in the control group, who said that markets were not the type of place they visited frequently. The Cape Verdeans’ and Brazilians’ preference for streets and markets, apart from their importance to them back home, suggests that these preferences are linked also to their preference for lively environments, as they mentioned during the focus groups. Shopping centres are another type of place that these two communities like, reinforcing their growing importance to these respective immigrant societies. However, shopping centres are used much less by the native Portuguese population.
Places outside the urban boundary, such as forests and the countryside, were less frequently used by the three immigrant groups (apart from forests by the Ukrainians). One reason may be due to poor access to these types of places. These findings support what the literature has proposed, namely, that minority ethnic groups have contact with nature, in the majority of cases, in urban areas, and that they make visits to the countryside infrequently (Agyeman, 2001; Askins, 2004). Also, the Portuguese respondents in the control group do not visit forests frequently, preferring, instead to visit the countryside more often than forests. The Portuguese respondents mostly mentioned visiting countryside/natural areas whereas the respondents in the three immigrant groups said they did not visit these spaces. In the city, ‘miradouros’ were the type of place least used by all three immigrant groups; the Cape Verdeans said they never used this type of place frequently. Although ‘miradouros’ were mentioned during the focus group interviews as a new type of space which some participants appreciated, the questionnaire findings did not confirm this view. Even among the control group, the number of participants who mentioned ‘miradouros’ was low, but nevertheless, it was higher than the immigrants.

Squares were more frequently used by Brazilians, less so by Cape Verdeans and lastly, by Ukrainians. Overall, however, the three immigrant groups were more likely to use this space than the native population.

The results show that the three immigrant groups use many of the same types of places as the native population, suggesting that both groups must often be in contact; however, the degree of contact was not explored in this thesis.

9.1.3.3. Frequency of use

According to the questionnaire results, frequency of use of outdoor spaces was significantly different for the three groups. The descriptive analysis revealed that nearly 50% of Ukrainians and 30% of Brazilians reported they would visit an outdoor space every day. This result, however, should be interpreted with caution. This might be because the respondents’ answers to previous questions in the questionnaire about their frequency of use of the ‘street’ as a public open space may reflect not only their leisure and recreation activity in streets but other ‘necessary activities’, as Gehl suggested (1987). Cape Verdeans, however, were less likely to use outdoor spaces regularly, and more than 20% said they rarely used it, reflecting a different usage pattern by this immigrant group. The binary regression model confirmed nationality as a predictor of frequency of use, reinforcing that Brazilian and Ukrainian immigrants were more likely to go outdoors than the Cape Verdeans. Although the binary
regression model showed that nationality was a predictor of the number of visits made to public open spaces, Gobster (2002), Jay and Schraml (2009), and Ward Thompson et al. (2009) refer to various ethnic groups' and immigrants' different frequencies of use of outdoor spaces. Another finding was that the frequency of visits by the Portuguese respondents in the control group (by percentage) was significantly different from the Ukrainians and the Cape Verdeans. The Portuguese were likely to visit outdoor spaces more frequently than the Cape Verdeans, but less frequently than the Ukrainians. The difference between the Portuguese and Ukrainians may be because, as described above, a higher percentage of Ukrainians reported they used outdoor public spaces every day. The difference between the Brazilians and Portuguese was not statistically significant, pointing up that some immigrant groups use outdoor spaces in a similar way to Portuguese people, but due to the small number of people in the respective groups, it is only possible to present this information as an observation.

Respondents' frequency of use was also likely to be affected by other variables, such as recreational patterns and preferences. Respondents' preferences for having music outdoors, being close to the river and a place where children could play were likely to increase their use of outdoor public space. On the other hand, although their preference for the sea was high (its importance was discussed at length, see above), this variable was not a significant predictor of the frequency of use. This may be because the Cape Verdeans were the immigrant group that said they preferred the sea the most, however, they were less likely to use the spaces frequently than the Brazilians and Ukrainians. As expected, immigrants who went out frequently for a walk also spent their time having barbecues/picnics, or sitting in an outdoor café. In effect, all these activities are types which require contact with the outdoors and therefore, they are more likely to be associated with a high visit frequency.

9.1.3.4. **Timing of visits**

The questionnaire findings show that a significant number of immigrants from Brazil and Cape Verde visited public open spaces during the warmer seasons, while Ukrainians were more likely to visit them all year around. The Portuguese respondents in the control group were also more likely to visit outdoor spaces throughout the year. There was a significant difference between the Portuguese respondents and those from Cape Verde and Brazil. Ward Thompson et al. (2009) found that white British users showed similar patterns of use of local urban green areas in different seasons and they would use them in cooler and colder seasons; while Pakistani and Bangladeshi people would visit the spaces less frequently in winter. These findings, overall, suggest that the use of outdoor spaces is affected by the
weather that immigrants face in the host country. The Cape Verdeans and Brazilians come from warmer climates. Their preference, therefore, is to go outdoors in summer and spring, or just in summer. Conversely, the Ukrainian immigrants who were used to harsher winters back home were more likely to visit outdoor spaces all year round.

9.1.3.5. **With whom**

As discussed above, the findings from the focus groups and ‘go-alongs’ suggested that immigrants are more likely to visit outdoor spaces with friends and/or family members. The questionnaire results provided a similar finding, confirming that there were no significant differences between the three immigrant groups in relation to the company they kept when they visited outdoor spaces. The percentage of immigrants going out alone was higher than the percentage of immigrants who said they would visit public open spaces with friends from the host country. This is another indicator of low interaction with the native Portuguese population. These results are similar to Peters et al’s (2010) work in the Netherlands; their findings show that most visitors go to urban parks with their friends or family. Although the authors also suggested that non-western migrants tended to go in larger groups than the native Dutch population, in this research, there were no significant results to support this tendency.

9.1.3.6. **Access to public open spaces: transportation and distance**

The majority of immigrants used public transport the most to access public open spaces; going by car was the next option, followed by walking there. There were no significant differences between the groups. In contrast, the respondents in the control group were more likely to use the car and/or to go on foot, but there were no significant differences between the Portuguese in the control group and any of the three immigrant groups.

A large percentage of the immigrants lived between 15-30 minutes and more than 30 minutes away from public open spaces. However, there were significant differences in terms of the time it took for the respondents in the three immigrant groups to get there compared with the Portuguese. The travel time for the Portuguese respondents in the control group was significantly less, suggesting inequality of access to public open spaces for the immigrant groups.
9.1.4. Research question 4: What barriers and conflicts do immigrants find which can deter them from using public open?

