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ABSTRACT

An examination of how young twice migrants in the Greater Toronto Area navigate the process of identity formation and its impact on their lifestyles and choices. Scholarly literature indicates laws are derived from multiple sources, and that the function of laws extend beyond social control to the domain of priorities, goals and worldviews of individuals and groups. The purpose of this thesis is to examine how experiences of migration and difference shape a condition of legal pluralism and the factors involved in twice migrant identity formation. Several themes emerged from interviews with six participants. The methodological and analytic approach arose from consultation with multiple research traditions, including grounded theory, and interpretivist and narrative analysis. The findings indicated that young twice migrants continuously shape their identities and correspondingly their navigation of laws and legal orders is adjusted. This has implications for future research on legal pluralism, and for policy makers.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The present research is an exploratory study into the various ways young twice migrants living in the Greater Toronto Area navigate their familiarity with and exposure to multiple lifestyles and cultures. Understanding the nuances of difference and the dynamics of diversity is an important step in creating adequate domestic and international policies that are concerned with migration and identity. Through in-depth interviews with twice migrants, this study explored the process of identity formation and the condition of legal pluralism. Issues of ‘difference’ and multiple belonging have been the topic of much scholarly and popular debate, and as such this dissertation aims to dispel myths and present the perspective of young twice migrants.

1.1 Problem Statement

What happens to the culture and identity of those who migrate? The ‘melting pot’ trope and other similar constructions of what a multi-ethnic, multicultural society should or could be, propagate the idea that an erosion of the past, a melting away of connections to the ‘homeland’, is the desired outcome. Rumbaut (1997) pointed to findings that demonstrated how assimilation is detrimental, and not benign, to the physical and emotional well-being of immigrants and their children. Far from being an ideal, then, such assumptions about assimilation in North America have now been revised and debunked. Other researchers have explained how assimilation in
some cases is a myth. Based on years of extensive research by several anthropologists, Roger Ballard (1994, ix) posited that immigrants and their children not only retain the culture of their place of origin, but they also redefine and renegotiate their culture and identities in response to their new environment, thereby resisting “racial and ethnic exclusionism.” Immigrants and their children are continuing to find substantial inspiration in the resources of their own particular cultural, religious and linguistic inheritance, which they are actively and creatively reinterpreting in order to rebuild their lives on their own terms (Ballard 1994, 6).

Migrants have thus become “skilled navigators” (Ballard 1994, 31), culturally and, as recently documented and elaborated on by numerous studies by legal pluralist scholars, legally.

More than a decade after Ballard, Steven Vertovec (2007) urged a serious rethinking of how we see, or characterise, our new multicultural reality: it is truly super-diverse. Vertovec (2007, 1049-50) proposed and encouraged further and much more specific study of this phenomenon, in order for us to understand how identity formation develops and is expressed. In the face of such diversity and complexity, this study explores the manifestations of law in the lives of young migrants in Canada.

This study is concerned with how young twice migrants, who have migrated multiple times, navigate their cultural and legal affiliations. It asks how complex legal identities are formed and are expressed. Parminder Bhachu (in Ballard 1994, 23) has demonstrated that migrants frequently migrate more than once before
reaching their final destination, which for some migrants will be Canada.

Increasingly, the phenomenon, and the implications, of the ‘legal baggage’ of migrants to the West are being examined. As migration patterns become more complex, so might experiences of identity formation and acculturation. My research aims to examine how legal identities are formed in those who have increasingly complex backgrounds. The common thread is the migratory experience; more specifically, the experience of having migrated twice.

Western legal theory has for the past few centuries been dominated by notions of law as commands emanating from a single, powerful source – a state or sovereign (Menski 2006; Griffiths 1986; Melissaris 2005), and this conceptualisation has failed to examine how actual people live their lives, and what provides the basis for individual and social interactions. Legal anthropologists, however, argue that a multitude of normative orders can be regarded as law, and that the sources of laws are multiple. Legal pluralism, as a subject of study, has been a subject of much debate, and scholars have argued for several foci for researchers interested in the phenomenon. This study is not concerned with “weak” legal pluralism (Griffiths 1986; Vanderlinden 1989) - the study of the partial accommodation by the state of multiple legal orders – but instead investigates ‘law’ as a normative aspect of social organisation (Benda-Beckmann 2002). Law is something beyond simply power and structure (Porpora 1989), varies in expression due to cultural nuances (Menski 2006), and is created when groups have a shared worldview (Melissaris 2005). Furthermore, legal pluralism in
this study is concerned with the role of migration, social networks and exposure to
difference (Vanderlinden 1989).

The question of what migration is and does to individuals and groups has
produced diverging conclusions. Migration has been understood as an incomplete
process (Herbert 2012; Kelly 2013), and one that unfolds differently for each
person (Lewis 1994). The ability of migrants to sustain meaningful and beneficial
social networks across state borders is what is generally meant by
transnationalism, and as such denotes activities which can challenge the traditional
notion of ‘state’ (Vertovec 1999; Appadurai 2002). While transnationalism benefits
migrants financially (Portes et al. 1999), increased monitoring and surveillance
means migration is increasingly becoming restricted to those with the monetary
and cultural capital to navigate immigration control (Brubaker 2005).

Transnationalism has also been linked to the concept of ‘diaspora’, whereby
support environments for migrants are emphasised (Rizvi 2005). Diaspora, often
studied with a focus on the concept of a ‘homeland’ (Mirzoeff 2002; Brubaker
2005; Safran 2004; Portes 1999) through which groups of migrants are said to
create a distinct identity and isolation from the dominant society of their new
homes, is a contested term and concept, especially in light of findings that challenge
the notion that strong ties to ‘elsewhere’ indicates alienation from wider society
(Min & Kim 2009; Sreberny-Mohammadi 2013). In contrast, some scholars have
argued that multiple belongings and adaptive identities are to be expected when
migrants face experiences of exile, oppression and constant change (Rizvi 2005;
Hall 1990; Clifford 1994; Mondal 2008; Appadurai and Breckenridge 1989; Ang 2012; Rahemtullah 2007; Castles 1987; Vertovec 1999). I will engage with the possibility of “multiple belongings”, and undertake an analysis that doesn’t prioritise a notion of a “static homeland” (Herbert 2012, 298).

Twice migration is not uncommon in today’s world (Takenaka 2007), and accordingly individuals and groups who have undergone multiple migrations have been the subject of scholarly study already (Kelly 2013; Jeffery 2011; Aydemir 2006; Bhachu 1985; Bhachu 1991; Ballard 1994; Dwyer 1994; Chowthi 2009; Kaur 2011; Rastogi 2009; Caravelis 2007). This study, however, is concerned with the previously unexplored intersection and convergence of legal pluralism and multiple migration. A more detailed discussion of these topics and concerns appears in Chapter 2.

1.2 Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research is to explore, describe and analyse the impact of multiple migration on the social, cultural and legal affiliations and identifications of young twice migrants. Furthermore, the thesis examines how notions of belonging and identity influence and shape a condition of legal pluralism for the individual. The research questions that serve as the basis for this thesis are,

1. “How does multiple migration affect notions of identity and belonging?”
2. “How do identity and belonging shape twice migrants’ relationship with various normative legal orders?”
3. “To what extent does multiple migration create a condition of legal pluralism?”

1.3 Overview of Methodology

Multiple migration impacts not only the individual who migrates, but also influences social networks. Multiple migration also depends on the very resources that in turn affect it, whether they be in the form of socio-cultural or financial capital. Thus it was necessary to use a variety of qualitative methods derived from multiple disciplines to capture the contextual, personal and social impacts of multiple migration. I treated migration as a “remarkable” (Silverman 2007) event and action, and my research design used in-depth interviews through which I discussed the lives and perspectives of six young twice migrants in the Greater Toronto Area, to explore the social and personal impacts of having lived in more than two countries.

The complexity of the research questions and lives of twice migrants meant I had to rely on several theories and methodologies to carry out my research. I developed my methodological framework from the recommendations derived from Actor-Network Theory, case-study based approaches, grounded theory, interpretivist techniques, ethnographic methods, narrative analysis and contemporary cultural studies (Latour 2005; Law 2004; Saukko 2005; Della Porta & Keating 2008; Silverman 1993, 2007; Ezzy 2002; Charmaz 2005; Geertz 2001; Silverman 1993; Maghbouleh 2012; Whyte 1955; Colic-Peisker 2004; Pelto 2013;
Spradley 1979; Melissaris 2009; Foucault 1972; Schutt 2006). This analytical and methodological framework is presented in detail in Chapter 3.

1.4 Rationale and Significance

This study is not only a ‘cultural study,’ but also takes a legal perspective, which has until recently been a rare combination in the study of minorities in the West. This study is significant in an age where tightened border controls make migration increasingly restricted for the privileged few (Brubaker 2005), and concerns about national identities problematise the multiple affiliations of migrants. My thesis does not simply concern itself with migrant attitudes in order to add to ‘integration literature,’ although it uses twice migrants as a case study to explore the complexities of global legal identities that everyone with exposure to different ways of thinking and living may experiences at some point. Simplistic understandings benefit no one; super-diversity has already “radically transformed the social landscape of migrant-receiving countries” (Vertovec 2010, 86). My research will further challenge myths of integration and assimilation, centring the focus on actual lived experiences as opposed to theoretical ideas about young migrants. As Vertovec (2007) notes,

[f]or policy-makers and practitioners in local government, NGOs and social service departments, appreciating dimensions and dynamics of super-diversity has profound implications for how they might understand and deal with modes of difference and their interactions within the socio-economic and legal circumstances affecting members of the population. Discovering and acknowledging the nature and extent of diversity is a
crucial first step in the development of adequate policies on both national and local levels. Here social scientific research and analysis can provide many of the key points of information and insight (1050).

This thesis serves as an initial investigation for what will hopefully be future and much larger projects on twice migrants in Canada. Some of the themes and topics explored in my study can also be applied to studies of other minorities in Canada and elsewhere. If our social landscape has changed so radically, we need radically different ways of addressing people’s needs today. My study, and other projects like it, aim to explore the potential of lived diversity on the ground, with implications for policy making.

1.5 Role of the Researcher

I was first exposed to the articulation of the concept of ‘legal pluralism’ in my first year of my undergraduate degree, and learning more about this phenomenon became my primary interest. It was also as an undergraduate student living in the United Kingdom that I myself first became a twice migrant. Born and raised in Norway, with an increasing interest in the language and norms of Iran (where my parents were born, and where I visit as often as I can), I experienced difficulties in explaining, and even understanding myself, where I was ‘from’ and who I ‘was’. Yet living in London, one of the most multicultural and diverse cities in the world, made me realise this was an increasingly common condition; most of my close friends were also (or later became), incidentally, twice migrants (though none
shared my specific migratory route). Struggling my whole life to find a legitimate identity as a Norwegian, and discovering how enriched my life became once I embraced my Iranian side, my perspective shifted once I moved to the UK. Like myself, my friends would roll their eyes at the question “Where are you from?” because it was both redundant and telling of prevailing ignorance and exotification of the concept of ‘origins’ (and the question took very long - too long - to answer).

Living in London meant we as twice migrants had room to explore our affiliations, to lose old ones and regain new ones. In my final year in London, after having embraced an additional set of values when I converted to Islam, I returned to the question of legal pluralism and began to compare the diversity of ways all my twice migrant friends and myself were negotiating all our experiences and memories, belongings and allegiances. In London, I met individuals who were born in Somalia, were exiled by war to Saudi Arabia, proceeded to move to England, identified as black in their teens through exposure to American hip hop culture, then embraced a Somali-British-Muslim identity at university. I was attending an Iranian cultural festival in Toronto when the terrorist attack in Norway occurred, and Anders Behring Breivik killed, among others, a former schoolmate of mine, supposedly for promoting ‘multiculturalism’. Twice migrant life was complex, often in confrontation with racism and otherness, and sustained through solidarity.

In New Brunswick, Canada, I finally realised the true absurdity of answering the questions “Who are you?” and ”Where are you from?” when the inquirer could rarely grasp the meaning of having lived as someone with Iranian-born parents for
19 years in Norway, then lived in London specifically (I hardly ever say I have lived in the UK, as I only ever lived in London, which is a city with its own specific demographics, dynamics and subcultures), and attended a university there with its specific culture and identity as radical and diverse. Yet the above information still does not describe who I am, where I feel at home, or even what my interests are (though migration certainly played a role in shaping these aspects), and the same is true for the hundreds of twice migrants I have met since 2009. These circumstances and realisations highlighted for me not only the gap in the migration and legal pluralist literatures, but also the importance of highlighting the complexities of twice migrant experiences and aspirations.

1.6 Definition of Key Terminology

The following are terms that have been operationally defined according to their use in this study:

*Birth country* refers to the country where the person or people in question was/were born.

*Personal start location* refers to the country where the ancestors of a person were born. This is not necessarily the same country as the person’s birth country. Termed *personal* start location, and not just “start location”, because “start location” is relative, and because every human being, if they go back enough generations, probably has their “definitive” start location in the place we today call Ethiopia (Carto et al. 2009, 139). For the purpose of
this study, personal start location is the place actors identify through oral and/or written tradition (and not the place one could identify through methods such as DNA analysis) as the birthplace of their ancestors, going back as far as the actors are able to identify.

*Transitional country* refers to the country or countries the person lives in after they have moved from their personal start location or birth country, and before they have arrived at their current country of residence.

*Country of residence* refers to the country where the migrant currently lives, e.g. Canada.

*Migrant* refers to a person who has physically moved, for whatever reason, to another area or country. Herbert (2012) argues that we should understand migration as an incomplete process, “involving multiple movements in which groups develop trans-national affiliations”, and that this understanding should replace a “notion of immigration as a single, final and rupturing act, with immigrants expected to forsake their old identity. Migration does not necessarily entail settlement; rather movements can be within the realm of ‘circulation’” (297).

*Twice Migrant* refers to someone for whom the action of migration has occurred more than once (Bhachu 1985). For example, a person can move from Iraq to Sweden. After a few years in Sweden, they have children, who grow up there; another action of migration happens and the family moves to Canada – all the members of the family become twice migrants, unless the spouse
has Sweden as their personal start location, in which case the children are still twice migrants, but the spouse (the father/mother of the children) would not be a twice migrant.

*Direct migrant* (Bhachu 1985) refers to someone migrating directly from their personal start location.

*Identity* refers to the subjective sense of self that is informed by the experiences agents have had through growing up with a migrant background in different countries. Identities “are formulated continuously in a process of negotiation with a number of economic, [social] and political forces that shift over time and space” (Bhachu 1991). Identity is connected to a sense of self, but also to a sense of community. The term here is directly tied to the normative legal orders the actor engages with, as identity is tied to “the social roles individuals [are] called upon to play” (Cohen 2010, 69). As such, we are also talking about *social* identities, which are not group identities but aspects of personal identity that are tied to the wider social realms in which the actor participates.

*Laws* refers to a dynamic attribute of social organization derived from rationalisation and justification of actions, and from a frame of meaning for human conduct (Benda-Beckmann & Benda-Beckmann 2013, 18). This frame of meaning is tied to history, and relies on a “shared normative experience” that ties laws to identity and a sense of self both as members of various groups and as an individual (Melissaris 2005, 850). Laws thus have
some level of consistency to them, and are not arbitrary in the sense that they lack any kind of rationale. The rationale for laws come from multiple sources – geographical societies (what we may call “society”, or “culture”, or “nation”), religion and codes of ethics, global society, and state (Menski 2006), hence why the term is in the plural. Agents navigate and personalise their version of their laws, particularly in cases where there is “a high incidence of multiplex and multifunctional relationships and institutions in actual social organization” (Benda-Beckmann & Benda-Beckmann 2013, 24). For my research and thesis, I will primarily focus on the personalisation and navigation of laws as experienced by twice migrants.