9.1.4.1. General barriers to the use of public open spaces

The focus group results highlighted lack of time and tiredness as the main constraints on visiting outdoor spaces. The questionnaire results confirmed these two factors. They were mentioned by all three groups, reinforcing other findings in the literature (Juniu, 2000; Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004). In fact, lack of time was a significant predictor of a decrease in frequency of use. The focus groups suggested other factors, such as economic problems, lack of public transportation and unfamiliarity with the environment as barriers. The questionnaire results, for all groups, however, did not support the view that these factors inhibit uptake of outdoor recreation. However, economic difficulties were a significant predictor in inhibiting use and frequency of visits. When the Portuguese respondents in the control group were compared with those in the three immigrant groups, the Cape Verdeans were more likely to cite economic reasons as a barrier to going outdoors than the Portuguese, which suggests that there is a gap, economically, between the two.

Public transport was the main type of transport for the immigrant groups. They did not see using it as a barrier per se. However, the respondents in the control group saw the poor transportation network as more of a barrier than the respondents in the three immigrant groups. Consequently, the Portuguese respondents used this type of transport less frequently than the three immigrant groups.

Other barriers identified in the literature (Low, et al., 2005; Stodolska, 1989), such as language and lack of access to information, were never raised in the qualitative methods. Fluency in Portuguese was not a problem for the Cape Verdean and Brazilian communities since this is the language of their home countries (there were some minor language variations), while the Ukrainians did not mention it as a barrier either. Language difficulties arose, perhaps, during the first years of eastern European migration, when the majority of immigrants were learning the language and consolidating their social networks and associations. News items at the time regularly reported the number of immigrant users of Portuguese beaches who had been dragged out to sea, due to their poor knowledge of the strong tides. The Portuguese government had to put signs at the beaches explaining how dangerous the sea could be, and after this measure, the number of incidents decreased significantly among this minority group. Strong networks and peer support within Eastern
European communities, and governmental efforts, may have contributed positively to overcoming the language barrier.

9.1.4.2. Safety

Immigrants’ perception of safety was another unexpected finding. Generally, the literature refers to safety as a potential barrier to immigrants’ and ethnic minorities’ use of public spaces (mostly, access to green spaces) (Jay & Schraml, 2009; Ward Thompson, et al., 2009). The findings, however, from both the focus groups and questionnaires contradict the literature’s findings. The research findings revealed that immigrants feel safe, generally, even when alone or in the company of others, and in most places in Lisbon, and they did not reveal any particular concerns. There were only significant differences between male and female respondents; women were likely to feel less safe in public open spaces when alone than males. The literature, also, has highlighted the same gender differences. Burgess (Burgess, 1996) pointed out how women are more likely to feel more exposed to racial and/or sexual threats when visiting woodlands. However, in the binary regression, safety was not a significant predictor of frequency of use, informing that it did not affect respondents’ number of visits to public open spaces. The focus groups were helpful in understanding why immigrants had this general perception of feeling safe. In their home countries, immigrants, particularly the Brazilians and Ukrainians, reported feeling insecure and threats of violence were high. Their experience in the host country was that it was much safer and it gave them a sense of security. Even some of the Cape Verdean participants, who lived in poorer areas, said that they felt safe there. On the other hand, the Portuguese respondents in the control group were more likely to feel less safe in most places in the city, and when alone, than the Brazilians respondents.

9.1.4.3. Behaviour

The questionnaires revealed that the Ukrainian respondents were more likely to feel free to do what they wanted outdoors than the other two immigrant groups. Cape Verdeans and Brazilians were more likely to feel inhibited and less free to do/behave as they wished. These findings were supported by the focus groups findings, where mainly Cape Verdeans and Brazilians reported they felt inhibited, behaviourally, by the native population. As expected, the questionnaire findings revealed how Brazilians and Cape Verdeans were more likely to feel they could not express themselves outdoors than the control group. These two immigrant groups cited as examples: how they behaved on the beach, their wish to enjoy some activities outdoors, to listen to loud music and to express themselves. These findings
corroborate other research findings (Ward Thompson, 2002; Rishbeth, 2004b) about the differences that exist between various communities’ perceptions of what is ‘correct’ or ‘proper’ behaviour and accepted recreational norms. Wood and Landry (2008) also refer to the behavioural differences that can occur at the beach. They gave the example of the argument that arose between white users and Lebanese-origin users, where the former accused the latter of breaking the behavioural code that was the norm at the beach and their treatment of women there. The Ukrainian group, however, did not mention or hint that there were any significant differences in expected behaviours than the Portuguese respondents, and during the focus groups or ‘go-along’ interviews, behaviour was not reported as an issue.

9.1.5. Research question 5: What is the role of memories\textsuperscript{153}?

9.1.5.1. Childhood memories

During the focus group discussions, participants were particularly keen to describe their life stories and experiences as children and adults in their home country in terms of how they used their surrounding outdoor spaces. This method was an excellent opportunity for immigrants to recall their memories. They described their memories of childhood with great enthusiasm and nostalgia; they had, mostly, happy memories of their times playing outdoors. The majority of immigrants in the three groups spent their childhood outdoors, playing on the streets. They described too other places such as the countryside, the forest, farms and even beaches; often they were culturally specific to each home country and immigrant group. Throughout the discussion, all the immigrant groups talked about their close contact with nature as children, running, climbing trees, swimming in the sea, etc.

The questionnaire findings corroborate the importance to children of playing on the street at that age. There were no significant differences across the three groups, revealing the importance of the street, cross-culturally, as an outdoor space. As expected, going to the beach as children was significantly higher for Cape Verdeans, however, during the focus group discussions, they said that older women had less opportunities to relax at the beach, as opposed to men, but this difference was less marked in the younger generations. The Ukrainian and Brazilian immigrants, as children, were more likely to have played in parks and gardens and in natural places than the Cape Verdeans. The Portuguese respondents in the control group, as children, were more likely to have played at the beach than the Ukrainians

\textsuperscript{153} A discussion of memories will be twofold: childhood memories and general homeland memories. The differentiation between these memories is based on previous findings in the literature regarding the importance of childhood memories (Ward Thompson et al. (2008)).
and Brazilians. When the control group findings were compared with the Cape Verdeans, Cape Verdeans were more likely to have played at the beach as children and in the streets more frequently, but less frequently in parks and gardens and natural areas. The binary regression revealed that for the three immigrant groups, those who had not played in parks and gardens as children were likely to have lower visit frequencies as adults to outdoor spaces in the host country. This finding supports the work of Ward Thompson et al. (2008), who first reported this association. The surprising fact is that this finding is applicable even to those immigrants who lived in a different country after childhood. The work of Rishbeth (2004b) also corroborates the significance of childhood to immigrants in the hosting country when it comes to their use of green spaces.

The ‘go-along’ also confirmed the importance of childhood memories in relation to immigrants’ engagement with the outdoor environment; they described it emotionally, with delight, nostalgia, and in some cases the cause for visiting the spaces. One ‘go-along’ finding was how the ‘new’ environment in Portugal, that is, in a country distant from the immigrants’ home country, evoked such strong memories of childhood. Since memories are personal constructs, it was not the environment per se that evoked equal memories for all the immigrants, rather, it was that individual respondents in each of the three immigrant groups found that their responses to different elements, such as animals, trees, stones, sculptures, etc., evoked memories of their childhood. Rishbeth and Finney (2006, p.288) have also pointed out how the landscape is ‘open to interpretation’ and that in different landscapes there are still elements that can be recognised as ‘like home’. The immigrant respondents in the ‘go-alongs’ also reported that talking or thinking about their childhood memories gave them a sense of wellbeing and of freedom.

9.1.5.2. Homeland memories

While talking about certain places and elements in the host country, some features seemed to trigger immigrants’ memories, such as architectural elements, some places, neighbourhoods, other immigrants from the same nationality, family, food, music and some green elements, such as trees and plants, the sea, etc. As Tolia-Kelly (2004) suggests in her study, plants were likely to evoke memories of familiar landscapes among migrant women. Although these elements were mentioned as triggers, it was expected that immigrants would recall these memories with greater enthusiasm, much as the memories of childhood had been. The questionnaire findings did not offer any greater insight into other elements that could trigger memories, apart from those mentioned during the focus groups. Finally, when the
research applied the last method, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians were more expansive when mentioning those elements which reminded them of their home country, possibly due to their close contact with the environment. For Cape Verdeans, particularly, closeness to the sea was, as expected, especially important. They felt very nostalgic about it but also, it offered them a great degree of comfort because the sea they gazed at in Lisbon was the same as the one they had looked at in Cape Verde.

Brazilians found many allusions to their culture in the Portuguese landscape, especially in the built environment, such as signs, colours, flags, the name of foods, restaurants, etc. However, these features did not seem to evoke any special memories in the immigrants. This may be due to the fact that they are such common features in the landscape that immigrants are already very used to seeing them, therefore, they do not attribute any particular meaning to them. Surprisingly, during the ‘go-alongs’, the Ukrainian immigrants, apart from providing strong descriptions of their childhood memories, did not mention any elements, either in Expo or Belém, that reminded them of home. They did not seem to see this ‘lack’ in a negative way. That is, they did not report they felt sad about the lack of references. Instead, they focused more on the positive experiences they enjoyed in particular places, the novelty of certain elements and the childhood memories that those places evoked in them.

As Chapter 8 shows, Expo has different thematic gardens which were had expected that might have triggered the immigrants’ memories. However, their recollections were mostly related to childhood (this was true especially for the Cape Verdeans) and much less so with the general characteristics of the homeland landscape. At the same time, the respondents talked more about an environment’s aesthetic values and how open spaces supported their sense of wellbeing, rather than memories. This finding echoes Rishbeth’s (2004a) proposition that community gardens which are designed to reflect a particular culture, are more appreciated for their quality and appropriate management, rather than their multicultural design.

Overall, the findings suggested that immigrants’ childhood memories, particularly, and to a certain degree, homeland memories, were important to them because they allowed them to create mental links between the pre- and post-migration periods, giving them a sense of comfort, familiarity, as well as nostalgia, as Rishbeth and Finney (2006) suggest. It is important, therefore, to recognise the capacity of the environment to evoke memories, especially in those immigrants who are alienated from the home environment in which they felt most comfortable. Tolia-Kelly (2004) also subscribed to that view, particularly in the context of immigrants’ mobility, and that the need for familiar landscapes (even some particular trees or
plants) is important. Rishbeth and Finney (2006) have also defended the need to better understand the role of homeland memories.

9.1.5.3. **The homeland elements that immigrants missed the most**

In this research, the three research methods used showed that when immigrants remembered their way of life in their home country they felt nostalgic and the strong pull of their memories. Contact with nature was something that immigrants missed. As the questionnaire findings revealed, Ukrainians missed contact with green elements. However, Cape Verdeans and Brazilians also missed other small pleasures, such as walking barefoot, a finding revealed during the focus group interviews.

The research discussed, at length, immigrants’ socialising outdoors. The Cape Verdeans and Brazilians, in the focus groups, reported that what they missed, particularly, was: sitting outside on the doorstep, chatting with others, going to outdoor cafés to meet friends, having barbecues, etc. The questionnaire findings support this focus group outcome, but it also indicated significant differences between the latter two groups and the Ukrainian immigrants. A new questionnaire finding was that the Cape Verdeans missed having barbecues, since, as mentioned above, they did not give it any particular importance during the focus groups, and they ranked it in last place on the list of preferred attributes, raising the question of the importance (or not) of this activity. The ‘go-along’ did not provide further insight into this matter to explain this discrepancy in the results, and the Cape Verdaen immigrants themselves did not further clarify this matter.

Interestingly, the Brazilian community missed the flora they had witnessed back home – this finding emerged in the questionnaire results. During the ‘go-alongs’, although the Brazilian respondents appreciated the new type of flora, they mentioned how different it was from Brazil. They mentioned the fruit trees back home several times (during the ‘go-alongs’, and during the focus groups), and reported they had good childhood memories of them which they kept through to adulthood. In Portugal, fruit trees, apart from orange trees and some Prunus sp. are rarely used in streets, parks and gardens. This may explain the sense of loss the Brazilian respondents felt.

As expected, missing the sea was relevant to the Cape Verdeans only and this finding appeared in all three methods.
9.1.6. Research question 6: Do immigrants feel attached to the new places?

The three immigrant groups had different views of place attachment. Although the sample was small, therefore the results should be interpreted with caution, discussions with the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians suggest that they had developed positive emotional bonds with some places in Lisbon.

Williams and Vaske (2003, p. 381) propose the idea that place attachment occurs on two levels and this research’s results echo their propositions:

- Place dependence: this is concerned with a space’s physical attributes which are such that they offer the opportunity to engage in certain types of activities. For the three immigrant groups, closeness to the sea, the river, trees, having opportunities to go for a walk, to spend time with family, the bars, social opportunities, were some of the place attributes they appreciated the most.

- Place identity (the symbolic importance of a place): participants were asked if their favourite places in Lisbon had a special meaning for them (adapted from Manzo, 2005). Brazilians and Cape Verdeans recalled the memories they had of events which had happened to them in particular places in Portugal. They already had memories in the host country after their first visits to these places; that is, in their settlement period. This suggests that immigrants’ first impressions of place and their experiences there can give them positive memories. As described earlier, immigrants’ had strong memories of childhood evoked by their visits to outdoor places in Lisbon and they valued too the overall sense of wellbeing that they gained from those visits. As Korpela and Ylén (2007) suggested, going to favourite places can be soothing, emotionally, after a negative experience and can contribute to ways to self-regulate moods. Although going outdoors is a vast research topic in terms of its known therapeutic and restorative qualities, it is not explored in-depth in this research. The findings, however, broadly, support this view. For example, one Cape Verdean respondent during the ‘go-along’ was keen to report how Belém helped her to achieve a balance and sense of peace after a negative experience at home.