*Normative legal order* refers to a body of laws deriving from the same source of rationale. Multiple normative orders exist, and the boundaries of these orders are semi-permeable, due to their internal plurality (Menski 2006). Normative legal orders are not static, as new laws arise from new or alternative interpretations and experiences.

*Diaspora* refers to a portable and flexible (Vasquez 2010, 128) social identity (Cohen 2010, 70), which a group of people form in a country they have migrated to. Diasporas result from the ability to foster transnational relations through connections to people and activities, and challenge the “hegemony and boundedness of the nation-state” (Werbner 2010, 74-75). The “orientation to ‘home’ may not necessarily be to a *national home*” (Werbner 2010, 75). Complex diasporas create potential cross-cutting ties
through sharing similar patterns of consumption, action, and so on
(Werbner 2010, 75-76). Diasporic orientations are not merely “inherited
nostalgia” (Maghbouleh 2010).

*Culture* refers to a context (Geertz 2001, 63) that acts as the actor’s “web of
significance” (Geertz 2001, 56). Culture refers to “the total way of a people”,
“the social legacy the individual acquires from his group”, and “a way of
thinking, feeling and believing” (Kluckhohn in Geertz 2001, 56).

*Racism* refers to “assumptions, beliefs and values” (Henry & Tator 2012,
249) that advance and justify actions, behaviours and sentiments that are
discriminatory, and that target racialised people. Furthermore, racism is
particularly and frequently reflected in cultural production (ibid.) and
everyday interactions.

*Othering* is a process through which dominance is established, often through
dehumanisation, and difference is articulated for the purpose of creating or
maintaining power relations (by which the *othered* are subjugated) (Said,
1978).

### 1.7 Organisation of the Dissertation

In Chapter 1, I introduced the rationale and background for this research, including
its purpose and execution, and definition of key terminology used. Chapter 2 is
comprised of a review of the relevant literature, addressing the questions that
remain unanswered by previous scholarship and thus that provide support for the
need for this research. In Chapter 3, I present in detail the research paradigm, methodology, setting, sample, data collection and analysis methods, and discuss the limitations and delimitations of the study. Chapter 4 is comprised of the findings from the research, organised according to the themes and patterns that arose from interviews with young twice migrants. In Chapter 5, I compare the existing literature to the findings, and elaborate on the implications of my conclusions on future research. Chapter 6 concludes the study, with final remarks and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter I will provide a critical review of the previous scholarly research on migration, identity formation and legal theory as they relate to the present study. In my search for how migration and experiences of difference impact identity, and the ways in which identity – or rather, a sense of self – relates to the legal pluralist concept of law, I will first give an overview of the concept of legal pluralism and its relation to migration, the different ways scholars have theorised minority and migrant belonging, and how they have dealt with outstanding issues of how power and politics contribute to old and new ways of thinking about identity. I will furthermore explore the existing literature on twice migration and evaluate to what extent standard and alternative theories of identity formation apply. In intersecting migration theory and legal theory, the question of whether identity and belonging affect legal navigation emerged. I also became interested in whether social networks, diversity and discrimination influence the choices individuals make. Many of the assertions about migration and belonging suggest questions about their applicability to the situation of twice migrants, and the research questions have arisen due to this.
2.1 Legal Pluralism and Migration

I will begin the review of the relevant literature by introducing the concept of legal pluralism, and tying it to the issue of (twice) migration.

In line with the methodology I adopted for this research (more details can be found in Chapter 3), I reviewed the bulk of the migration literature after conducting my field research. This was done to let the data influence the course of the study as much as possible. However, I did start out with some research questions and interests, and a thorough grounding in legal pluralist literature. My primary interest from the onset was in exploring the limits of legal pluralist theory in relation to twice migrants. I wanted to assess to what extent the theories of law, as proposed by legal pluralist theorists, can inform our understanding of how twice migrants navigate sets of values and expectations. In addition, I wanted to see whether twice migrants themselves - and the ways in which they led their lives - could further inform legal theory. Studies of twice migrants have been done before, and much of legal pluralist research today concerns immigrants, but so far twice migrants have not been the focus of legal pluralist research. Thus when I conducted my research in the field, I had these matters in mind, and returned to the same questions when I reviewed the scholarly literature.

In order to bridge the literature on migration in general, twice migrants specifically, and the growing literature on legal pluralism, I had to begin with the most basic shared objective of these works: analysing how individuals and groups
experience and harmonise their lives. The migration literature deals with how migrants in particular adapt to life in new locations, and the challenges they face, while legal pluralist literature focuses on the similar issue of how people and entities adjust to competing narratives of power and influence. According to Castles and Miller (2009 in Kelly 2013), one can take macro and micro approaches to the study of migration and migrants. The former approach takes account of politics, economics and other “large-scale institutional factors”, whilst the latter considers, in contrast, the “networks, practices and beliefs of migrants themselves” (ibid.). Thus, legal theory in general is more concerned with the macro aspects of people, structures, change and movements, while the migration literature delves into the details of how groups and individuals react, adapt and adjust to transformations of location and power. Legal pluralist theory helps us connect legal and migration literature by also going into the details of how law manifests in people’s lives. I followed Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt (1999, 220) to ask questions about “the individual and his/her support networks.” This study thus belongs primarily to the category of micro approaches. However, no approach is ‘pure’ and devoid of elements of the other approach, and consequently I address some of the structural factors relevant to migrants’ formation of networks and practices.

The subject of how ‘law’ is envisioned is crucial to my own research, as legal pluralist theories first made me interested in the ways ‘law’ manifests itself in migrants’ lives. I therefore will first review the literature on the concept of ‘law’
and other broad concerns before turning to the issue of individual legal navigation. How does one come to a definition of law that distinguishes it as a phenomenon in its own right, different from social relations and politics, but that does not divorce it from the real life elements that shape and influence its manifestation? Griffiths warns us against the trap of conceptualising the law in a manner that simply reflects what we think 'law' ought to be, and argues that it is precisely this trap that perpetuates legal centralist myths of what the law is (1986, 3). I have followed, for this study, an understanding of law and the legal that is “decentralised” and able to acknowledge “the existence of legal communities beyond state law” (Melissaris 2005, 850). This enables us to understand the legal “bottom-up in the light of the material bonds that keep a community together, rather than top-down by starting from authority or sovereignty” (Melissaris 2005, 850). I have therefore adopted a critical look at law from an anthropological perspective, and in formulating questions for participants and analysing interview material, I tried to keep the scope as wide as possible.

Twining (2002, 232 in Menski 2006, 83) addresses some of the issues facing scholars engaging with traditional legal theorists and the general public when trying to discuss law as plural in form:

...[for] over 200 years Western legal theory has been dominated by conceptions of law that tend to be monist (one internally coherent system), statist (the state has a monopoly of law within its territory), and positivist (what is not created or recognised as law by the state is not law).
Thus a more decentralised and legal pluralist view of the law "raises important questions about power" (Griffiths in Menski 2006, 82). The question of power was kept in mind as interviews were conducted, as considerations such as class, gender, and racialisation based on physical or cultural features all have a role in the play of competing forces.

Legal pluralism as an approach has often been expressed as a 'battle' against what Griffiths dubs "the ideology of legal centralism" (1986, 1). Legal centralism refers to the arguably political motives behind viewing law as solely emanating from the state or sovereign. This 'battle' sometimes manifests itself as attempts to demonstrate the actual and possible ways that the state law has and can accommodate practices of a 'legal kind' that are seemingly at odds with the dominant (state) legal system. However, there is another branch of legal pluralist scholarship that deals more with the philosophical and theoretical groundings of what we envision as law and tries to break away from privileging the nation-state. Legal pluralism that is only interested in investigating the flexibility a given legal system has to accommodate 'other laws', can only tackle the issue of "weak" legal pluralism (Griffiths 1986), or what Vanderlinden calls "relative" legal pluralism (1989, 153). Vanderlinden characterises such relative legal pluralism as "the acknowledgement by the State system of its incapacity to realize to the full its totalitarian ambition" (1989, 153). Confusing this for legal pluralism happens when one "completely neglects observation and adopts a purely theoretical stance" (ibid). This thus necessitates a reconceptualisation of what law is. One cannot move
on to observing more complex legal pluralism if one continues seeing law as simply
the exercise of a state or sovereign. Both Vanderlinden (1989, 155) and Griffiths
(1986, 1) envision law as a concept existing in society itself, with Vanderlinden
identifying legal pluralism as legal mechanisms applied in a “single social order” in
an identical manner, while Griffiths argues that legal pluralism is the “presence in a
social field of more than one legal order”.

While Griffiths (1986, 39) argues that social control in more or less all forms
is ‘law’ or ‘legal’, F. von Benda-Beckmann seeks to move away from singular
conceptions of law, which he deems reductionist. Viewing law as an aspect of social
organisation, and not as a specific domain, F. von Benda-Beckmann describes law
as subjective, normative and cognitive conceptions that are held as valid for a
particular group (2002, 48). By conceptions, he means a collective term that covers
rules, notions, standards and more. He identifies legal phenomena as cognitive and
normative conceptions that fulfil certain criteria that in a general sense “recognise
and restrict society’s members’ autonomy to behave and construct their own
conceptions” (F. von Benda-Beckmann 2002, 48). Thus these cognitive conceptions
have a normative element, which in turn manifests as laws (mostly) within two
categories: general laws that offer an if-then scheme based on typified situations;
and laws that are of the as-then nature and which are based on concrete situations
debating concepts of “structure”, argues that “law” is not simply “behaviour”, or the
prediction thereof. Menski (2006, 82) argues that law, as a social phenomenon, is
based on “cultural foundations”. Similarly, Melissaris argues that different groups have their own system or conceptualisation of ‘law’ (Melissaris 2009, 11). He sees law as the “normative commitment to a legal order”, and argues that it emerges from and relies on the “commitment of the participants to their shared [normative] experiences” (Melissaris 2005, 850). This, he argues, is because normativity is necessarily preceded by a “coherent impression of the world”, which becomes the background to legal orders, as the law must always be justified in some way. In order for this to happen, however, there must be something beyond just shared ideas of what duties and rights are: “what is also necessary is an idea of how these obligations and entitlements will be located in and affect the world of objects” (Melissaris 2005, 851). Law can then be said to be a multitude of things that can be traced through the impact they have on relations, or rather, in what way actions shape relations, and vice versa. Ergo, the study of law asks what ‘powers’ (loosely used here) compel people to act the way that they do, which is also the objective of the present study. This is a more micro approach to law than the study of “weak” legal pluralism.

The argument that laws are adhered to due to a collective commitment, which in turn comes about from group members sharing experiences, made me interested in the literature on diaspora and transnationalism. Before we return to the issue of defining and locating ‘law’, I will review the migration literature that focuses on the topic of social networks.
'Migrant’ is a broad category that can be applied to people with a range of different experiences. A person who has physically moved, for whatever reason, to another area or country, is a migrant. In addition, Rumbaut (1997, 15) distinguished what he called the ‘1.5 generation’ from other first generation migrants; the 1.5 generation differ in that they are “foreign-born youths who immigrated... before age 12.” The implication for this generation is that they have direct experience with their parents’ ‘home land’, and any nostalgia felt through this connection is not just “inherited” (Maghbouleh 2010). Herbert (2012, 297) argues that we should understand migration as an incomplete process, “involving multiple movements in which groups develop trans-national affiliations.” This understanding replaces the more common way of speaking about migration as “a single, final and rupturing act” (ibid.), whereby migrants eventually forsake their old identities and understandings. Instead of envisioning migration as an action that happens once in someone’s life, the study of twice migrants helps to highlight, as Herbert suggested above, that migration is a “process” (Kelly 2013, 42). I wanted to see whether this process included new ways of being that provide migrants with meanings and socio-cultural capital. Migration, it has been claimed, does not necessarily entail settlement; but rather, movements can be within the realm of ‘circulation’. In addition, it has been argued that different life events and generational variations can provide for “radically different” (Lewis 1994, 60) migratory experiences. Again, these were claims I wanted to test in my own research.
Much of the literature on migrant networks has been focused around the concept of ‘transnationalism’. The term transnationalism has been used to refer to various manifestations of interactions between people and a variety of institutions and groups across countries (Vertovec 1999). Most of the contemporary research into transnationalism ties these activities to nation-states. However, transnationalism – in the form of trade and connections across distances and borders (of various kinds and “permeability”) - certainly occurred before the existence of the modern ‘nation-state’ (ibid.). Through the study of transnationalism, the traditional notion of state itself is called into question, as the basis of global interactions changes through a change in the relationship between people, wealth and territories (ibid.). Instead of appearing dispersed, it is argued that migrants form “transnational communities” that are sustained by various manners of organisation, movement and communication, and these can be ascertained and recognised by researchers (Vertovec 1999, 449). Economic and technological advancements have intensified some kinds of activities within the umbrella of ‘transnationalism’, and have moved some transnational activities – political, social and economic - to a virtual space (ibid.). Appadurai (2002, 174) argues that mass media and technology in combination with migration has created “diasporic public spheres, phenomena that confound theories that depend on the continued salience of the nation-state as the key arbiter of important social changes.” All of this indicates that the conditions should be prime for migrants who wish to maintain instant and continuous connections to and with old homes.
Different scholars have used the term ‘transnationalism’ to describe somewhat diverse phenomena. For example, Portes et al. (1999) reserve the term for a very specific type of migration and continued connection, and define transnational migrants as those with especially strong continuous economic ties ‘back home’; accordingly they assert that migrants with “greater average economic resources and human capital (education and professional skills) should register higher levels of transnationalism because of their superior access to the infrastructure that makes these activities possible”. Despite new and old practices of transnationalism, Brubaker (2005, 9) argues that borders have not become unprecedentedly porous, at least not with regard to the movement of people. States have “gained rather than lost the capacity to monitor and control the movement of people” using surveillance and technologies of identification, and the post-9/11 world has made it harder for poor individuals and families to find work and refuge in prosperous nations (ibid.). Thus while the world is seemingly more ‘connected’ than ever before, as will be demonstrated below, this has only made it easier for those with abundant resources to migrate and resettle, and has not necessarily democratised immigration. And so despite the increase of tools and the focus on migration, both in literature and in the more popular spheres, migrant flows to, for example, the United States have decreased compared to a century ago, and “the mobility of the great majority remains severely limited by the morally arbitrary facts of birthplace and inherited citizenship and by the exclusionary policies of states” (ibid.). As instruments and agents of global capitalism continue to
structurally reconfigure capitalist activities (Vertovec 1999, 456), the new world economy and the dynamics of capitalism are said to give rise to distinct forms of adaption by migrants (Portes et al. 1999, 227). In the age of restricted migration, I had questions about whether twice migrants must therefore be highly privileged and must make full use of their cultural and monetary capital in order to manoeuvre the intricacies of immigration processes.

As five out of six of the participants in this study had lived in one or more of the Arab Gulf countries prior to moving to Canada, I also wanted to review the history of migrants in the region in light of Brubaker and Vertovec’s findings above. According to Al-Rasheed (2005, 6), migration to the Arab countries of the Persian Gulf region has in most cases “functioned under the patronage of the state.” Thus states are actively facilitating migrants’ moving abroad for periods of time to work. The oil resources of the member states of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) are often seen as the primary reason for modern migration to Saudi Arabia and other Gulf nations. These resources mean migrants receive benefits and salaries that are much higher than they would in their country of origin. While modern interest in Gulf nations by Western nations and businesses might be primarily due to this, Muslims from South Asia who are recruited for labour, in Saudi Arabia in particular, are said to feel an additional pull to the country due to its historical and present significance for adherents of the faith (Al-Rasheed 2005, 2). According to Al-Rasheed (2005, 3), the public discourse in Arab Gulf countries is occupied with perceived threats to the “authenticity” of local Arab culture, with particular
apprehension around “creolization” and ‘globalisation’. Local identity is increasingly defined as *Arab*, and Al-Rasheed asserts that if one looks past the glossy façade of modern technology, grand shopping centres and fast-food chains, “one encounters strong assertions of tradition rather than celebrations of hybridity and cosmopolitanism” (ibid.). In Chapter 5 we will see if this is also what the twice migrant respondents in this study reported.