Familiarity with a space, the fact that immigrants had visited particular places many times in Portugal, also seems to contribute to positive attachment. This finding supports what Giuliani et al. (2003) advocated as the third component of place attachment: long residency
and familiarity with a space. Peters et al. (2010) also corroborated this hypothesis by showing that the more often people visit an urban park, the more attached they become to it.

However, the degree of place attachment among the Ukrainian respondents appeared to be different from the Brazilian and Cape Verdean groups. Although Belém and Expo were among immigrants’ favourite places - they enjoyed what those spaces had to offer (place dependence, one of the components suggested by Williams and Vaske (2003)) and they visited them often (familiarity, as proposed by Giuliani et al. (2003) - the respondents did not attribute any special meaning to them. One respondent even suggested that they had not been in Portugal long enough to create such ties. This finding suggests that, given the components (as proposed by Williams and Vaske (2003)) that make up place attachment, the Ukrainian respondents had not fully developed a sense of place-identity. In contrast to the Cape Verdean and Brazilian respondents, the Ukrainians’ memories of place (acquired in Lisbon) had not been developed, and the evocation of their childhood memories and sense of wellbeing were not strong enough to create positive ties with any particular public place in Lisbon. Hidalgo and Hernández (2001) suggested that, ‘place attachment’ being an empathic bond with a specific place, it is likely that an individual will have a tendency to cultivate a close relationship with that place. In the case of the Ukrainian group, it was unclear from the findings whether the Ukrainians have fully developed a sense of ‘place attachment’ according to the previous theories.

Finally, the Cape Verdean and Brazilian respondents developed multiple attachments in both their home and host countries, a finding which echoes Gustafson’s work (2001). Churchman and Mitrani’s findings (1997) support the view that immigrants’ preference for new characteristics shows that they are likely to increase their attachment to new places; however, the degree to which immigrants’ attachment to the home country results in poor attachment to the new environment in the host country was not clear in this research. All the respondents in the focus groups and ‘go-alongs’ seemed to have strong ties with their home country. Even the Ukrainians appreciated some of the attributes of the new places in Lisbon but this did not translate into a strong place attachment to them or poor attachment by the Cape Verdeans and Brazilians. Preference alone, therefore, did not define attachment. Churchman and Mitrani (1997) also suggested that if an immigrant had a positive experience in a place that is likely to influence, positively, their attachment and lessen their feelings of nostalgia for their home country. During the ‘go-alongs’, immigrants mentioned briefly their paths to migration. Their descriptions were mostly positive, including from the Ukrainian respondents, showing, overall, a generally positive experience and that it had been the respondents’ free choice to migrate.
However, the role of attachment was unclear; they all expressed strong feelings of nostalgia for home, particularly the Cape Verdeans who, despite this, reported they felt especially attached to Belém. The methods used to explore attachment in the two studies were different and no direct comparisons can be drawn.

9.1.7. Research question 7: How do immigrants from different backgrounds and with different life experiences respond to new spaces?

9.1.7.1. Gender differences

Gender differences were not a major influence in relation to immigrants’ use of public open spaces. The focus groups and the ‘go-along’ did not highlight many differences between genders; only the questionnaire findings revealed a few significant differences between males and females, as illustrated above. Females were more likely to engage in calmer activities and to value places in which children could play, while missing the social aspects of outdoor spaces which they were used to back home, and to feel less safe when alone in the host country, than men.

9.1.7.2. Age differences

The questionnaire findings showed that age differences were not very significant. They affected respondents’ leisure and recreation activities where, as expected, those who were more than 65 years old and between ages 34 and 55 were more likely to spend time with their family. However, the respondents aged 65+ years were less likely to go for a walk and visit natural places outside the urban boundary. This may reflect the impact of age on older immigrants’ recreational patterns. This aspect was not explored further but possibly, access, distance and a lack of good paths (see Sugiyama, Thompson, & Alves, 2009 for how good paths increase walkability) may influence recreational activity in these areas. In terms of preferences, immigrants who were 65+ years were more likely to value a place where children could play. Interestingly, Sugiyama et al. (2009) also pointed out how this characteristic was appreciated by older people in Britain and was associated with pleasantness, a factor which is likely to increase uptake of walking in this age group. Having barbecues and picnics were not particularly appreciated by young people between aged 18-24 years. Since they are the younger immigrants they had, perhaps, less contact with these activities in the home country, and therefore, had little engagement with them in the host country. None of the other research methods sheds light on this matter. It is, therefore, unclear why there is this difference.
9.1.7.3. Educational and occupational differences

The focus group findings suggested that, for the Brazilian immigrants, those from a higher social class (with higher levels of education and in better paid/status jobs) had different recreational patterns in the host country, however, the differences were less clear in the home country. As expected, for all three immigrant groups, those with a high level of education and in highly skilled jobs were more likely to go to cultural events and to read outdoors.

The preferences of immigrants with low levels of education (1-4; 5-9 years) included seeing many people as a main priority and so markets were among the types of places they used the most; while immigrants with a Masters/PhD-level of education used them much less.

Frequency of use was likely to be affected by participants' level of education. Those with low levels of education were less likely to visit outdoor spaces frequently. However, these results should be interpreted with caution since, of all the immigrants, lower levels of education were found among the Cape Verdeans who, as seen above, showed low levels of frequency of use.

Education seems to impact on frequency of use. Those immigrants who had been in education for the least number of years were more likely to see financial problems and the unfamiliarity of places as possible barriers; while those with a Masters/PhD were less likely to feel that way. As expected, these same two barriers were also likely to be affected by immigrants' occupation in the host country: those in low-skilled, poorly paid jobs were more likely to see financial problems as a barrier to use; while those who were unemployed tended to say that unfamiliarity of place was a barrier. The fact that those immigrants who were unemployed knew fewer places raises the issue of how immigrants with few resources can become isolated. Those with lower levels of education were also more likely to feel inhibited outdoors; while those with a higher level of education were more likely to feel free.

9.1.7.4. Number of years living in Portugal

The number of years the three immigrant groups had been living in Portugal mirrored three different waves of immigration and it was associated closely, therefore, with their respective countries' of origin. It gave little insight into how the number of years could affect immigrants' use and perception of public open spaces.

As expected, those living in Portugal for less than five years were less likely to spend time with family members during their leisure time, since family reunions usually takes place after the settlement of the leading migrant member. Also, those who had been living in
Portugal for less than one year were more likely to visit outdoor spaces on their own. Immigrants usually move to the host country on their own and this first year corresponds to their settlement period when they are building routines into their lives in the host country.

Immigrants who had been living in Portugal for between 16-20 years were more likely to visit ‘miradouros’. This typical Portuguese type of place is least used by immigrants; of those who do visit ‘miradouros’, it may signify their acculturation; that is, the longer an immigrant has been living in the host country, the more likely he/she is to engage with and visit such places.

9.1.7.5. Previous type of place in the home country where respondents lived prior to their migration

The research also considered whether immigrants’ previous homes influenced the way they related to public open spaces in the host country. Their past experiences influenced their leisure activities and preferences in Portugal and the new elements triggered memories of the places they missed from home. Immigrants who used to live in a city were more likely to go for a walk outdoors in their free time and they preferred an environment with urban characteristics and one which offered scope to do different activities. The ‘go-along’ findings show that the Brazilian participants reported they appreciated the built environment, the ‘new’ architecture, the glass facades, etc, but for reasons related to these environments’ novelty, especially if previously they had lived in a rural area.

On the other hand, as expected, immigrants who came from rural areas were more likely to miss contact with nature and the presence of greenery. The respondents in these categories were also likely to miss gathering outdoors with friends. In small rural villages, it is easy to see how their streets, as the focus group findings show, fulfil this important social function.

9.1.7.6. Migration experiences

Overall, immigrants reported having had positive experiences in Portugal. However, there were significant differences between those who felt they had had either a very negative or a very positive experience.

Although the respondents did not expand on their negative experiences, in the questionnaires, those immigrants who reported having had a very negative experience were less likely to visit outdoor spaces and therefore, they engaged less frequently in outdoor activities, such as going for a walk outdoors and to the beach. Conversely, immigrants who
had had a very positive experience were more likely to visit outdoor spaces frequently and to engage more often in activities they had enjoyed previously back home. In addition, they would go outdoors throughout the year; it did not depend on the season. However, in the regression models, this was not a significant predictor of frequency of use, revealing that perhaps it is not as influential as initially anticipated.

Since outdoor spaces were not used frequently by immigrants who had had a very negative experience, they showed a strong preference for using places such as shopping centres more frequently and, as anticipated, these centres were less likely to be used by immigrants who had enjoyed a very positive experience in outdoor space. Financial problems and feeling unsafe were perceived as likely barriers by immigrants who had had a very negative experience.

The reason for the migrating also affected immigrants’ experiences. Those who left their own country by choice were more likely to appreciate their experience in Portugal; while those with who did not were more likely to have a negative or neutral experience.

9.1.7.7. Reasons for migrating to Portugal

Immigrants’ reasons for migrating did not seem to have a significant impact on their relationship with the environment, contradicting the research’s initial assumptions. Those respondents who had not made the decision to migrate were more likely to spend their leisure time resting at home; while for those immigrants whose move to Portugal was not entirely their own choice, they were likely to feel least safe in the places they knew well.

This last finding, and the previous one about the immigration experience and safety, raises questions regarding their perceptions of safety. Although the previous findings suggest that safety was not a barrier and that overall, immigrants’ perception of safety was positive, these findings suggest that for those immigrants who are in a more fragile situation, either because they were forced to migrate and/or because they experienced a less positive migration process, safety is an issue.

9.1.8. Summary - main research question: What is the relationship between immigrants and public open spaces in the host country?

As the discussion above reveals, the initial hypothesis was confirmed, namely, that different cultures use outdoor spaces in different ways. However, the relationship between immigrants and public open spaces is complex and it is based on a number of variables.
Table 9:1 summarises the main research main findings which describe this complex relationship.

Table 9:1 – Summary of findings

| New findings                                                                                     |
|                                                                                                 |
| immigrants’ preference for music and their feelings associated with it                           |
| the strong role of childhood memories even for immigrants living in a new environment            |
| nationality as a predictor of immigrants’ frequency of use                                       |
| the preference for the beach, especially among Ukrainian and Brazilian immigrants                 |
| the importance of the sea to immigrants                                                          |
| the significance of walking as a cross-cultural activity                                           |
| poor evocation of homeland memories by thematically designed gardens in the host country          |
| immigrants’ attachment to spaces in the host country                                              |
| the ‘new’ memories associated with immigrants’ experiences in new public open spaces              |

| Expected findings                                                                               |
|                                                                                                 |
| lack of time and money would be barriers to frequency of use by all three immigrant groups        |
| the role of outdoor spaces for socialising                                                      |
| having a barbecue                                                                               |
| cross-cultural preferences for landscape elements, particularly, water and green elements        |
| the importance of shopping centres                                                              |
| low engagement with new outdoor activities                                                      |
| different recreational patterns and use of outdoor spaces for different groups                   |
| different perceptions of the outdoor environment                                                 |
| different preferences – how they are culturally rooted                                           |
| frequency of use of outdoor spaces by the three immigrant groups at different times of the year  |
| low frequency of use of natural areas                                                            |
| immigrants’ longer travel time to access public open spaces compared to the native population     |
| not all immigrants would have developed emotional bonds with the spaces                          |

| Expected findings which did not emerge                                                            |
|                                                                                                 |
| safety would be perceived of as a barrier, yet it was not                                        |
| elements in the landscape were not as important as initially thought for triggering memories of  |
| similarities with the home country. The majority of references were in relation to childhood     |
| memories                                                                                         |
| the importance of the street would be more relevant                                              |
| the number of years living in Portugal and immigrants’ reasons for their migration would         |
| be more relevant to their use of public open spaces.                                              |
9.2. Conclusion

Even though, historically, migration has always occurred and been driven by different push and pull factors, its current scale and rhythm makes it a worldwide phenomenon. Europe is experiencing its impacts, mainly by the increased pressures on its urban areas due to the high volume of settlement of new populations. As the literature shows, public open spaces have evolved over the years, and although they had been regarded highly, access to them was not always free to all citizens. With migration to urban areas, and as this research shows, public open spaces have a greater importance to migrant communities, and greater effort should be made by governments to ensure that access to free, public open spaces is made available to all immigrant groups. Access to public open spaces seems to have the potential to promote tolerance and the exchange of cultural values between the various communities. As Portugal’s recent history of migration shows, the unexpected wave of immigrants after the decolonisation period and a lack of regulation in urban planning led to the creation of segregated areas where immigrants have settled and created their own neighbourhoods. Many of these areas are deprived, located outside Lisbon’s city centre, with poor or non-existent public open spaces, which limits immigrants’ enjoyment of such spaces.

This research has offered a detailed picture of how three groups of immigrants (Cape Verdeans, Brazilians, Ukrainians) relate to public open spaces in Lisbon that are ‘new’ to them by presenting findings based on the views of the immigrants themselves about their activities, preferences, attitudes, memories, attitudes, use and attachment to place. The findings show that immigrants’ relationship with public open spaces varies for each of the three nationalities, but common ground does exist. Furthermore, the study suggests that while significant differences exist between the three nationalities, they enjoy using public open spaces and they play an important part in their recreational patterns, in maintaining their wellbeing, and reminding them of home, both wistfully but also positively.

Immigrants’ place attachment to their new environment varied across each of the three groups; it was mainly dependent on their appreciation of the physical attributes of the space, how that space allowed them to engage in various activities, and their familiarity with, and the meaning they ascribed to place. This meaning is complex, but childhood memories and the development of ‘new’ memories acquired in the places are significant. Taken together, these findings suggest that some immigrants are able to create emotional ties to the host country such that they may help them to integrate in the host society by fostering feelings of belonging. Multiple place attachments are also possible and being attached to the ‘old’ environment does not block immigrants’ attachment to the ‘new’ in the host country. In fact,
immigrants’ memories, when they recalled their experience of open spaces in Portugal, were valuable and their evocation, prompted by the various landscape elements they saw, helped them to bridge the gap between their pre- and post-migration lives.