Economic and religious connections between Arab Gulf countries and the rest of Asia and Africa are not new, and have been substantial for at least 1400 years; the historical relationship with Asia and Africa means diasporas from these regions have existed in the Gulf region for centuries, though the establishment of diaspora communities “reached a climax with the discovery of oil and the need for international labour” (Al-Rasheed 2005, 6). As the Persian Gulf is situated between Europe, Africa and the Indian subcontinent, its geographical location made it ideal as a “transit station for larger commercial flows in recent times” (ibid.). The oil boom in the GCC countries led to urban development and an intense recruitment of skilled and unskilled labour, often from South Asia; the labour force is overwhelmingly non-GCC nationals, and the local population remains small in all the Arab Gulf countries (Al-Rasheed 2005, 1).

Thus in the GCC countries, migration is not just a tactic by migrants that benefit from global capitalism, but is also actively encouraged by the states. There is no expectation by Arab Gulf States of migrants staying in the GCC region indefinitely, and so activities that serve to facilitate trans-national ventures are not
discouraged. I wanted to test whether this was what migrants themselves also reported.

Vertovec (1999, 447) describes the various usages of the term transnationalism more broadly than Portes et al., and has grouped the meanings into themes: transnationalism as a “social morphology, as a type of consciousness, as a mode of cultural reproduction, as an avenue of capital, as a site of political engagement, and as a reconstruction of a ‘place’ or locality.” Thus the term covers a wide variety of activities individuals may opt in or out of once they have migrated. Significantly, all of Vertovec's themes are linked to social activities, even productions of consciousness or place. “Transnational consciousness” is linked not just to space, but consciousness constructed through experiences involving people and space; likewise, political engagement benefits from trans-cultural literacy, and reconstruction of place requires transactions and interactions between people.

Portes et al. (1999) also invoke the social aspect of migration when they describe transnationalism in relation to a group of migrants who have direct economic and political involvement across nations. I wanted to touch upon these issues in my study to see whether twice migrants express this kind of “transnational consciousness.” Next, I will evaluate whether old and new conceptualisations of diaspora apply to twice migrants and whether related theories help us understand twice migrant life.

According to Vertovec (1999, 449), transnationalism as used in sociology and anthropology is most often meant to describe a “social formation spanning
borders”, and diasporas can certainly function in such a way. The question is whether twice migrants form bonds with compatriots who have also twice migrated, and to what extent these shape life in a new location. According to Rizvi (2005, 176), “[s]trong diasporic networks” mean people start to “view emigration as perfectly normal,” whilst they simultaneously provide “a supportive environment for managing the complex processes of mobility”. These were theories that I wanted to test vis-à-vis twice migrants.

Early academic usage of the term “diaspora” principally concerned a small number of cases and were in relation to a conceptual ‘homeland’, as was the case with the ‘classical’ Jewish diaspora (Brubaker 2005, 2). In the nineteenth century, people ‘in’ diaspora “were seen as a disruption to the natural economy of the nation-state”, and subsequently “diaspora peoples themselves envisaged an end to diaspora whether in Theodore Herzl’s Zionism or Marcus Garvey’s return to Africa” (Mirzoeff 2002, 205). More recent conceptualisations of the term include various sets of ethnocultural and country-defined diasporas, as well as other diasporas (e.g. white, liberal, queer, or digital diasporas) (Brubaker 2005, 2-3). Safran (2004, 10), using the example of the Jewish diaspora in particular as a model, argues that diasporas continue to represent not just any minority community, but are comprised of immigrants that retain cultural connections with a kind of “homeland culture and/or religion.” Clearly drawing on similar sources for his formulation, Brubaker (2005, 5) identifies three elements that are core to most understandings of diaspora: dispersion in space; an orientation to a “homeland”; and boundary
Diasporic dispersion has been alternately interpreted as forced dispersion and as any manner of dispersion in space, often across state borders but also within state borders (ibid.). Nevertheless, a state is not a prerequisite to diasporic dispersion or affiliations; the Jewish diaspora is a case in point. Dispersed by persecution and divided by competing claims to power, the Jewish diaspora precedes modern manifestations of centralised power.

The preservation of “a distinctive identity vis-à-vis a host society (or societies)” is called “boundary-maintenance” (ibid.). More than a collection of people who share certain characteristics, a diaspora is often seen by scholars as distinguished as a community by its ability and willingness to mobilise and operate within and, to some extent, separate from a larger polity (Armstrong 1976 in Brubaker 2005, 6). In this way, a diaspora is regularly characterised as held together by active solidarity, attachment and social relationships that link diaspora members across geographic and political boundaries into a transnational community. This can be linked to the discussion in the legal pluralist literature on ethnic minority immigrant groups bringing their ‘legal baggage’ with them to the countries to which they move (Menski 2006).

A few words should be said here about some of the research on what kinds of attachments migrants are said to have, to places and lifestyles. According to Min and Kim (2009), there are different degrees of ‘ethnic’ and “sub-ethnic” attachments - meaning attachments to people of the same region, language or religion - and the level of attachment is dependent on three primary factors: 1) the
extent of group homogeneity; 2) religious affiliations; and 3) education and degree of fluency in the language of the land. They use Indian and Iranian (direct??) migrants to the United States as an example of peoples with a high level of group heterogeneity based on the existence of several different languages, religions and ethnicities/cultures, and Korean migrants as an example of a relatively homogenous group (ethno-linguistically and religiously). Religion is said to contribute to the notions of ethnicity, primarily through congregational activities that help maintain social networks, and through the practice of religious rituals at home, and serves as the main sub-ethnic “boundary-marker” for Indian migrants to the United States (Min & Kim 2009, 761-62). Hurh and Kim (in Min & Kim 2009) have shown that degree of ethnic or religious attachment does not affect the level of socialisation with the dominant population negatively; migrants are able to maintain close and meaningful ties with several groups simultaneously. Similarly, Sreberny-Mohammadi’s (2013) study of second-generation Iranian-Americans who ‘returned’ to Iran after graduating from university shows they have a high level of attachment both to Iran and an Iranian identity, as well as identifying in many respects with broader American culture and life. My study was designed to assess whether it would also be possible for twice migrants to manage and balance meaningful ties to several places, peoples and ways of being. I will now return to the question of law, and situate the individual within the processes of migration and legal navigation.
Jacques Vanderlinden (1989, 152), when speaking of legal pluralism, centres the concept not upon particular legal systems, but rather upon the individual actor, “who can be subjected to many legal orders as a member of many networks.” Because my research focuses primarily on migrant experiences, this approach is more appropriate to my study. Vanderlinden (ibid.) argues that focusing on whether or not a given legal system is ‘pluralistic’ is somewhat fruitless, as he envisions legal systems as sets of practices that aim to regulate relevant social networks. Alternatively, legal pluralism happening on the ground, for the individual, is more like a condition, a way of being and existing (Vanderlinden 1989, 153). This condition occurs when the person continuously:

is confronted in his behaviour with various, possibly conflicting, regulatory orders, be they legal or non-legal, emanating from the various social networks of which he is, voluntarily or not, a member (Vanderlinden 1989, 154).

Menski (2006, 84) proposes a “meta-language” to talk about law in a sense that conveys it as a universal\(^1\) phenomenon that is globally focused. Such a way of envisioning the law “cannot avoid taking many culture-specific elements into account”, and rejects assumptions of the “unilinear direction of human development” (2006, 84-90). In the study of twice migration, this means taking

\(^1\) Note that this use of the term universal is not in the sense that the application, purpose or form of law is the same everywhere at any time. However, it challenges the notion that some peoples or societies are ‘lawless’.
account of the myriad of experiences and exposures to different ways of being that produce new methods and manifestations for self-regulation and group regulation for migrants. These particular conceptualisations of law were kept in mind in designing and undertaking the study of twice migrant physical and philosophical navigations.

Summary Remarks on Legal Pluralism and Migration

As we have seen above, the study of law is also the study of power, and the functions of relations and structures. Rather than legal phenomena emanating from just ‘systems’, the individual actor experiences a condition of legal pluralism, through exposure to different ways of life, and through being confronted with a rethinking of their own habits. Legal phenomena are thus both cognitive and normative. Such highly personal struggles, which are closely related to matters of identity and belonging, I call (legal) navigation and negotiation throughout this dissertation. Research questions that arose from the legal pluralism literature were concerned with how migrants establish meaningful ways of navigating different normative and cognitive legal frameworks, how this is manifested in the lives of twice migrants, and what we can understand about the role of power in light of these findings. The migration literature has presented transnationalism and diaspora as ways in which migrants form bonds that span across borders. Just as transnationalism has been classified in the literature as endeavours that rely on social connections, so has diaspora been conceptualised as the maintenance of a
collective ‘sameness’. From this, I became interested in questions about how twice migrants establish social networks, whether life events and variations provided for a diversity of experiences, and to what extent monetary and cultural capital play a role in facilitating twice migration.

2.2 Identity and Belonging

In this section I have reviewed the relevant literature on the concept of individual and collective identity and belonging, in light of the broader theories of migration and migrants’ social networks that were provided above. In this part of the study I will address questions about the adoption of identity. I was curious as to what extent identity is not something one chooses to adopt, but may emerge as a result of life processes. This led me to critical approaches to the study of migrant identity formation. Instead of privileging the nation-state and relying on outdated definitions, the sources below critically examine how politics of difference contribute to the formation of an individual’s identity.

Migrants being able to sustain transnational ties is not a recent development, whether for personal or business reasons. Changing global conditions have implications for the sustaining of ties, and the nature of these community ties are interesting. According to Portes (1999, 464), political “convulsions” in the ‘home’ country encourage migrants to feel morally obligated to maintain ties to communities left behind, and migrants are as a consequence “more likely to engage in a variety of activities to bridge the gap and sustain a common
bond”. Whether those convulsions take place in the personal start location or a transitional country is an interesting question in relation to twice migrants. Furthermore, discrimination and hostility also “give direction to [migrants’] adaptive strategies, including those of a transnational character”, encouraging migrants to identify as a group to “reaffirm its collective worth” (Portes 1999, 465). This, he affirms, leads to symbolic and sometimes physical separation from the “host society”, where individuals are “in the country, but are certainly not of it” (ibid.). Diasporas have been defined by Safran (in Clifford 1994, 304) as “expatriate minority communities”, and he maintains that seeing the “ancestral home as a place of eventual return” and the commitment to a maintenance or restoration of wherever home is, are features of a such expatriate communities.

Ibrahim, a young man interviewed by Rizvi (2005, 187), had this to say about the notion of ‘home’, and of belonging:

Why do you have to have a home, why can’t it [be] everywhere?... Neither here nor there. Or I can always say I have three homes. After all, my lifestyle is the same in all three places. I am the same person, who is privileged enough to be able to enjoy what the world has to offer.

It is thus important to acknowledge that there are some significant problems with the classification of someone as indefinitely a ‘migrant’ – or expatriate - with a home elsewhere, and this I call ‘perpetual migrant syndrome’. It risks negating the (frequently) permanent nature of their stay, and can downplay the sense of attachment the ‘migrant’ feels in relation to their ‘new home’. It perpetuates otherness. When does one stop being a migrant? It would be unfortunate if this
study encouraged the idea that people who had at one time migrated could never fully become a permanent feature in the construction of a national or cultural identity, whether that be the nation one migrated from or to. Therefore, it is a complicated task to utilise terminology that distinguishes between various geographical locations and cultures to which actors are connected. It was not without difficulty that I reached a sort of compromise with myself in choosing to use for example ‘personal start location’ instead of the more common ‘home’ or ‘original’ country. Speaking of an ‘original’ country enhanced the sense of the foreignness of the migrant. ‘Adopted’ or ‘host’ country, referring to the countries that migrants move to, function in much the same way. ‘Birth country’ is a term that offers certain challenges, particularly in the study of twice migrants; the emphasis on place of birth perpetuates notions of ‘blood ties’ to a land, and in the case of twice migrants, might not capture the full complexity of the actor’s experience in that country and can place a distorted primacy on the country in which one was born. And so it is with caution that I have used more alternative terminology, without implying any permanence or universal application to their usage. As the study focuses on people who have migrated, finally, to Canada after having lived in one or more places, there is no need to designate any place as a ‘host’ country; Canada will act as the ‘final destination’. This finality is of course assumed until the migrants move to another place. Notably, all of the migrants in this study expressed a desire to live in Canada, not just sojourn there for a time. In addition, as will be obvious through this study, ‘birth’ country and ‘original’
country are not necessarily synonymous; as the study considers children of migrants to be twice migrants, the country that acts as a starting point for their parents will be designated as ‘personal start location’ (a more in-depth description of this term is given in Chapter 1, in the definition of key terminology). The countries between the original and the final locations will be called country/countries of transition, though somewhat reluctantly. With this in mind, we can engage critically with migration scholarship that continues to use somewhat unclear vocabulary.

While we saw above that the term ‘homeland’ was often invoked in relation to diasporas, the supposedly obligatory attachments to a ‘lost homeland’ are disputable. Clifford, for example, notes (in Brubaker 2005, 6) that we can speak of a South Asian diaspora – broader than state affiliations – that is “not so much oriented to roots in a specific place and a desire for return as around an ability to recreate a culture in diverse locations”. In addition, “cosmopolitan Jewish societies” in the Mediterranean in the Middle Ages did not necessarily come together as communities primarily through attachments to a homeland; culture, kinship, business and travel, as well as attachment to specific cities served as links between Jews (Goitein 1967 in Clifford 1994, 305). And after 1492, when the Muslims and Jews were expelled from Spain, Sephardic Jews longed for specific and familiar cities in Spain as homes to return to, at the same time as they longed for the Holy Land (ibid.). Thus the diaspora network was “multi-centred”. In pre-1492 Muslim Spain, “lines of identity were drawn differently, often less absolutely”, because
difference “was articulated through connection, not separation” (Clifford 1994, 325). Experiences of a “shared, ongoing history of displacement, suffering, adaption, or resistance” can be as important in serving as a cohesive glue as can an idea of a specific geographical origin (ibid.). Diasporas, in cutting across the boundaries of nations, are “a testimony to the inherent fragility of the links between people, polity and territory and to the negotiability of the relationship between people and place” (Appadurai & Breckenridge 1989, i). The study design allowed for these nuances to emerge.

Portes et al. (1999, 217) postulate that an increasing number of people lead “dual lives” through speaking two (or more) languages, by having homes in several countries, and, crucial to their analysis, by making a living through regular and continuous contact across countries (ibid.). As the narrative on ‘dual lives’ is a common one in popular discourse, yet is one that I am highly suspicious of, it made me look for literature that attempted to unpack the assumptions and limitations of this line of thinking.

It is often argued that young migrants, particularly those originating in Asia or Africa, may feel caught between two ‘worlds’, “two different cultural systems with competing values” (Mirza, Senthilkumaran, and Ja’far 2007, in Mondal 2008, 21). In this sense, and contrary to Hurh and Kim (in Min and Kim 2009, above), “the turn towards a religious identity is partly in response to a sense of cultural alienation in the West” (ibid.). However, Mondal argues against the “between two cultures” argument: “very few – well, none, actually – young Muslims to whom I
spoke exhibited any signs of ‘alienation’” (ibid.). Furthermore, Mondal argues that this simplistic culture-clash narrative is part of the process that alienates young migrants. The argument that certain young migrants are alienated stems from the notion that, for example, “a secular, ‘Western’ lifestyle and an Islamic one are two antithetical alternatives” (ibid.). From his interviews with young British Muslims, however, Mondal found that, rather than surrendering to one particular ‘camp’, all the participants in his study “narrated their personal histories in ways which emphasized a desire for self-empowerment” (2008, 22). Without desiring to “fetishise” or idealise the concept of ‘choice’ (Vakulenko 2012), this made me interested in looking for manifestations of the ability of young twice migrants in exercising agency to embark upon a conscious identity navigation.

In his case study Mondal notes that, in practising Islam, younger generations have taken a different approach from that of their parents and grandparents. The older generations, if they practiced at all, did so more out of “collective observance”, maintaining a certain public persona and partaking in a, for them, mere “aspect of social life” and “one dimension of a cultural and communal life that they took for granted” (Mondal 2008, 4-5). Mondal (2008, 5) thus maintains that their children were given room to “breathe” and navigate their own boundaries and understandings of where they “found [their] morals and knew [themselves].” At the same time, it is noted that the younger generation, in addition to dealing with the same issues as other young British men and women, have an extra layer of “issues”. These issues are not always necessarily about peer pressure. Mondal
discusses the choice of a young British Egyptian girl to start “going to bars and clubbing” during her first year at university:

I asked her if she had felt under pressure to conform to such a lifestyle, but she categorically denied it. ‘A lot of people think there’s peer pressure, but a lot of the time I think it’s yourself that pressurises you more... I remember completely wanting to do all these things and wanting to do them myself, for myself’ (2008, 15).

It is thus not only peer pressure that is the deciding factor for young people’s actions and values; they are fully capable of making decisions for themselves and find ways to live their lives as they see fit, though not always in full display and announced to the rest of the world (Mondal 2008, 14). In Mondal’s study, however, even informed choices were often part of a “negotiation of the conflicting demands, pressures and temptations of modern life” (2008, 17). With this in mind, I purposefully designed my study to avoid generalisations and allowing nuanced accounts of young migrant choice-making processes.

Building on bell hooks, Clifford (1994) argues that:

theories and discourses that diasporize or internationalize ‘minorities’ can deflect attention from long-standing, structured inequalities of class and race. It is as if the problem were multinationalism - issues of translation, education, and tolerance - rather than of economic exploitation and racism (313).

Hall (1990, 222) touches upon this when he talks about “cultural identity”; in his view, cultural identity is not an “accomplished fact” represented through cultural practices. Instead, it is a never-ending production constituted within
representation. Cultural identity is not a “shared culture” held in common among people with shared history and ancestry, and that one taps into to connect to stable cultural codes of “one people” (ibid.). Identities are subject to activities of history, culture and power, and are “the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (ibid.). In other words, cultural identities represent a *positioning* made within discourses of history and culture (Hall 1990, 226). Crucially, tactics and efforts to create a meaningful collective identity are due to having “no claims to territorial propriety or cultural centrality” (Chow 1993 in Ang 2012, 1). This take on identity replaces the search for “what we really are” with “what we have become” (Hall 1990, 225).

History and the reality of existing differences mean:

> [w]e cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about ‘one experience, one identity’, without acknowledging its other side – the ruptures and discontinuities (Hall 1990, 225).²

In Hall’s view, cultural identities are also constantly engaging in production and reproduction, “through transformation and difference” (1990, 235). Thus I was interested in looking at identity from the angle of change and repositioning, as a response to life events.

---

² The ruptures and discontinuities are unique for each community; Hall specifically discusses here the traumatic experiences of Afro-Caribbeans through forced displacement from Africa and the subsequent experiences of slavery and colonisation.
Mondal reports a comment from a researcher with the Islamic Foundation’s Policy Research Unit in the UK:

Well, being in the limelight, for example, in the media, you know? For a young person who’s already struggling to find themselves I think that’s an added pressure – how people perceive them. That’s quite an issue when you’re growing up and perhaps you’re a teenager or in your twenties and you’re trying to understand who you are as a person, and then when other people are sort of labelling you at the same time the pressure is increased much more (2008, 6-7).

Rahemtullah (2007, 2) argues that in Canada, “the politics of difference (however benignly understood) that characterizes multiculturalism in Canada requires that specific histories and experiences be erased in an attempt to produce an easily knowable difference.” Rahemtullah notes that while many immigrants, twice migrants included, are attracted to Canada because of the promise of a diversity that embraces ‘all’ customs and traditions, they are ultimately “expected to embrace a constructed identity that stems from fixed ideas in the mainstream discourse” (2009, 5). The politics of identity are thus “a logical offshoot of the decline of assimilationism and its illusory promise of equality on the basis of a strived-for but never achieved sameness” (Ang 2012, 11).

For migrants, economic success and social status previously depended largely on rapid adoption of and entrance into mainstream ways of life of host societies, but for migrants whose ties to their personal start location and birth countries remain strong and who have the resources to engage in personal and commercial travels ‘back home’, “success does not so much depend on abandoning
their culture and language to embrace those of another society as on preserving
their original cultural endowment, while adapting instrumentally to a second”
(Portes et al. 1999). As Ang highlights, however, even attempts to adopt
mainstream ways of being are not enough if one is racialised:³

Even the most Westernized non-Western subject can never become truly,
authentically Western. The traces of Asianness cannot be erased completely
from the Westernized Asian: we will always be ‘almost the same but not quite’, because we are ‘not white’ (Bhabha 1994, 89). As Bauman (1991,
105) remarks, “The acceptance of assimilation as a vision and as a
framework for a life strategy was tantamount to the recognition of the
extent hierarchy, its legitimacy, and above all its immutability’ (Ang 2012,
9).

Castles (1987, 99) describes the situation of migrants who were categorised as
merely ‘guest workers’ in West Germany: “They came as foreigners, they remain
foreigners after many years in West Germany, and their children are born as
foreigners.” In West Germany, until recently, children of migrants were not granted
citizenship even if they were born there; “they are treated as foreign by the country
of birth [West Germany] but are foreign, in all but name, in their parents’ country
of origin, too” (ibid.). Nationality is important not because citizens automatically
have equal rights and face no discrimination, but because the lack of “security of

³ A term that has had different denotations (and connotations) since its first
recorded usage in the 19th century, but which is used here following Miles, where
‘racialisation’ as a concept refers to “those instances where social relations
between people have been structured by the signification of human biological
characteristics in such a way as to define and construct differentiated social
collectivities. The concept therefore refers to a process of categorisation, a
residence, civil and political rights” means non-citizens cannot fully participate in the society in which they live (Castles 1987, 161). People who lack citizenship “do not have the opportunity of deciding to what extent they want to interact with the rest of the population, and to what extent they want to preserve their own culture and norms” (ibid.), though of course, interacting with the rest of the population can happen in tandem with both preserving and not preserving one’s ‘culture’. The issue of nationality was therefore one that was touched upon in my study.

Castles (1987, 90-99) in his table of ethnic minorities in West Germany, includes people from Finland, Italy, Ireland and Spain (among many others), but he points out that “some foreigners are more foreign than others,” and in the old West Germany, as well as elsewhere today, the line of foreignness begins and ends with skin colour and ethnic origins. Minority status and ethnic categorisation are assigned, not a given. Minorities do not automatically organise themselves as separate groups after settling due to some extraordinary communal connection and cohesion; “Becoming a minority is a process whereby dominant groups in society ascribe certain (real or imagined) characteristics to the newcomers, and use these to justify the assignment of specific economic, social and political tools” (Castles 1987, 96). According to Clifford (1994), “the masses of these new arrivals are kept in subordinate positions by established structures of racial exclusion,” and as such diaspora consciousness is composed of negative and positive experiences, the former arising from the experience of discrimination and exclusion. The hardship and economic challenges on top of that mean that some migrants may
instead foster transnational relationships and, according to Clifford, identities, whereby not everything is staked on “an increasingly risky future in a single nation” (1994, 311). Racism and exclusion can in turn encourage a “reactive ethnic formation”, whereby transnational relations provide avenues for the possibility to affirm ‘old’ identities (Popkin in Portes et al. 1999, 232). Migrants, and other groups in similar situations, thus become groups on two levels: they are envisioned as a homogenous group by the dominant societal groups, and they themselves react to the categorisation and discrimination experienced by forming bonds of solidarity. Hall uses the example of Martiniquais and Jamaicans who have ended up with different cultures and histories due to Martinique being part of the French Caribbean; yet they share a history of uprooting, slavery, transportation and “insertion into the plantation economy” and are thus unified across their differences to some extent (Hall 1990, 227). Relations of difference are also how some meanings and representations are derived; ‘meaning’ is dynamic and continuously encompasses additional meanings when faced with difference (Hall 1990, 229).

A question, then, in relation to twice migrants, is how experiences of othering may affect the process of group and individual identity formation, whether this othering process happens each time they migrate, and to what extent bonds of solidarity are formed between individuals and groups whose migratory trajectories and cultural backgrounds are not identical.
Particularly among youth, the experience of migration can lead to a “fluidity of constructed styles, social institutions and everyday practices”, sometimes described as “hybridity” or cultural negotiation (Vertovec 1999, 451). These “hybrid cultural phenomena” sometimes produce new ethnicities, especially as socialisation has occurred across cultural fields (ibid.). Likewise, Hall also emphasises the “hybridity, fluidity, creolization and syncretism” of diasporas (in Brubaker 2005, 6). Hall remarks that it is not essence or purity (of sameness) that define the diaspora experience, but the “recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of ‘identity’ which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity” (ibid.), similar to Vertovec’s hybrid social phenomenon. According to Brubaker, this signifies a tension on diaspora in the literature (that perhaps also exists in the lived reality on the ground), between boundary-maintenance and boundary-erosion. Ang, too, prefers hybridity, which she finds a more appropriate focus than “other key concepts in the contemporary politics of difference - such as diaspora and multiculturalism”, because hybridity “foregrounds complicated entanglement rather than identity, togetherness-in-difference rather than virtual apartheid” (Ang 2012, 3). In this entangled reality, individuals who have themselves migrated several times may be “especially well placed to analyse this complicated entanglement because it is embodied in her own life trajectory” (ibid.). In my research and analysis I looked for evidence of twice migrants expressing such ‘fluid’ or hybrid identities.
Summary Remarks on Identity and Belonging

Individuals, it is argued, can feel connected to groups, cities and sentiments without wanting to leave where they are, and are capable of juggling multiple attachments. The notion of space itself is different in a well-connected age, with people migrating multiple times. Likewise, groups are less homogenous than imagined, and people can connect across cultures and nations by relating to each others’ experiences. In addition, generational differences mean the younger generation may form different ways of being, based on their own experiences, without rejecting one or another ‘culture’. Being Othered and discriminated against, rather than being ‘caught between cultures’, are in part of how individuals come to feel alienated from the dominant population, and why they may form solidarity with others they feel are like themselves. Instead of identity being something to be assumed or worn, ready-made, identity is said to be always *becoming*, yet politics of difference and identity politics mean migrants’ identities are routinely judged and analysed by others based on chosen characteristics. It has been argued that hybridity is closer to the ways in which migrants navigate cultures and attachments. As such, I wanted my study to allow for nuances in belongings and choice-making processes to emerge. In addition, I became interested in issues of Othering, structural barriers (such as citizenship issues) to integration, and in looking for motivations for migrating several times.
2.3 Multiple, Onward and Twice Migration

In this section I explore the existing literature on multiple migration in general and twice migration specifically. We will see how the discussion above relates to twice migration, in that it may be that alternative theories of belonging and identity are needed to describe twice migrant experiences.

There is a growing body of literature on the continued migration of migrants, which has been highly valuable in adding to the existing literature on diverse migratory routes and experiences. However, the literature on multiple migration has usually been focused on ‘return’ migrants, who are often second-generation immigrants moving to their parents’ country of birth (Sreberny-Mohammadi 2013, 119). Twice migration itself has also been the subject of academic literature, usually under the name ‘onward migration’. Much of this literature focuses on individuals who after their first migration do not attain a relatively high income, and so choose to move to a second country to increase their financial prospects. And while the personal start locations tend to be poorer in economic terms than their final destinations, “richer countries tend to serve as intermediary countries” (Takenaka 2007).

Onward migrants have been said to migrate not due to a preference for living in the countries to which they move, but to improve their financial prospects (Nekby 2006, 199). Only refugee migrants are said to migrate due to reasons other than financial ones. Kelly's (2013) research into Iranian onward onward migrants
documents the multiple migrations of people who did not have much of a choice in their initial move, both in terms of leaving their country of birth because of persecution, and due to not having a choice as to which country they were going to move. There are also other studies that look into the onward migration of refugees or displaced people (Jeffery 2011; Takenaka 2007), or that, like Nekby’s, focus on labour/finance as the primary motive for migration, such as Aydemir (2006). Due to the highly different nature of migrations in this study compared to these above mentioned studies, and because the migrants who participated in my study more closely resemble those of Bhachu rather than those who have been the focus of Nekby, Jeffery, Takenaka and Aydemir, I will continue to use her term ‘twice migrant’ instead of ‘onward migrant’ as a term for the individuals who participated in this project.

My particular project concerns twice migrants and their particular sets of experiences. ‘Twice migration’ is when the act of migration has occurred more than once, although migrants may relocate more than twice. For example, a person can move from Iraq to Sweden. After a few years in Sweden, they have children, who grow up there; another act of migration takes place and the family moves to Canada – all the members of the family become twice migrants. Are twice migrants more likely to regard Canada as the place for permanent settlement, as opposed to ‘direct migrants’ who might regard their stay here as “transient” (Herbert, 2012, 299)? Bhachu (1991) notes that twice migrant Sikhs from East Africa in the UK were “lacking a crucial defining feature typical of the direct migrant, i.e. the myth of
return”. This might indicate that Canada is regarded as a new, permanent home. Even though the children often do not participate in the first migration, the findings of Ballard et al. (1994) show that children of migrants usually feel very connected to their parents’ ‘home’ country; for the purpose of this study, these individuals too shall be regarded as twice migrants. Given that many migrants and their children, perhaps particularly those who tend to be racialised, often do not feel welcome in the country of transition (the first country to which they migrated), it makes sense to respect the close ties children of migrants have to their personal start location. The one exception to the ‘twice migrant’ label is if the spouse of the twice migrant (parent) has not experienced migration or is not the child of a migrant themselves. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, if the lady from Iraq living in Sweden, married a Swede whose family had lived for so many generations in Sweden as to render them ‘just Swedish’ (meaning they could not identify any other attachments to places or people), that spouse would not be counted as a twice migrant upon arriving in Canada, although their children would. The person who was ‘just Swedish’ would be designated a ‘direct migrant’, instead. As an example to illustrate the frequent occurrence of twice migration, according to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service data from 2002, 12.5 percent of immigrants had lived in a country other than their birth country “immediately before coming to the United States” (Takenaka 2007).

A number of studies have emerged that focus on twice migrants in North America, and I will engage with the most relevant ones to the present project
below. They investigate East African Indian and Caribbean Indian twice migration, Chinese migrants from South Asia, and Greek-Canadian twice migration to the Unites States.