The evidence from this study revealed that immigrants’ experience of life in the hosting country, Portugal, is, generally, positive. However, a very positive or negative immigration experience is likely to have an impact on their relationship with the environment. For that reason, policies to support the arrival of new inhabitants should also consider the use of public open spaces, by inviting and stimulating immigrants to take part in life outdoors.

The new environment in Lisbon presented several novel aspects which were appreciated by most of the participants: the flora, the sea, the beach, the chance to engage in new activities. The sea was the most novel and surprising aspect of the environment for the Brazilians and Ukrainians; while it prompted nostalgic memories and gave a sense of comfort to the Cape Verdeans. When immigrants engage with a new environment, therefore, it is not only connected with negative emotions and feelings of alienation. It is important to recognise that the new environment, while physically different, can also be exciting and the novelty can help immigrants to overcome a sense of what they have left behind. A particular design, therefore, in an open space in the hosting country that is focused on recreating the ambience of other places and cultures, might not always be successful and relevant to those immigrants who want to identify with the native population and country, and it may result in creating ghettos.

Although the role of public open spaces in contributing to fostering tolerance, cultural integration and social cohesion was not fully covered in this study, the research reveals the potential of these spaces to do so. The findings suggest that by experiencing and sharing open spaces with the native population, by exchanging their respective cultural norms and values, by learning from each other’s attitudes and engaging in new activities typical of the host culture, and by visiting new types of spaces, this may increase immigrants’ sense of belonging, and decrease their cultural shock. However, this general finding should be treated with caution since the role of public open spaces in fostering social interaction between immigrants and the native population, and thus which may help to promote social inclusion, was not fully clear. This highly complex process of integration of the respective populations is dependent on not only their behaviours in and use of open spaces, which act as a ‘stage’ for mutual interaction, but it is deeply rooted in other sociological aspects which may take a long time to surface and it involves overcoming many socio-economic barriers. Immigrants’ full adaptation to, and integration in the new country may take several generations, however, even
so, many groups may choose to keep their own cultural identity distinct and live fairly exclusively within their own communities. This, however, does not devalue the importance of public open spaces in immigrants’ lives and their adaptation to the host society. On the contrary, by ensuring that immigrants have access to high quality spaces, it will give them the opportunity to choose if they prefer either to be on their own or to engage with other users, and to decide with whom to socialise (the native population or with people from their own community), putting, therefore, the onus of degrees of socialisation upon them.

Using outdoor spaces to socialise also came across very strongly in the focus groups and ‘go-along’. However, the differences in recreational patterns and in behaviour, between the immigrants’ desires and habits and what is socially and culturally accepted by the host country, was a problem for some immigrants. What is crucial to this process is to ensure that both the native population and immigrant groups are given equal opportunities to use public spaces – in ways that reflect their cultural and behavioural norms and which they enjoy (even where that may involve creating some space for particular uses that are separate from those being used by fellow immigrants or the native population) so that the communities do not miss the chance to continue using outdoor spaces for socialising.

It is also important to acknowledge that open public spaces can be restorative, by helping people to unwind and relax from their hard and demanding working life. For that reason, ensuring access to healthy environments can be beneficial to immigrants’ overall wellbeing.

This research has shown the potential of mixed-method research as a tool with which to research immigrant groups. The sequential steps taken during the research process ensured that there was scope for topics relevant to the participants and respondents to be addressed. That is, the methodology was sufficiently flexible to let the research explore further issues that were raised by the immigrants, for example, in the earlier focus group interviews. The focus groups were the first step in giving the three immigrant communities the chance to express their views, problems, desires and expectations in relation to the new environment they faced every day. The questionnaires then collected information which supplemented the findings from the focus-group method. This allowed predictions and statistical comparisons to be made between the three immigrant groups’ experiences of open spaces and the Portuguese respondents in the control group. Finally, the ‘go-along’ interviews allowed some participants from the three immigrant groups to say what features and aspects they liked in two public spaces in Lisbon, Expo and Belém. This gave them further opportunity to voice their experience of places in the host country, and also to describe how particular features and
aspects triggered personal memories of the past, particularly memories of childhood. Research methodology, more typically, often evaluates people’s landscape preferences by using photographs. This research showed that recording respondents’ narratives and their experience in situ were successful alternatives to previous research methods used. Although this research used each method independently, and in a sequential order, they worked in an integrated way, reinforcing the various findings. Therefore, the triangulation of methods is vital when interpreting this research’s findings.

In addition, Canter’s ‘theory of place’ provided a framework to understand the relationship between people and place, by analysing the relationships across all three categories (activities, physical attributes and concepts of the environment). In terms of design, Canter’s theory also has practical application, meaning that design needs to reflect users’ social needs in open spaces (the activities they like to engage in), the physical attributes they prefer most to support their needs/activities and their perceptions of and in open space.

In general, this study contributes to research in the field of landscape architecture by:

- Reinforcing the importance of immigrants’ use of outdoor space, especially when they are living in a new environment in a host country that is very different from their experience in their home country;
- Extending the body of knowledge on the differences between immigrants from different cultural backgrounds and their perceptions and preferences of public open spaces; before this research was undertaken, little was known about these three immigrant communities’ responses to and use of open space;
- Revealing the differences in the experience of outdoor space between the Portuguese control group respondents and that of the three immigrant group respondents;
Reinforcing the importance of green elements and the presence of water as immigrants’ key preferred elements in outdoor spaces, and acknowledging that this preference is cross-cultural;

Revealing that, although people are likely to relax in outdoor spaces, the presence of some facilities such as music being played, barbecues, and cafés are among the attributes immigrants prefer, especially those from Brazil and Cape Verde;

Recognising that green spaces such as parks and gardens are among immigrants’ and Portuguese people’s favourite places, but also that they particularly like using other public open spaces such as the beach;

Demonstrating that nationality is an important predictor of the frequency of use of public open space;

Showing the importance of childhood memories, even for immigrants who feel displaced from their home environment;

Reinforcing the idea that immigrants can develop multiple attachments, especially to public open places, both in the host and home country;

Showing that, contrary to the literature’s findings, safety was not a key barrier to immigrants’ use of outdoor spaces;

Showing that mixed-method research is particularly suited to working with participants from different cultural backgrounds and to explore people’s relation with space.

Finally, planning and design must be based on an understanding of the relationship between people, culture and environment, as well as on the political and social implications of the design process. Landscape architects, among other design and planning professions, should be aware that their work can improve and include the use of outdoor spaces by immigrants (among other minorities).