Dwyer (1994) traces the history of trade with and migration to East Africa from Gujarat in India. Although trade has been happening for at least two millennia between the two regions, it was only in more recent times that people of Gujarati origin began to settle in Africa. After the independence of East African nations in the 1960s and the process of ‘Africanisation’, East African Indians began to move elsewhere; those born in India before partition had a small window of time in which they could retain British citizenship and move to the United Kingdom (this right was eventually restricted after the 1968 Immigration Act) (ibid.). Among Gujarati twice migrants in Britain, it has been region, caste and sect rather than their residence in countries other than India which have served as the primary foundations for the creation of social networks (Dwyer 1994, 182). To be clear, Gujarati East Africans, Khojas (Gujarati Shia Muslims) in particular, have formed distinct communities for themselves, based on their common Gujarati-East-African origins, but these communities have clear ethno-religious borders, and so there is less of a ‘Gujarati East African’ community, as there are multiple such communities divided across religion, sect and sometimes caste, which in turn suggests multiple legal orders. This is because their modern settlement in East Africa was prolonged, and Indians from Gujarat had the opportunity to form what was largely separate ethno-religious cultural groups where they lived (Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania).
Much like other migrants today, Gujarati Indians saw East Africa not as a place for temporary sojourn, but as a new home, with opportunities and privileges that advantaged them compared to life in India.

Another somewhat similar group of twice migrants are the Indo-Guyanese, who, similar to Indians in East Africa, were brought in by the British in the late 19th century as workers (Chowthi 2009, 8). Although their labour contracts expired after 5 years, the Indians, whose numbers were close to or even over half a million, largely decided to stay in Guyana (ibid.), where they formed their own distinct social identities. Chowthi (2009, 19-24) describes how the identity of Indo-Guyanese went through a process of mild creolisation, whereby their customs and everything else was retained except language; reactive identity, through which a strong sense of Indian-ness against Creole identity was asserted after independence; ‘multiculturalism’, where diversity was nationally celebrated and attempts were made at fostering a ‘Guyanese’ (only) identity; and finally ‘hyphenation’, which today emerges as the common way Indo-Guyanese identity is expressed, as both Indian and Guyanese. Chowthi explains that hyphenated identities are “fluid, hybrid, and more tolerable in social life because they are not strong ethnic identities” (2009, 23). As we saw above, it is interesting to note that Ang, in contrast, argued for hybridity as an empowering way to deal with multiple belongings. After migrating to Canada and the United States, Indo-Guyanese and other Indo-Caribbeans have formed “dense transnational communities” in New York and Toronto in particular, with other Indo-Guyanese/Indo-Caribbean people
(Chowthi 2009, 29). Rahemtullah (2007) provides a thorough and necessary investigation into the history of Afro-Asian (such as Gujarati Kenyans) and Indo-Caribbean twice migration to Canada. Her study is centred on analysis of literature by Canadian East African Indian and Indo-Trinidadian authors, and provides a poignant critique of the limits of state multiculturalism when faced with the complexity of twice migration.

Kaur (2011) gives a detailed account of the history of the British colonial ‘Indenture System’, by which many Indians were sent to work in South East Asia, first as prisoners, and later as “routinely exploited” labourers. Her work does not focus on twice migrant experiences, but her analysis provides an excellent detailed view into the history of how colonisation of India and other countries plays a crucial role in early documentation of twice migration, and that of Sikhs in particular.

Rastogi (2009) analyses issues of identity formation apparent in the work of three twice migrant authors with ancestry from China, who moved to North America via India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, respectively. Rastogi traces the fragmented history of Chinese families in Pakistan, and how, instead of mythologising the ‘homeland’ (in this case China), the twice migrant author instead sees China as “remote” and inaccessible, not assuming “fantastic proportions”, but instead receding from memory and both individual and diasporic identity (2009, 39). The author, Tham, having lived in Pakistan with Chinese ancestry only, would present herself as Pakistani after moving to the United States, after having adopted
the food culture, dress, language and customs of Pakistan. This was met with surprise in the US, though Tham explains that in Pakistan, this would be the natural way for her to present herself, as hyphenated identities are not in use there, and everyone accepted her as Pakistani, and not, for example, Chinese-Pakistani - or ‘just’ Chinese (Rastogi 2009, 40). It is therefore somewhat ironic that it is in the United States “with all its celebration of plurality and diversity, where Tham’s assertion of a Pakistani identity is called into question” (ibid.). Ultimately, Tham’s Pakistani-hood is relegated to the background and to the past, when American ways of problematising and envisioning identity impose on her the urge to discover her ‘Chinese roots’ and assume a Chinese-American identity. This corroborates the critiques above that highlight how the politics of identity in Western countries problematise and negate migrant experiences and hybridities.

Rastogi (2009) also highlights the case of Lin-Rodrigo, Chinese “only in appearance”, whose “bi-racial” Tamil and Chinese origins meant she was marginalised in the small Sri Lankan village in which she lived both as someone with Chinese appearance, and as part Tamil. Interestingly, the cases of Tham and Lin-Rodrigo are both such that the twice migrants in question have very strong attachments to their transitional countries, and are so accustomed to the food, dress and languages of the respective nations that at first they find it hurtful and absurd to be seen as anything other than Pakistani or Sri Lankan, respectively, despite growing up being noticeably ‘different’. In contrast to Sikh migrants to South East Asia and Hindu, Muslim and Sikh Indian migrants to East Africa, Tham
and Lin-Rodrigo were not part of larger - or even small, but tight-knit - ethnic communities that continually informed them of and recreated a past identity and attachment. Likewise, Lin-Rodrigo in particular asserts her Sri Lankan heritage through her command of Sinhalese, despite not having the right to the citizenship of the country in which she was born.

Caravelis’ study (2007) on Greek Canadian migrants to Florida identifies several factors leading to the second migration of Greek-Canadians; it does not elaborate sufficiently on how these Greek-Canadians came to develop and negotiate their identities and subsequently their feelings about moving to different countries.

While once-migrants are often male ‘pioneers’ who settle abroad alone, to later establish their own families in their new country, twice migrants often migrate as complete families (Dwyer 1994, 183). Furthermore, twice migrants tend to be able to enter the United States and Canada on the basis of their skills and professions, as “skill-based migrants tend to be highly mobile geographically” (Takenaka 2007). While “not all onward migrants fit the same educational and occupational profile” (Kelly 2013, 27), education seems to be an important factor. This is partly due to “pro-skills immigration policies”, which countries with a high GDP purposefully put in place to attract those with “skills in certain labour fields” (Rizvi 2005, 176). Policies that prioritise and favour migrants in skilled and professional occupations are not the only way ‘developed’ countries may attract such migrants; international education policies indirectly facilitate the movement of skilled migrants (ibid.).
Summary Remarks on Twice Migrant Literature

Multiple migration, and twice migration in particular, is increasing for people with the resources to migrate a second time. Because studies on ‘onward’ migration and ‘twice’ migration have tended to highlight different motives for multiple migration, I suggest reserving the former term for those whose motives are mainly financial or related to labour. Examples of twice migrants in the literature include East African Indians, Indo-Caribbeans, Pakistani and Sri Lankan individuals with Chinese ancestry, Sikh Indians in South East Asia, and Greek Canadians. Past colonisation is key to understanding twice migration from certain regions and backgrounds. Formerly colonised peoples have migrated to the ‘West’ after first having established themselves for generations in places other than their birth country. The available data on twice migrants further highlights the limitations of the ‘homeland’ narrative, which is exacerbated in migrants’ lives by identity politics in the West. Despite growing in-depth scholarship into the phenomenon of twice migration, and despite issues of specific identities having been somewhat explored in the aforementioned studies, there is a noticeable gap in the literature concerning the legal navigation, and the related identity configurations, of twice migrants in general. This study attempts to fill some of the gap, by studying twice migration as a phenomenon on its own, exploring the plurality of routes, reasons and results of multiple migration.
2.4 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I engaged with a variety of approaches to migrants’ social and individual attachments and formations of sense of self, including theories that centre racialisation and being Othered in understanding how such formations and attachments come about. I have furthermore introduced the relevant literature on the phenomenon of twice migration, as well as the legal pluralist conceptualisation of law and how that relates to the study of twice migration and identity formation. Given the questions generated by reading the relevant literature, I will in the next chapter move on to a discussion of the appropriate methodological approaches to the study of twice migration and legal pluralism in light of the theoretical literature.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter I provided an overview of some of the key arguments in the larger discussion concerning migration and its effect on identity, belonging and law. The purpose of this project was to explore twice migrants’ experiences of articulating and approaching these aforementioned issues. Over the duration of four months in Summer and parts of Autumn 2014, I carried out an exploratory study in the Greater Toronto Area to inquire into the ways in which multiple migrations affect identity, belonging and legal pluralism, the latter as it plays out in everyday life. This was to gain a sense of important factors that encourage and inspire young twice migrants to make (new) choices and how they interact with the multiple values, resources and networks they have gained. In the following pages I will outline the “integrative methodological framework” (Saukko 2005, 343) employed to conduct the study, the context for the research setting, the characteristics of the research sample, and explain data collection and analysis methods, as well as address the validity, limitations and delimitations of the study.

3.1 Research Paradigm

As anyone who studies the social sciences is well aware, there are many approaches to research. The question relevant to this study was, what methodological challenges are there to legal pluralist research? The answer depends on what it is one is trying to do. One part of the answer comes from
deciding what kind of legal pluralism one is engaged with, and what the objective of the study is. Is it to “find” legal pluralism? Is it to find another definition of legal pluralism? Or is it to look for the various manifestations of diverging legal identities for multiple migrants? As is evident from the discussion above, my research fit the latter approach. If laws change and are piecemeal (Moore 1978), then a definition of law that has boundaries permeable enough to permit that was required. Likewise, a method that recognized and examined this permeability was needed. Della Porta and Keating (2008, 212-213) outline a simple, preliminary test for choosing a study method:

1) Is the method appropriate to the theoretical problem?
2) Is it relevant to what is being studied?

As a preliminary starting point, I evaluated qualitative and quantitative approaches to this particular research project. Peshkin (1998, 418) outlines the differences between qualitative and quantitative inquiries:

In quantitative inquiry, researchers tend to look hard, but seldom much more than once, as in the questionnaire or test performance of a given individual. In this fact is the trimness and orderliness that establishes the economy of this form of research. In qualitative inquiry, however, researchers tend to look again and again, and they look, moreover, in the varying moods and times of both researcher and researched.

Qualitative research thus is more appropriate when looking for meanings (Ezzy 2002, 81). A purely quantitative method that collects statistics on law and legal backgrounds was therefore insufficient and inappropriate for this study. Law is a complex phenomenon, and it is this complexity that we are trying to trace out and
understand as legal pluralists. Statistical data will certainly prove valuable at a certain point; numbers can help to provide some context to what is happening. Would we even speak of such a thing as “multiculturalism” if we didn’t already know that a significant number of the population are descendants of or are themselves born outside of Canada? Of course, such information could also be derived through interviews, but as will be discussed below, certain interview types are of a qualitative, rather quantitative, nature. Or rather, they are a result of a combination.

Most research, at least in the social sciences, does not, however, fall neatly into clear-cut categories such as ‘qualitative’ and ‘quantitative’, and is instead the result of a mix of both methodologies (Hammersley 1996, 160); the former engages in continued observation of its object/subject (Peshkin 1998, 418). In this particular instance of studying legal pluralism and identity construction, it was less relevant to back up arguments with a large number of data, since even small numbers of data gave insight to this phenomenon. In other words, what I looked for was an “observation of what people are actually doing” (Silverman 1993, 6). I attempted to trace instances, the emphasis being on just finding elements of legal pluralism existing ‘out there’.

3.2 Research Methodology

In accordance with interpretivist theory, I regarded participants as actors with a meaningful role, with my own role as the researcher becoming that of one
searching for meanings that motivate actions (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 24). The aim is to understand and interpret events by looking for “the meanings human beings attribute to their behaviour and the external world” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 26). As such, the theory was formulated after the research, though building on a basic theory of twice migrants engaging with questions of identity and belonging, which developed further during the research and after analysis of the cases (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 27). Similarly, I used a grounded theory approach where theory is “built up from observation”, though I recognise pre-existing theory as influential and as shaping our modes of inquiry (Ezzy, 2002, 12-13). Below I will outline the main approaches in research methodology from which I derived guidance, namely a) Actor-Network Theory's situated inquiry that emphasises connections; b) case-study based approaches; c) grounded theory; d) interpretivist techniques; e) ethnographic methods; and f) contemporary cultural studies.

Bruno Latour (2005, 3-5), critiquing the dominant approaches in social science, whereby common sense has come to view the “social” as “a specific type of causality”, argues for a concept of the social as not something that offers the explanation, but as something that we are trying to explain. He goes on to define the social as a “trail of associations between heterogeneous elements” (Latour 2005, 5). This is what forms the basis of his Actor-Network Theory (ANT) – the study of these associations into networks that connect movements. Similarly, in his *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) employed Ferdinand de Saussure’s
theory of looking at things in light of their relations. Although mainly discussing how historical analysis is made, the crux of Foucault’s argument was that nothing should be viewed in isolation; that is, one should not assume that events have only a single cause. Likewise, Silverman, also building on Saussure, warns against “searching for individual instances or examples” (2007, 71).

According to ANT, the social cannot remain a stable concept that is “used to explain a state of affairs” (Latour 2005, 10). Despite this, Latour (2005, 11) insists that ANT aims to *reassemble* the social, not to deconstruct it. Methodological considerations emerging from this must take into account that:

> it is no longer enough to limit actors to the role of informers offering cases of some well-known types. You have to grant them back the ability to make up their own theories of what the social is made of (Latour 2005, 11).

Similarly, Melissaris (2009, 9) is sceptical of research that is purely descriptive, as:

> [a]ll a sociologist aiming at description can do is observe and record regularities, which she will have already picked out by employing a pre-selected concept, which will already have some content.

Latour (2005, 22) argues that there are an infinite number of uncertainties resulting in an endless variety (or plurality). He distinguishes between different categories of uncertainties: groups, actions, objects and facts all have their internal plurality. There are many contradictory yet simultaneously existing types of identities in motion; actions may have their goals displaced by numerous agents; there are endless types of agencies in interaction; and there are continuous disputes surrounding facts. Similarly, John Law (2004, 3) speaks of the “situated
inquiry”, which addresses whether what someone thinks or knows makes sense in another location, and how.

With a few cases, one may collect a large number of characteristics; what is interesting is elaboration and explanation, not so much generalisation (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 207). Della Porta and Keating (ibid.) propose looking at a “complex set of relationships, which allows for causal complexity to be addressed.” This is because:

[w]hen focusing on individual cases... [the researcher] might aim at an understanding of a complex unit, by grasping the relations among its constituent parts... not looking for a causal explanation, but rather... an effort to understand the principles by which the parts consistently fit together (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 205).

A “case-based logic tends to explore diversity...by thick description of one or a small number of cases” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 207). Therefore, the merits of case studies outweighed those of quantitative approaches in this instance, since:

[t]he case-oriented strategy focuses upon a relatively small number of cases, analysed with attention to each case as an interpretable whole (Ragin 2000, 22), seeking to understand a complex unity rather than establish relationships between variables (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 204).

Case-oriented approaches allow for: “an in-depth knowledge of a small number of cases [providing] the basis for generalizations that are temporarily limited to the cases studied and whose wider relevance should be controlled through further research” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 206). While Della Porta & Keating look favourable upon case studies, Silverman and Latour stress elements that redefine
how a case study is done. With ANT, an attempt is made to: “allow the members of contemporary society to have as much leeway in defining themselves as that offered by ethnographers” (Latour 2005, 41). This does not mean, however, an absence of analysis. As Silverman suggests, there are many ways to look at a case study, and many ways of letting the data speak. Crucially, however, the enquirer should not: “in advance, and in the place of the actors, define [the] building blocks” (Latour 2005, 41). This does not imply that the researcher in any way has a ‘neutral’ viewpoint – quite the opposite. Silverman and Melissaris remind us that the researcher enters the research with their own preconceptions; the important thing is to let the process and subsequent analysis mould and reshape these conceptions, and to have the ultimate say. Both Silverman (2007), whose recommendations regarding methodology are outlined below, and Latour stress the importance of objects and how they may play a role in social relations.