Policy makers and planners tend to focus on the reality of the native population; they do not always acknowledge that the population is diverse and that it consists of various immigrant groups. These communities are not only culturally and socially different from the native-born population, but they also live in specific areas, often in deprived neighbourhoods and generally, they work hard and long hours in low-paid jobs, and they are poor. These circumstances cannot be separated from the findings of this research. The differences, in terms of their respective use of outdoor spaces, between the Portuguese (in the control group) and the immigrants (in the three groups), should be recognised: immigrants have different
expectations (behaviour, activities), preferences (barbecues, music; types of places) and different barriers (economic, lack of time, tiredness, poor access).

Designing for a culturally diverse society where different cultural values are respected should be a key priority for landscape architects. It is crucial, therefore, to ensure that immigrants’ needs are met and spaces are planned to support the broadest number of users. In the landscape architecture profession, where creativity and in-depth knowledge of the environment and people are its basis, it has the potential to contribute to creating a multicultural and tolerant society, in which public open spaces, accessible to all, are of great importance.

9.3. Implications for future policy, planning and design

Immigrants’ use of public open spaces in the hosting country is a particularly important facet of their lives and policymakers, planners and landscape architects should acknowledge its significance as a central point in future policymaking and planning.

The key findings of this dissertation have policy implications for those whose responsibility it is to integrate immigrants into the hosting country in terms of promoting social cohesion beyond those core values, attitudes and behaviours that the host country expects its citizens to uphold, but also, as stated above, for those who plan and design outdoor spaces, especially landscape architects.

- **Green elements and water**

  Overall, this research demonstrates significant cross-cultural agreement amongst the three immigrant groups from Cape Verde, the Ukraine and Brazil, and also by the Portuguese in the control group, as to the attractiveness of landscape features, such as the presence of green elements and closeness to water, the river and especially to the sea. Lisbon’s privileged geographic location, surrounded as it is by the River Tagus and its closeness to the sea, offers particular characteristics which were particularly appreciated by the three immigrant groups and the native population despite their very different cultural backgrounds. Planners, therefore, should consider the rehabilitation of the river front, since this would increase not only the number of green spaces in Lisbon but also provide users, both immigrants and the native population, with a greater choice of public open spaces. In terms of design, the
incorporation of trees and lawns in public open spaces is relevant to the majority of users, including the native population. The trees that are selected for planting should be chosen from a range of local species, since the immigrant groups particularly liked those types that were native or adapted to Portugal; they regarded them as novel and enjoyed seeing them. Whenever possible, landscape architects should also make the most of the views that are available, by working with the existing topography and creating, if possible, visual links to the River Tagus. All three immigrant groups, as well as the control group, reported that they appreciated other types of water features, such as ponds or fountains. The fountains in Expo (see Chapter 8) are one example of a very successful project that has incorporated water elements into public open space. Consequently, designers should consider ways to integrate water elements into their design of outdoor spaces.

- **Socialising outdoors versus relaxing**

  Some of the social activities the three immigrant groups did outdoors included: visiting outdoor spaces with friends and/or family, taking children to play in the open space, having barbecues or celebratory parties, or simply people-watching. In addition, all the participants mentioned the importance of outdoor spaces as places in which to relax. To accommodate a variety of uses and people’s need to socialise and relax, places, especially green spaces, should be planned and designed as flexibly as possible so that they offer different areas for different uses, such as informal and formal recreation, areas for socialisation and also for seclusion.

- **Music**

  Immigrants from Brazil and Cape Verde valued music being played outdoors, and the control group also appreciated music. Although music is often played in outdoor cafés, this might not be sufficient to attract immigrants since it is usually necessary to buy something to eat and/or drink there. Designing spaces, therefore, where music can be played outdoors seems imperative. The design, especially of parks, or, for example, in the revitalisation of river-front areas, where there is enough scope to accommodate concerts, should also be considered. In established parks and gardens, the existing bandstands, which have long been abandoned for that function, could be converted to stages for concerts. Managers of other public open spaces where there is no defined area for music to be played, and designers and planners of new spaces, should assign spaces to that function.

154 In Portugal, the use of lawns should be considered with particular attention. In ecological terms, they have demanding levels of water consumption, and in a country with water shortages, this is a critical issue. Therefore, when considering the incorporation of these elements, landscape architects should look for those species which are adapted to the edaphic and climatic characteristics of the site.
- **Having food outdoors**

  Participants in the immigrant group from Brazil particularly associated playing music outdoors with socialising and having a barbecue. The Ukrainian respondents also enjoyed having a barbecue but they viewed it as an activity they did as a family and/or with close friends. However, they do not necessarily associate music with, nor is it part of their preference related to, that activity. This poses a dilemma as to how to design spaces that will address both needs. In very large, open places, barbecue facilities can be sited in different areas, and one location might be designated as a place in which to play music and enjoy barbecues, while a smaller area could also have barbecue facilities but allow for some privacy, as would be appreciated by the Ukrainian immigrants. Although having a barbecue is not a typical Portuguese pursuit, there seems to be an urge to offer the facilities to do so in public open spaces, not just on the outskirts but especially within the Lisbon area.

- **Facilities for children and the importance of childhood memories**

  The research findings indicated that the three immigrant groups' childhood memories were an important predictor for their frequency of use of outdoor spaces as adults in the home and host countries. It is important, therefore, for planners and designers to consider migrant children’s access to public open spaces. By ensuring that both first and second generations have the opportunity to enjoy recreation outdoors, this might, in the future, contribute to an increase in use of public open spaces by minority groups. Also, women are more likely to appreciate places where children can play. Designing formal or informal areas where children can play should be taken into account, especially in very urban and densely built environments. This could also promote closer bonds between children and the environment.

- **Sport**

  Immigrants’ were not actively or highly engaged in sport, but neither were the Portuguese in the control group. Nevertheless, immigrants mentioned how they used to play football in their home country. Since football is also a very popular sport for the Portuguese, the provision of public open spaces in which to play football needs to be rethought. Parks and gardens could have formal areas for sport, or simply allow football to be played (either on grass or paved areas). Places such as the beach also have the potential to accommodate various sports. Some beaches have formal areas for playing sports, such as volleyball. Designated areas for playing sports at the beach could be extended in terms of area, but also,
if all-weather areas were built that would let people enjoy sport throughout the year and so extend the official beach period155.

▪ **Rethink access to green spaces**
  The findings from this study suggest that immigrant groups are more likely to have less access to public open spaces than native-born Portuguese people. They showed that they have to travel further to access public open spaces for recreation than the control group. For this reason, it is crucial for planners to review access to outdoor spaces. Since the majority of immigrants work long hours, far from where they live, it is understandable why, during their sparse free time, they prefer to rest and do not wish to travel far beyond Lisbon’s city centre to enjoy quality public open spaces. More high quality, small green areas should be created within their neighbourhoods’ fabric, or parks should be located close to some of the densely built and deprived neighbourhoods where immigrants live. In addition, another measure that should be encouraged is the revitalisation of the already existing, but neglected public spaces in the poor neighbourhoods, or in the city centre.

▪ **Access to the beach**
  The beaches were among immigrants’ and the native population’s favourite places. However, the frequency of visits to these spaces was particularly low for Cape Verdeans and Brazilians. Since the beaches are located outside Lisbon’s city centre, it is important to consider implementing measures that will tackle any transport issues to ensure that people from immigrant communities have as equal access to the beach as native-born Portuguese people. The beaches should also provide areas with appropriate facilities for those forms of recreation that immigrants particularly enjoy, such as sports, playing music and having barbecues.

▪ **Visits to natural areas**
  Immigrants’ use of other outdoor areas beyond the urban boundaries was very poor. There is a need, therefore, for public transportation and access to these areas to be improved, especially to meet the needs of older people among the immigrant communities. Also, planners and managers could consider the potential of these spaces in terms of social inclusion, since they could accommodate many of the leisure activities mentioned by the immigrants in the three research methods. At a planning level, planners and managers should be working on how to make these spaces more welcoming to minority groups, and should try

155 This period varies according to each municipality, but usually comprises the months of June, July and August.
to ensure that these spaces provide a wide range of facilities (good paths, toilets, barbecue and seating areas) to meet the needs of the majority of the population.

- **Inviting immigrants to go outdoors**
  Planning for large events, like musical events, or different cultures' public celebrations where music from various countries would be played, or where barbecues and picnics were allowed, could be planned outdoors. This would be a good opportunity to share and to show various aspects of immigrant culture and potentially, it could increase awareness of the differences and similarities between immigrant groups and Portuguese people and break down pre- and misconceptions. It could also be a way to attract more immigrants to use outdoors spaces and so it should be integrated into park authorities’ planning aims and objectives.

- **Acknowledging the differences**
  The findings suggest that each immigrant group uses and experiences public spaces in Lisbon differently. This is dependent on their background, different cultural values, past experiences and ‘place attachment’. It is important, therefore, not to consider immigrants as one, single group due to their migratory status but as different groups. In terms of policy development and implementation, policymakers and planners have to acknowledge that different immigrant groups have their own particular preferences for the things they like to do and see in outdoor spaces. These preferences require planners and policymakers to examine, carefully, each group’s needs prior to implementing any policy changes.

- **Participatory planning**
  By acknowledging each group’s singularities, policies should focus, therefore, on participatory planning processes. These will involve supportive positive interaction between groups and planners to ensure that the various minorities living in Portugal are involved in decision-making processes, especially when new public open spaces are being developed in areas near to where immigrants live: “Ultimately, meaningful engagement enables ethnic minorities to represent their concerns, to contribute in a way that enriches the environmental experience for everyone, and to lead.” (Ling Wong, 2009, p. 218).

9.4. **Limitations**
As mentioned in Chapter 5, this research faced many challenges while engaging and recruiting participants from minority communities. Practical problems included the lengthy recruitment time, small participant numbers and lack of available control over the groups.
Although this research applied a variety of methods, it is important to emphasise the exploratory nature of this research.

The statistical claims of this research should also be interpreted with caution. The size of the groups in the different methods was always small, and arguably, larger samples would have contributed to more solid and statistically relevant evidential research, therefore, generalisations have been made with caveats, particularly, given that the control group was very small. For this reason, the research conclusions drawn from the immigrants’ reports of their experiences of open space and that of the Portuguese respondents have been made cautiously. The number of valid questionnaires was relatively small and the sampling methods did not offer a true representation of the population. In addition, most of the data was not distributed normally, being either positively or negatively skewed and non-parametrical statistical tests and binary regression were used to analyse this type of distribution.

The quasi-experimental method of the ‘go-along’ interviews was done with a very small group of participants. Ideally, more ‘go-along’ interviews should have been conducted in the same places, to validate the findings. Another problem was the fact that this method was conducted in March, perhaps if it had been done in summer, other places, such as the beach, would have been chosen.

Nevertheless, the triangulation of methods and the repeat inclusion of the same variables across the different methods, have contributed to validating and building an evidence base.

9.5. Areas for future research

This research provided answers to its original research questions but en route, many other questions were raised and further research should be conducted to explore them:

- Some immigrants’ preference for playing music outdoors was a result which has not been explored much in the literature. However, its connection with outdoor behaviours was not explored fully, and since there is a gap in the literature, this is an area of study worthy of further exploration by researchers.

- In a country such as Portugal, with its long coastline, research needs to be done which addresses immigrants’ recreation patterns in coastal areas. The investigation could be divided into two areas of research: the beach as a place for recreation, immigrants’ behaviours there and their perceptions of it; and also, similar to the work undertaken by Zasada et al. (2010), the impact
of international retirement migration (IRM) on Portuguese coastal areas (the Algarve), such as golf courses and construction.

- Immigrants’ background, especially their income and social class, should also be addressed in future research in order to see whether these variables influence their relationship with the environment, and whether they are more or less important than their nationality.

- Although use of public open spaces in the hosting country appears to play a major role in immigrants’ socialisation, it is unclear if this involves socialising only with fellow nationals, or with the host community. Hence, research to establish what actually occurs could help to identify better ways to support integration of both populations in the society. At the same time, the application of other methods could establish the types of relationships which develop in public places, the size of the groups, possible conflicts, etc.

- Future research could focus too on the views of children born to first-generation immigrants in terms of how they use public open spaces. In the longer term, more research could be done to identify the differences between first and subsequent generations to assess the changes in communities’ cultural backgrounds, to rethink their needs and the subsequent policy implications for planners/landscape architects as they support future generations.

- The role of place attachment in immigrants’ lives is a topic worthy of further attention, especially in terms of how it is formed and its implications. Based on the findings of this research, a future investigation could ask why some immigrants develop bonds with the host country and others do not. Is it influenced by different levels of acculturation and assimilation? Are immigrants’ memories essential to them developing an attachment? What is the best method to measure attachment?

- At a local level, it would be helpful to research the relationship between immigrants and their surrounding local environment (e.g. neighbourhood) and how these environments can support immigrant groups’ everyday activities.

- The health benefits of being outdoors have been central to much recent research, however, further study is needed, particularly in relation to immigrant groups, who work long hours in demanding jobs, live in densely
populated areas and have little access (and other barriers such as lack of time, poor transport, distance) to quality public open spaces. How can such spaces in the host country contribute to improving immigrants’ health and wellbeing? Would feeling good, mentally/physically, help to improve immigrants’ experience in the host country?

This research focused on three immigrant groups’ interactions with public open spaces in Lisbon. The research findings show that the topic is more complex, and has more tangential, interdisciplinary issues attached to it than analysis of immigrants’ attitudes, uses, perceptions and memories suggests. For that reason, this research can constitute a base for future interdisciplinary research, including other areas of knowledge such as sociology, psychology and health.
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