A case study of legal pluralism on the ground should also be careful to not simply employ weak forms of qualitative methods. Silverman (2007, 37) warns that most research that aims to be qualitative, ends up forgetting to read and decipher, to listen and to look, and instead merely reports back verbatim what a small selection of interviewees decide to disclose. Silverman argues that such a method merely “manufactures” data to “answer a specified research problem” (2007, 37). Similarly, Latour urges the social scientist to: “trace connections between the controversies themselves rather than try to decide how to settle
Grounded theory attempts to build up theory “through careful observation of the social world”; in other words, theory is “built up from observation”, though it recognises pre-existing theory as influential and as shaping our modes of inquiry (Ezzy 2002, 12-13). Grounded theory refers only to: “studies in which data collection and data analysis are conducted concurrently alongside theoretical sampling” (ibid.). Furthermore, “emerging analysis guides the collection of further data” (Ezzy 2002, 87); through continuously analysing and interpreting the data as it was collected, I was able to modify my questions and approaches in the interviews. According to Charmaz (2005, 509), researchers applying grounded theory principles need to adopt grounded theory guidelines as “tools”, but avoid its “objectivist, positivist assumptions in its earlier formulations.” This means emphasising the phenomenon under study rather than the methods used to study it. She reiterates Silverman and Melissaris’ warnings that the researcher enters the field with their own interpretive framework, interests and life stories, and that the researcher must take into account the research context. The researcher contributes to “constructing what we define as data”, as the questions that are posed reflect what we ourselves know of it (Charmaz 2005, 509). Furthermore, the conceptual categories do not emanate from the data or from methodological practices, but instead arise through the researcher’s interpretation, and are: “interpretive renderings of a reality, not objective reportings of it” (Charmaz 2005, 510).
This conceptualisation of the role of the participant-actors and researcher is mirrored in the interpretivist tradition. The interpretivists see human beings as actors with a meaningful role, and the role of the scholar becomes that of “discovering the meanings that motivate their actions rather than relying on universal laws external to the actors” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 24). Positivists, meanwhile, insist on a method that is hypothetico-deductive, meaning one starts with a theory and “tests” the world to see if the hypotheses therein “survive the ordeal”, following a “logic of inference” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 26). The interpretive approach, however, which is qualitative, “aims at understanding events by discovering the meanings human beings attribute to their behaviour and the external world” (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 26). The order is flipped: the theory is often formulated after the research, perhaps building on a basic theory, which develops during the research and after analysis of the cases (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 27). Crucially, “[p]redictability is impossible since human beings change in time and space”; instead of looking for universal rules to explain concepts, people’s motives are instead interpreted (Della Porta & Keating 2008, 27).

Silverman’s ‘ethnography’ proposes looking at the mundane in extraordinary settings or for the extraordinary in mundane settings (2007, 27). Silverman (2007, 59) argues for an approach that also looks into “naturally occurring data” (though not completely dismissing quantitative or ‘weak qualitative’ methods). In the case of legal pluralism, interviewing actors about their
views on ‘law’ and the many ways in which participants think laws may occur could be problematic, given the tendency of many to view law in centralist ways. In addition, interviews may not be comfortable settings for someone to discuss such personal issues. To be more precise, then, having interviews as the only method of trying to map or locate law and legal pluralism is potentially problematic.

Miller and Fox (in Silverman 2007, 91) make a distinction between “discursively-oriented ethnographers” and “other qualitative researchers”; instead of the latter’s tendency to see everyday life as stable and set, the former’s “[d]iscursively focused research on social settings, on the other hand, emphasizes how social realities are always under construction”. Silverman concludes his remark on ethnographic practice recommending that research should: “treat ‘obvious’ actions, settings and events as potentially remarkable”; “recognize that talk, documents and other artefacts as well as interaction can offer revealing data”; and “seek to locate what precedes and follows any gobbet of data (look for ‘sequences’)”. As a result, a method that is only a recording of responses to predetermined interview questions is somewhat lacking. Silverman (2007, 71) argues that we must also conduct a “[t]horough analysis...[of] an extended sequence of interviewer-interviewee talk”. How do people envision their reality? Are multitudes of legal identities traceable through the way people respond to questions? Silverman maintains that we cannot answer the question of ‘why’ without first looking at: “interactional sequences (‘how’) in which participants’ meanings (‘what’) are deployed” (2007, 83). In short, ethnographic research should
aim to: “understand the context in which the parties generate their meanings and interactions” (Silverman 2007, 82). In doing this, Silverman warns, however, the researcher must be careful not to succumb to what he calls “Divine Orthodoxy”, whereby the researchers see themselves as always able to: “see through people’s claims and know better than they do” (2007, 88). Similarly, Melissaris (2009, 14) warns us of engaging in perpetuating an “expert culture”, whereby officials and legal philosophers inform the rest of us of the laws of others, effectively silencing: “those who can meaningfully speak of the law”. Legal theory should turn inwards on itself, and embrace pluralism, “by cancelling the distinction between observer and observed” (Melissaris 2009, 22).

While social researchers can no longer legitimately claim objectivity from their ivory-tower position, studies of culture are also moving beyond romanticised notions of being able to speak from the bottom up (Saukko 2005, 344-45). This is where methodologies like ANT come in, and research is viewed as cutting horizontally across - not below or above, creating a critical role for the researcher as well as connecting institutions, people and things to create a more integrated methodological framework (ibid.). One of the critical roles of cultural studies, after emerging as a paradigm in the 1970s, was in its “ability to take seriously a popular, often ignored practice... trying to understand its significance from the point of view of the people involved as well as against the backdrop of wider social context” (Saukko 2005, 345). The problem with this methodology is that it risks using micro-scale and local - however significant - experiences as “props for social
theories”, in line with other modern attempts to “excavate” hidden layers of reality (e.g. the Freudian unconscious, the Marxist model of superstructure and “genes as the blueprint for life”) (Saukko 2005, 345-46). Saukko recommends instead that one juxtaposes social processes more horizontally, to highlight interactions and interruptions, without privileging one process over another.

What does this suggest for the legal pluralist research? Dealing with the first point of Silverman’s conclusion, in addition to ‘open-ended interviews’, my research benefited from analysing what is taken for granted as I examined legal mechanisms. The pressures of navigating legal fields and mechanisms were expressed in ordinary situations that are sometimes taken for granted. Latour (2005, 22) warns against taking for granted “new associations” by viewing them as conventionally societal. Choices like how to interact with co-workers, how to plan for a future ‘career’, and whether to live alone or with friends or family may display such struggles. Taking into account Silverman’s second recommendation, I chose to investigate legal navigations occurring in or evident through ordinary life; identity construction - including of the legal kind - was traceable in decisions that involved seemingly mundane things such as which neighbourhood to live in and what criteria are used to choose which university one attends. A final question was how do public debates and state policy influence how navigating legal identity plays out? Is there a historical context for why a certain choice was made instead of another one? Legal pluralism and the construction of belonging, then, can be
identified in a vast variety of ways. Including and incorporating context helped to avoid generalisations of the workings of legal pluralism and identity construction.

For this research project I thus used a variety of qualitative approaches to examine how twice migrants experience navigating legal, social and personal identities in Canadian society. Adopting the interpretivist approach that regards individuals as meaningful actors, I traced the various connections in the lives of these migrants that formed their repertoire of laws and informed their navigation through identities and belongings. While borrowing from a range of qualitative methodological approaches, I focused less on the methods, of, for example, ANT and grounded theory, and more on the desired outcomes and approaches, and their overarching principles and objectives. I found that the coding practices of grounded theory were particularly helpful in developing a theory and becoming familiar with the data, while the other methods guided my perspective on how to view the data.

### 3.3 Research Setting

According to statistics collected during the 2011 Census/National Household Survey (NHS) in Canada, one third of immigrants in Toronto city (note that this is a considerably smaller area than the entirety of the GTA) are newcomers, meaning they moved to Canada within 10 years of the Census/NHS, and between 39% and 51% of residents in the Greater Toronto Area were born outside of Canada (City of Toronto, 2013). According to the 2011 NHS, immigrants - defined for the purpose
of the Census and NHS as “a person who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by immigration authorities” - make up 21% of the total population of Canada. The Census/NHS does not take into account multiple migrations prior to arriving in Canada. The Greater Toronto Area (GTA) was thus chosen as the general site for this project due to its high number of established and more recent immigrants, making it likely for there to be a twice migrant presence there. In Toronto, “distance from the city centre has no appreciable effect on the proportion of recent immigrants, except in neighbourhoods that are 25 kilometres or more from the city centre,” (Turcotte 2008, 8; emphasis added), and so although I did not seek only participants who were recent immigrants, this was partly the reason why the GTA was selected, as areas beyond the GTA are necessarily even farther away from the city centre and thus have fewer recent migrants.

3.4 Research Sample and Data Sources

For this study, purposive sampling in the form of snowball sampling was used. I looked for university students over the age of 19 who were twice migrants. Prior to the study I had secured a twice migrant informant outside of the Greater Toronto Area, who did not partake in the project as a participant. The informant established initial contact between myself and some participants, and referrals led to contact with more people in the wider social network of the twice migrants in question. In the weeks before commencing my data collection, I also targeted universities in the Greater Toronto Area, approaching student clubs and attending events where twice
migrants could be found. These were contacted via email to ask for permission to attend with the purpose of finding possible participants. One of the participants was located in this way, through an event aimed primarily at young Muslims. The most likely reason outreach to student clubs was largely unsuccessful, was because the data collection happened during the summer, when most of these social groups are inactive. I did not look for a representative sample, as it was not within the scope of this study to offer a representative case, and the primary purpose was to establish contact with any young twice migrants available.

My initial plan was to include two - one male and one female - individuals who had migrated only once, to compare findings and to aid in evaluating whether twice migrants are a different case from ‘once migrants’. Although several attempts were made to approach once migrants for the study, the limited time and resources led to all the participants being twice migrants. I believe that the data, however, even given the small sample size, provides enough material to suggest that twice migrants deal with additional (albeit also sometimes corresponding) sets of challenges throughout their lives compared to once migrants, and so I do not believe the lack of once migrants was a great detriment to this particular study.

There were six participants in this study; all were between 21 and 25 years of age. Half were male and half female, with four having their personal start location (PSL) in Pakistan. One had India as their personal start location while another had Egypt as hers. The majority had arrived in Canada between the age of 10 and 20, with none being born in Canada. Four participants had spent
considerable time in Saudi Arabia, while one grew up in Kuwait. Only one individual was born in a transitional country (TC), with the rest being born in their personal start location. Initially, I aimed to have up to five individuals participating, but when opportunity presented itself, a sixth was included close to the end of the data collection period, to strengthen the data and to add another set of experiences to complement and supplement what had already been collected. Although this did serve to even the sample, and much benefit was derived in terms of data, I did have much less time with this particular participant due to meeting them later in the collection phase. All names have been changed to preserve participants’ anonymity.

All of the participants had recent university experience, with all but Shireen still being university students at the time of the interviews. While three of the participants had more than one transitional country of settlement before coming to Canada, none had more than one personal start location (i.e. none came from mixed-background families). Half of the participants had lived in four countries in total.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Kuwait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. An overview of the key characteristics of the participants.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of countries lived in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawud</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyla</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahnaz</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtaza</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shireen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of countries lived. Total number, including Canada.

Informed consent was obtained from all of the participants prior to commencing interviews, in compliance with Chapter 3 of the Tri-Council Policy.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

I conducted over 12 hours of face-to-face interviews, all of which were audio recorded and transcribed and analysed using open, axial and selective coding processes in line with grounded theory practices (Ezzy 2002, 88-93). Interviews were generally between one and two hours long, though one interview lasted almost four hours, and three of the participants were interviewed twice during the period when data was collected. Although I had hoped to interview all the
participants at least twice, not all were available throughout the data collection period, and some had already left the GTA near the end of that time.

Asking someone to talk about their identity is asking them to bare things that are at the centre of their own understanding of themselves, and this is not something one is wont to do with a complete stranger. The participants, however, often obliged by directly addressing questions of identity, or otherwise offered glimpses of themselves in casual encounters, and sometimes inadvertently engaged in discussions that displayed aspects of their identity navigation. Interviews with participants encouraged the individuals to tell their life stories, and allowed them to focus in on and bring up topics they personally felt were prominent. This gave rise to varying degrees of effectiveness, and so the focus was later shifted to accommodate for the different extents of reflection the twice migrants had done on their life so far. To stimulate the conversation, questions were posed to the actors about their life and experiences and their thoughts on belonging, making the interviews “semi-structured [and] topical” (Maghbouleh 2012, 80) when participants became unsure of what to discuss next. With some participants, occasional conversational probing (Whyte 1955, 279) was sufficient to elicit lengthy narratives, explanations and discussion on twice migration, though in other cases I had to ask more open-ended questions in order to encourage the individuals to continue the conversation. The audio recording of my interview with Dawud was lost, and so I had to rely on my notes to create a transcript of the session.
During my initial exploratory phase I discovered something I had long suspected: interviews are not enough to get the full picture and participant observation greatly enhances data collection. However, I had severe time and resource constraints, and could not incorporate even some level of participant observation, though I made an effort to keep interviews informal. Whyte (1955, 289) explains how, when researching for his *Street Corner Society*, his initial structured plans on how to map social structure through asking a series of questions never actually happened, as he “examine[d] social structure directly through observing people in action”. Whyte emphasises the importance of “observing people in action and getting down a detailed report of actual behaviour completely divorced from moral judgments” (1955, 287). Likewise, Colic-Peisker (2004, 88), reflecting on the awkward formality of the research setting, recalls that:

My favourite migrant story was recorded across a table full of homemade sweets and through expressive body language and tears of a woman who only felt comfortable when all the physical traces of ‘research’ (tape recorders, papers, consent forms) were removed from sight.

Maghbouleh (2012, 80) notes, and Whyte (1955, 303) makes a similar suggestion elsewhere, that “[h]anging out’, while methodologically and taxonomically frustrating, is where important, generative intellectual work happens between research participants and researchers”. I found that casual conversation that did not conform to the typical interview structure facilitated more engaged discussions. Therefore, following Pelto (2013, 163-164) and Spradley (1979, 58), I attempted to conduct the interview more like a friendly
conversation than a questioning. I enhanced the friendly conversation by: “slowly [introducing] new elements to assist informants to respond as informants” (Spradley 1979, 58). Since I am, like the participants, a social animal, I used conversational probing and expressed my genuine personal interest in hearing the twice migrants’ stories, to facilitate getting to the heart of their identity navigation. I also stated clearly to the participants what my research is investigating, in order to facilitate fruitful conversation. However, I was careful not to lead the interviewees, and avoided giving accounts of my own experiences and past except where prompted by the interviewees.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

Analysis, according to Geertz (2001, 60), “is sorting out the structures of signification... and determining their social ground and import.” The researcher is dealing with a “multiplicity of complex conceptual structures” (ibid.). Ezzy notes that: “[q]ualitative data analysis is an interpretive task. Interpretations are not found – rather they are made, actively constructed through social processes”, and so data collection and data analysis cannot be easily separated (2002, 73).

Following the methodologies I relied upon for this project, data analysis started with data collection, as data collection is in itself a process of interpretation (Ezzy 2002, 78).

Data were analysed for emerging themes and concepts, as well as issues, as soon as data gathering began, in line with what both Pelto (2013, 201) and Ezzy
(2002, 60) recommend for ethnographic and qualitative data. This preliminary analysis consisted of some mapping, preliminary descriptions, lists of types of people, and ongoing political and economic developments (Pelto 2013, 201). I also kept a journal to review the research progress, checked interpretations and strategies with participants, and conducted some early coding and transcribing (Ezzy 2002, 65). This “interpenetration” of data collection and analysis is consistent with grounded theory and ANT, as it includes participation of the respondents and is in line with flexible research strategies (Ezzy 2002, 64).

My aim was to: “understand the context in which the parties generate their meanings and interactions” (Silverman 2007, 82), the parties being not just the participants, but also myself as the researcher. I tried to avoid “Divine Orthodoxy”, (Silverman 2007, 88). Social realities are constantly under construction, and so I attempted to “treat ‘obvious’ actions, settings and events as potentially remarkable” (Silverman 2007, 91), though in reality this applied more to the interview setting and events, as there was no participant observation involved in the study.

Early transcription and coding of interviews, allowed for reflection and reconsideration of the techniques used, and also allowed my conceptualisation of the material to mature over time, and for a “more sophisticated theoretical model and [an] evolving theoretical scheme” to emerge (Ezzy 2002, 71). Through coding, data can be fragmented and rearranged: “to produce a new understanding that explores similarities, and differences, across a number of different cases” (Ezzy
2002, 94). Coding allows analysis to emerge as more structured and organised, and: “allows the researcher to move beyond pre-existing theory to ‘hear’ new interpretations and understandings present in the data” (ibid.). Qualitative coding creates categories from the interpretations that are made of the data (Ezzy 2002, 123).

Following Ezzy (2002, 86-123) I used coding to disassemble and reassemble the data to identify concepts and themes and link these to emerging theories about the twice migrant engagement with law in the development of identity. Coding helped me explore similarities and differences in a number of cases and to create categories meaningful to my informants, and formed part of my thematic analysis. Thematic analysis: “aims to identify themes within the data” (Ezzy 2002, 87-88).

Constant comparison (Ezzy 2002, 90) is one of the key methods of grounded theory, and is facilitated by open coding, or the “naming and categorizing of phenomena through close examination of data” (Strauss and Corbin 1990, in Ezzy 2002, 88). In open coding, all written data – field notes and transcripts – are conceptualised, line by line. I followed the open coding process with axial coding, relating the concepts from the open coding process to each other and finally to major themes (Ezzy 2002, 91). Finally, I employed selective or theoretical coding to identify: “the core category or story around which the analysis focuses” (Ezzy 2002, 92). The NVivo qualitative data analysis software was used to organise, manage and analyse the data, since this is software I had become familiar with through assisting with coding on a different research project.
For my research, I also borrowed aspects of narrative analysis, as it:

“identifies the broader interpretive framework that people utilise to turn meaningless events into meaningful episodes” (Ezzy 2002, 95). For the purpose of this study, narrative analysis aims to bring out the big picture of the participant, to understand how they understand experiences in their lives (Schutt 2006, 339). This is particularly interesting in light of the complexity of twice migrant experiences. Narrative analysis examines how people describe events, their consequences and their aftermath (Ezzy 2002, 96). This method of getting at and inquiring about the data proved valuable to the study of twice migrants as it focused on their descriptions of experiences. It allowed for a comparative analysis and the focus permitted reflection and consideration of emotions and understandings. Bell (in Ezzy 2002, 99) argues that narrative analysis provides a “particularly strong way of addressing” the question of how interviewees understand and articulate agency, power, resistance, and what constitutes as knowledge. Narrative analysis also: “explicitly addresses the role of the interviewer in the construction of interview responses” (Ezzy 2002, 99).

3.7 Responsibility and Positionality

Some remarks about my position as researcher in this study and the process of establishing credibility are due. My own “identity markers” (Maghbouleh 2012, 86)

4 This title was paraphrased from Maghbouleh’s (2012) own reflections on this topic in her PhD dissertation.
- being visibly Other in a Western context, ‘brown’, noticeably Muslim, as well as my being a twice migrant (the last two were known to some of the participants prior to interview sessions, and sometimes after concluding the interviews, depending on circumstance) - have impacted my ability to pursue and carry out this research project. I had access to a range of resources and people, including my informants, by virtue of my own characteristics and networks. Having previous knowledge of the areas people come from or of their rituals (daily or otherwise) and using that in conversation is one way to show people they are more than mere objects in a study, and that you value them as full human beings with complex histories and attachments. I was thus able to use my extensive familiarity with migrant and immigrant life and experiences, as well as my relative acquaintance with South Asian cultures in particular to establish rapport with the individuals who were interviewed. Several of the participants in this study would ask/state “you know what I mean, right?” (or other similar formulations) when discussing aspects of twice migration, cultural attachments, or being ‘brown’, and so on. They would also usually automatically assume (correctly) that I was familiar with the terminology of Muslims and/or South Asian peoples, and so would use jargon without explaining their meaning.

All of this could have influenced responses and interpretations. According to Maghbouleh (2012, 86):

A good deal of ethnographic ink has been spilled over insider/outside dynamics in research, and in particular, “racial matching” between interviewers and interviewees (Merton 1972; Baca Zinn 1979; Hurtado
Qualitative sociologists have yet to come to a consensus on how racial matching enhances or hinders the quality of data collected.

To avoid my own biases overshadowing the data, I received some feedback from participants by discussing and checking interpretations of the data with them, primarily in the early stages of the study. Although participant feedback has "emancipatory political implications for the research process" (Ezzy 2002, 68), and would be particularly helpful for this study given that this research is intended as an exploratory study, only two participants were interested in reading through and discussing the analysis of the data. I benefited from their comments, which have been included in Chapter 5. In an aim to further encourage the centrality of the participant in the analysis, I used "low-inference descriptors" when analysing, which are "descriptions phrased closely to participants’ own account" (Maghbouleh 2012, 84).

### 3.8 Limitations and Delimitations

In planning the data collection process, I limited the scope of the study to only university students or very recent graduates. Although I was open to including older twice migrants if the opportunity presented itself, the contacts I was able to establish in the short time the research was conducted were all in the same age group. The hope was that there would be twice migrants who had transitioned through Europe and/or Oceania, or another combination, as well. The limited time and access to twice migrants in the GTA meant I was also not able to locate twice
migrants with other backgrounds than the ones presented in the study - there are many different twice migrants, and not all have backgrounds and experiences in Africa or Asia.

Several external conditions worked to constrain the scope of the study. In the planning phase I had hoped to include participant observation to collect data outside of the interview setting, but time constraints did not allow for this. The short time I had to conduct data collection and the scale of the Greater Toronto Area meant it was a challenge to locate a more diverse group of twice migrants when I had few contacts in and relatively limited knowledge of the place. The data collection process occurred during the summer when most people are busy and hard to track down, and all the student clubs and organisations were on holiday as well and did not have events until near the end of the time that was allotted to conduct interviews. Since the majority of the participants were Muslim and the month of Ramadhan - in which Muslims fast from dawn till dusk and participate in devotional activities - occurred in the middle of the period when research was conducted, an entire month was virtually free of contact with the twice migrants, apart from the interviews with Ahmad, who was not participating in the Ramadhan activities.

The data presented in this study is not presented as representative, of course, but provides insight and evidence into a topic that has not yet been fully explored.
3.9 Chapter Summary

In this chapter I outlined how an integrative methodological framework that borrowed from Actor-Network Theory, interpretivist and ethnographic methods, grounded theory and cultural studies was employed to conduct the study. The small sample size allowed for insight into the experiences of some young twice migrants living in the Greater Toronto Area. Long, semi-structured interviews and life stories formed the data. I also elaborated on methods of analysis, and addressed issues of validity and limitations of the study. In the next chapter I will move on to thematically present transcripts from 9 interviews conducted with six twice migrants between June and September in 2014.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

In this chapter I will organise and report the main findings from the transcripts of nine interviews conducted between June and September in 2014. The organisation and analysis involved multiple stages of coding, by hand and using the Nvivo qualitative data analysis software, through which several themes emerged. Specifically, five overarching themes emerged from the interviews, including: 1) super-diversity, or how twice migrant experiences and attitudes vary based on distinct backgrounds and affiliations; 2) how quickly twice migrants become used to new practices and settings; 3) the complex relationships twice migrants have with the people and places where they have lived; 4) how twice migrants actively pursue understanding and derive meaning from their beliefs; 5) feelings that arise from being othered and discriminated against and how these contribute to twice migrants’ reluctance to live in certain countries, or to belonging.

4.1 “Nothing is Easy in Explaining Where I'm From”: Super-diversity

In this section I will highlight some of the aspects that interviewees themselves highlighted that provided insight into the specificity and super-diversity of their backgrounds, including migratory trajectory, religion, language, and ethnicity. Although four of the participants in this study (Ahmad, Dawud, Mahnaz and Murtaza) had Pakistan as their personal start location, and all had lived in one or more of the GCC countries, their backgrounds and experiences were by no means
identical. Dawud, for example, is the only one of the participants in this study who is a member of a minority group of Muslims that belong to the religious movement Ahmadiyyah. Dawud elaborates on a difference between “mainstream” and Ahmadiyyah Islam:

The difference between Ahmadiyya and mainstream Islam is that mainstream Muslims believe that the khilaf is Isa [Jesus], and that he will be reincarnated. Ahmadis believe Isa is completely dead, but that the khilafah will have the qualities of Isa. Jesus was a reformer. The khilafah will be a reformer of Islam. We believe that the khilafah has come. Regular Muslims believe that Jesus will come. You wouldn't be able to tell from physical, outward practice that someone's Ahmadi.

Ahmadi Muslims' status as ‘Muslims’ is sometimes disputed by orthodox Muslim theologians or lay people. They face severe persecution in Pakistan, but not in Kuwait where Dawud lived before moving to Canada:

Ahmadiyyah is a bit different than Sunni Islam. I did not have to hide that I'm Ahmadi in Kuwait. Mostly Pakistanis and Indians care about whether or not you’re Ahmadi; Arabs don’t pay much attention to that... The stuff they taught us in school [in Kuwait] about Islam was mostly based on Sunni interpretations... I would sometimes question what we were taught in school. Some of the teachings we learned in school were different from the Ahmadiyyah interpretations. It didn’t make much difference. In Pakistan you have to hide it if you're Ahmadi. There are many Ahmadi people in Kuwait.

---

5 Dawud is referring to the concept of a messiah.
6 Misnomer. The overwhelming majority of Muslims do not believe in reincarnation.
7 This refers to the Ahmadiyyah belief that Jesus will have a successor, khalifah al-Masih.
8 Dawud, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 31 July 2014. Transcript based on notes.
Languages were one way in which twice migrants actors specified and distinguished themselves as being ‘atypical’. In addition to being Ahmadi, unlike the other participants, Dawud also specified the distinct area in Pakistan his family was from, and their ethnic origin:

I speak Urdu and Saraiki with my mother. Saraiki is not so similar to Urdu, and is spoken a lot quicker than Urdu. Punjabi speakers understand Saraiki and vice versa. It’s from the Baluchistan area... My background is Balochi, from [a village in the Punjab region].

In the case of Shireen, as well, specificity is brought up. Shireen, who was born in Kenya but whose personal start location is India, belongs, like Dawud, to a particular minority ethnic group:

It’s this tiny little town in Gujarat called Kutch, so it’s like nothing, nothing is easy in explaining where I’m from, ’cause even though my ancestors were from India, it’s even complicated to explain how they got there. Some people say they were Turkish before and had migrated to Gujarat, and then they migrated to East Africa. Some people say we don’t know where they came from, it was just always Kutch, it was always Gujarat. And so it’s also a mix of the unknown, and not having that history down on paper. But it’s just not a common family tree, to be honest. So I’m Memon. So when I said I was from Kutch, there’s a lot of Memons in Kutch, but there’s also a different, it’s like your sect, the caste you’re from. And then that gets a lot more niche, too. So I’m a certain type of Memon. So there’s like Pakistani Memon, I’m Kutch Memon, there’s all these different Memons.

9 Dawud, 31 July 2014.
10 Shireen, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 10 September 2014.
Furthermore, because the majority of Kutchi speaking (or otherwise) people from Gujarat who migrated to East Africa are either Twelver or Ismaili Shi’a Muslims, people who met Shireen for the first time who would know something about Indians in East Africa always assumed she was Shi’a.

So when I got to university, you guess people were a little more up to speed on the fact that you don’t have to look like what the country represents in everyone’s minds, so even though we had come so far in terms of people understanding that you could be from East Africa and have Indian origin, everyone would automatically assume “oh are you Shi’a? Are you Ismaili?” and it’s like, “no, I’m not!”, and it’s, you know...\(^\text{11}\)

Murtaza tells me, when prompted, where he is from in Pakistan, but also gives an unsolicited comment much later in the interview regarding visiting the United Kingdom and meeting people who were from the same region in Pakistan as his family:

I was born in Azad Kashmir... There’s a lot of people there [in the UK] from my area, Azad Kashmir.\(^\text{12}\)

This specificity is again emphasised by Mahnaz. She was born in Karachi, and talks about her fiancé, who was also born in Pakistan, and who like her grew up in Saudi Arabia (he also later lived in Malaysia at the same time as her):

\(^{11}\) Ibid.
\(^{12}\) Murtaza, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 27 August 2014.
Everything [is the] same. But he’s from Lahore... Lahore is usually Punjabis. Punjabi’s a different language, and Urdu is a different language. But when Punjabis speak in Urdu, their accent is different. It’s a Punjabi accent.\textsuperscript{13}

Although she notes later that they speak English and Urdu with each other, she has highlighted that despite their similar migratory trajectory, the two do not share an identical history or culture. Similarly, we see that although the families of Mahnaz’s fiancé and Dawud are both from the Pakistani province of Punjab, there are some cultural and linguistic differences, though both know Urdu.

Ahmad, who moved back and forth between two Arab Gulf countries, Canada and Pakistan, has lived in Pakistan for almost as long as he has lived in Canada, nearly a decade. However, because his family moved several times, he was placed with other ‘international’ students at school:

> All the people in our class were people who had moved from other countries. So it was all of like international-ish students, so people who had moved from Pakistan to somewhere else and come back. And it was pretty chaotic, I guess, compared to other classes.\textsuperscript{14}

As we will see later, this background information sometimes plays a role in the subjects that are discussed in the interviews.

\\textsuperscript{13} Mahnaz, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 27 June 2014.
\textsuperscript{14} Ahmad, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 30 June 2014.
4.2 “I Got Used to it Pretty Soon”: Twice Migrant Reactions to New Settings

In various different contexts, the twice migrants in this study discussed situations where a change in location – i.e. a migration – would expose them to a new way of being or thinking, including changes of religious practice such as dress, prayer, drinking and dating. At times this would prompt a reaction, though sometimes the participants reported not adjusting their own lifestyles.

Leyla, whose family had moved from Egypt to Saudi Arabia, later moved on her own to live with her aunt in the United States for a year. She attended community college while she lived there. She explains how her dress changed, and how the nature of the social environment also impacted on? the activities in which she would take part:

I [first] wore my hijab for elementary school, when I was 12 years old. I took it off my first year of uni, when I went to [the US]. So even when I was in my hijab, I told you, I was gothic, I was playing a guitar. Hijabi girls don’t do that stuff, really. But it was nice, because I was very jolly, and all my friends were guys, actually, I had limited girl friends. But I had my limits, obviously, ‘cause I was like hijabi, and I was religious, but in the same time, I was not like cultural “ok, I’m hijabi, I have to stay home”, I was out there doing things, participating in different organisations in school, we call it clubs... Well, for my dad’s side [taking the hijab off] was like a safety reason. [The US] is very different from Canada... You know about MSA, right? The Muslim [Student] Association here, in school. We had one in my school in [the US], where there were a lot of Pakistanis and like Muslims cultures. And the thing is, here we deal with the politics in a different way. Even there, I wanted to be part of the Muslim Association, but my aunt told me not to. And then I was very upset, and I go on Facebook and I understand why my aunt told me that. It was because they post pictures of them burning Israeli flags on the street and things like that. And I support an opinion, but I don’t go extreme like that, and if I become a part of a club like that, people might think I’m a part of it. So that’s the exact thing my dad thought about the hijab, because of how people have a certain thought of Muslims, they might...
generalise and make you a part of it if you wear it. And part of that, I was by myself, he was leaving me, right, with my aunt, and he was worried. It was my first time away from my parents. So he didn’t want to risk it with anything. He did not want me to be in the category of Muslims, where people can think I am an activist. So that, for safety reasons. Because, these things don’t happen in Canada, Canada is totally different, but in the States, it’s everywhere. So that was one thing, but my things was, I wasn’t really wanting the hijab that much, and I was moving into a different place, and I told you I change my outfits a lot, like my style. So that was one thing. I think I just wanted like a different experience.\textsuperscript{15}

Leyla mentions already ‘being different’ than the ‘typical hijabi type’ that she was used to in Saudi Arabia, and says fear of being associated with “extreme” Muslims was another reason why she and her family decided she was not going to wear a headscarf in the United States. While she considered starting to wear a headscarf again later on, she ultimately decided against it:

I: And do you think you would wear it again in Canada?
L: I really wanted to, the whole time after I took it off. I enjoyed it [not wearing hijab] a little bit, because I was like so excited, [when] I took it off. But when school started and I started seeing a little bit of hijabi girls, and I went praying once in the MSA without even seeing that video on Facebook, and I was like “oh, I’m loving it, I just wanna keep it on”. But I don’t know, right now I feel like there are more important things than the hijab. Especially that I’m married right now, I don’t really do anything wrong. So you always feel like you wanna do hijab if you, that it will help you become a better person. But I don’t think hijab will make me a better person, ‘cause – it probably would, but to me I feel like I’m already married, I’m settled, my husband’s very protective over what I wear, as well. So, half-sleeves is my limit ((chuckles)). And knees can’t be shown or anything, so he’s very protective in that sense. So I don’t really... And I don’t go clubbing or anything, I don’t go parties, so I’m becoming

\textsuperscript{15}Leyla, interviewed by the author, Greater Toronto Area, Ontario, 11 August 2014.
more of a family person. I don’t think a hijab is gonna make me more religious. And especially, I’ll tell you something. In high school - the reason I would say the hijab benefited me, was because when you wear hijab, people know how to treat you, even in university. I wasn’t wearing hijab in university, right, so I was treated differently from high school. In high school, people in my class, like guys and girls, they used to like hug and kiss on the cheek, and that’s how they said hi. Just like here, guys and girls hug, right? So when I was there, people knew their limits, just by my hijab, but when I came here at university people just wouldn’t know, and people would just hug you! You would put your hand out, and they’d be like, “hey, hug!”, and you’d be like “ok...” I’m not gonna embarrass them [by rejecting their hug], you know, I was just awkward myself. So I would say in that sense hijab makes you known for what you can do and what you’re not going to do. People know how to treat you, how to talk to you, what topics to talk in front of you about. Without the hijab, people don’t know who you are.\(^{16}\)

Therefore, although she believes the general social environment in Canada is more open, and she could wear a headscarf without being judged the same way she felt she would be in the United States, by this point she has moved on from it being a central concern in her life, as circumstances have changed.

In addition to not participating in MSA activities in the US because the particular MSA at her college was “extreme”, Leyla’s participation in political activities in general dwindled when she moved to Canada. At first when Leyla came to Canada, she and her father attended political rallies that called for the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak. However, she no longer participates in political activities, and

\(^{16}\) Leyla, 11 August 2014.
notes that she is fearful of the consequences of being outspoken about her political views.

From the political side, even on Facebook, you keep, these days especially, you keep getting those events, protesting for Palestine, and everything right now. But I don’t want anything to affect my future plans, you know, I don’t wanna take a risk. I don’t know if whatever I will do will even matter... We are protesting, but who cares? ...If someone is controlling a company or industry the economy is depending on, then people would listen to them. But obviously these people are gonna end up killed in the end. Or jailed or put in Guantanamo Bay or whatever ((laughs)). Yeah, people who stand up for the right things or their opinion in that sense, they always end up killed. Or assassinated in that sense. It is kind of sad, but yeah. I’ll tell you something that’s been really scarying me. I also have this thing if I want to be part of this Palestinian [protesting] thing, because I have my opinion, too, right? But then I’m applying for my visiting visa for the States. I wanna go to Florida and visit there, I’ve never been to Florida... And I have my, what is it called, appointment, to go and talk. My interview... I know that if I post something [on Facebook] and they don’t like it, they’re gonna reject me. For just me posting something. And what is the post gonna do?

Murtaza, who is currently “a practising Muslim”, talked about being “very religious in Saudi, too,” and was and is praying five times a day. However, his practice of praying was discontinued for a while after he moved to Canada. In Murtazas words, he:

kinda didn’t pray for a while, probably a couple of months, but then I got back into the rhythm. Ever since then, I pray [regularly]... Pretty much [it was that I had] just moved... and I just wanted to understand it more than

17 Ibid.
18 Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
like [just] follow it. ‘Cause my parents didn’t really force it on me, it’s just my choice.\textsuperscript{19}

In Dawud’s case, meeting other Muslims in Canada was a new experience:

In Kuwait, you automatically become a practising Muslim... It took about 4 years, so by the second year in university, to get used to people [in Canada] practising [Islam] differently. Friends in high school weren’t the practising type. A girl that I dated was Muslim, and she would drink. It didn’t bother me at first. We started dating in high school and into university. So that helped [me come to terms with her drinking]. The first time [she drank] it started bothering me a lot. I was open with my parents about me dating, and it didn’t bother them much. It was mainly just time that made me less bothered [by the different levels of practice]. Also, my friends in Kuwait, when they moved, some live in Toronto, and they were not really practising. I realised that it was more common than I thought it was... I have not been influenced in my practice by meeting other Muslims.\textsuperscript{20}

Although Dawud is at first surprised and “bothered” to meet Muslims who drink, for example, he cites time as the most important factor to his getting used to this.

Meeting Muslims who drink has not, however, made him inclined to do so as well.

Similarly, Mahnaz was surprised by some things in Malaysia:

It’s a Muslim country, so my parents were like comfortable with me going to Malaysia... Going there from Saudi Arabia was very different. I had a cultural shock over there at first, ‘cause like, you know how in Saudi Arabia all women, we’re supposed to wear abayas\textsuperscript{21} and scarves and hijab and everything, all covered. Malaysia was totally different. It was my first time seeing girls wearing shorts...tank tops also, it was a shock for me, but then I got used to it, I got used to it pretty soon.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Ibid.
\item[21] An abaya is a full-length and loose-fitting robe. It covers everything but the head, hands and (sometimes) feet.
\item[22] Mahnaz, 27 June 2014.
\end{footnotes}
Like Dawud, Mahnaz is “shocked”, but is not dismayed by her experience in Malaysia, nor does she herself adopt a new dress code.

Ahmad, who moved with his mother to Canada and lived there for three years before moving back to Pakistan, felt that he adopted some of the Canadian culture, and “took much more of that in. And left my, like Pakistani past behind”:

I: The year when you moved back to Karachi, for one year, what was that like? Moving from Canada and then back to Karachi?
A: It was kind of weird. ‘Cause I went back to the same school I used to go to when I was there before. And I remember like when we went to the class, when they like introduced me to the class, I can remember the people there, and I could like see their faces like “What, is that the guy that was there before?” But yeah, it’s pretty cool. It was kinda weird too, because the people I was really good friends with before, I couldn’t get along with anymore. I guess my interests changed. Probably because I moved to Canada.

Ahmad cites his move to Canada as the most likely reason why he could no longer get along with his old friends in Pakistan. He also feels his personality changed after moving to Canada the second time:

A: I guess it changed a little bit after the second move to Canada.
I: Changed to what?
A: A bit more extroverted. I can interact much better than, I can get used to situations much better than before. But, yeah before that I was like super introverted, and not very communicative, and like, stayed by myself.
4.3 “It’s Like This Instant Connection”: Community and Twice Migration

In order to understand more about how participants made choices in everyday life, they were questioned about the kinds of social environments they had been and were in, and whether they actively sought certain kinds of community experiences. Ethnic, diasporic and religious ties were discussed, with each participant reporting their attitudes to affiliating with the different kinds of communities at various locations. Given that their (families) migrated twice, or sometimes three times, this added to their experiences and impacted on their relationships. Many of the participants reported growing up with friends who shared a similar background to them, and often continued to maintain connections with people they felt shared a similar culture, though this was not always the case.

Although Ahmad is not Muslim, the majority of his closest friends are of South Asian origin and are Muslim, though he does have friends who are neither Muslim nor South Asian. About his friendship experience in high school, he said:

I hung around with mostly the, er, “brown group”, I guess… In Saudi, it was easier, well at first it was easier to make friends with brown people, ’cause like if I became friends with one brown person, I’m like already in the group, you’re always hanging out together. And as time went on, it was such a small community in our grade, right, we kind of knew, everyone knew everyone else. So then as time went on, we were all kind of friends with each other.23

Mahnaz expressed the same reality somewhat differently:

23 Ahmad, 30 June 2014.
But my friends [in Saudi Arabia], of course, they were Pakistanis. I mostly hung out with them. They had the same background.\textsuperscript{24}

Upon returning to Pakistan for a year, Ahmad quickly found friends again:

Well, it wasn’t really difficult, ‘cause where I lived, right, I already knew some of the people there. So, like straight away I was in a community, I guess. And, even in the school, we had a specific class for all of the international students, so it was easy to get along with them, because we came from a similar type of culture. So that wasn’t too bad.\textsuperscript{25}

Ahmad had the chance to become friends in school with a twice migrant after coming to Canada, and relates:

It was normal. Other than the fact, when I first met him, I was always talking about how I loved Saudi Arabia because of all the friends I had, and then he would just like look at me like, “that was the worst experience of my life!” ((laughs)). But other than that... It was just like meeting another brown friend, I guess.\textsuperscript{26}

Shireen, however, did not meet any peers with the same background, growing up in Canada. Nevertheless, her friends were all from families who had migrated to Canada relatively recently:

I don’t think I ever had like a purely Canadian friend until adulthood, to be honest. So everyone I was friends with was either second or first generation Canadian as well. They weren’t “immigrants” per se, but they had ties somewhere else, just as I had ties somewhere else. It’s just that their ties

\textsuperscript{24} Mahnaz, 13 August 2014.
\textsuperscript{25} Ahmad 30 June 2014.
\textsuperscript{26} Ahmad, 27 July 2014.
were direct and my ties were kind of going through a number of different trees...In fact, I felt like in high school, culture ended up being the main reasoning of how you ended up having friends. And so the Muslim friends kind of mixed with the Hindu-Indian group, so it was like a Desi group by label. And I never really, I couldn’t relate to that group, ’cause they were all the same to me, and I was like “this is just too much.” I was used to diversity. So I ended up having Greek friends and Chinese friends, and all these different cultures and ethnicities.  

While Shireen explains above that it was “too much” to join a group where everyone shared the same cultural background, Dawud had somewhat of a different view:

I have many friends from East Asia and South East Asia, and also Caucasian friends. There are cultural similarities between [me and the Asian friends]. It’s easier to be friends with such people, as they would understand the same problems with families and religion, and so on.

Leyla had mostly Egyptian and Pakistani friends in Saudi Arabia. This changed when Leyla moved to the United States, and attended college. Leyla’s community college in the US had many international students, and her friends there were subsequently from a variety of backgrounds:

I think my parents, my mom and my aunt, they targeted that school specifically because they knew I’d feel more comfortable [in that environment]. There were a lot of Asians, some Moroccans, barely any Arabs, like Egyptians, other than Moroccans. I only have one Moroccan friend from there. The rest are all, like Korean, from Taiwan, Vietnamese, yeah. There’s Malaysians as well, a lot of Malaysians, actually. And a lot of

27 “Desi” refers to people, culture, etc from (broadly) the Indian subcontinent.
28 Shireen, 10 September 2014.
29 Dawud, 31 July 2014.
Indians, too... No Arabs. I only made one [white] American friend, actually, there, my whole year... But yeah, it was very, very comforting. ‘Cause I just didn’t feel awkward, being the only new one. There were a lot of other new ones. And it helped to go to the orientation. ‘Cause that’s where I made all my friends... Actually, there was one Iranian friend that I had in [the US]. But he was very whitewashed ((laughs)), so I wouldn’t count him an Iranian.30

Later on when Leyla moved to Ontario with her family and attended university, she found more Arab friends:

Actually, I had a friend there, and that friend introduced me to all the Arab people. And that’s when I started to be comfortable. I had like eight friends on the first day, and they were all Arabs... So, eventually, one of the guys I was introduced to, the second day, he introduced me to his sister. And from then on, she’s been my friend until now, and she introduced me to the other Arab girls. It’s not like I only wanna be with Arabs, it’s just that the circle you’re introduced to, and you just eventually hang out with them. Like, I had Asian friends in [the US], and I totally loved them. But I would say [town in Ontario where she lived] is filled with Arabs, and that’s why I ended up knowing Arabs. Like, the amount of people that are in a place, that’s why you always end up in their circle.

Ahmad’s friendship circle widened when he moved (within Canada) and became a university student:

I guess I have different sets of friends now. I have friends from, that I hang out with a lot from high school, that I had in high school. Race wise, they’re like mixed. They’re mostly brown, there’s, every now and then, some of my white friends, who join in. There’s a few black friends. And then I have friends in, my university friends that I hang out with. And it’s the same, they’re mixed. There’s a few Asians, and a couple of black friends, and a few white friends, too... my high school friends, they’re, they’re more religious, so I can’t, I don’t really go to pubs and stuff, or to too many parties. With my

30 Leyla, 11 August 2014.
[university] friends, we would hang out at the pub a lot, or, and go to parties, and stuff... My closest friends in [university] are brown.\textsuperscript{31}

Similarly, Dawud explains:

I have some friends who are practising Muslims. And some who are no longer Muslim. And also friends who are non-Muslims. There is no difference hanging out with one group or other. I would hang out with the latter friends in clubs, I don’t mind, but more practising friends wouldn’t go to clubs, so I don’t hang out there with them... When I first moved to Canada, I got friends who were Muslim and who did drink and didn’t practice [Islam]. They have a double life at home and with friends. It bothered me at first, but then I got used to it.\textsuperscript{32}

When Mahnaz moved to Malaysia to attend university, she met fellow students who, like her, had moved there from Saudi Arabia, or who had moved there directly from Pakistan:

I’ve had Pakistani friends in Malaysia who were from Pakistan, so yeah, we connected, but still, I don’t connect with them on a level that I connect with people, Pakistani people who are from Saudi Arabia. You know what I mean. In Malaysia, I had Pakistani friends who came from Saudi Arabia just like me, and Pakistani friends who came from Pakistan. But I connected with the friends, the people who were from Saudi Arabia [more] than the people who came from Pakistan. Even though I know, I know Pakistan, I know what’s going on there, but. I don’t know. I can relate to the people coming from Saudi Arabia, since I’ve lived there.\textsuperscript{33}

As we have seen, unlike the other actors, Shireen did not grow up with friends from the same background. While Leyla and Ahmad in particular reported meeting more

\textsuperscript{31} Ahmad, 30 June 2014.
\textsuperscript{32} Dawud, 31 July 2014.
\textsuperscript{33} Mahnaz, 27 June 2014.
people of other backgrounds when going to university, for Shireen it was the opposite:

   It wasn’t until, to be honest, it wasn’t until *university*, actually, and this is quite sad, that I had to wait so many years to find any people who were East African and Indian.³⁴

In Shireen’s case, of course, she did not grow up in an environment with any other East African Indians, whereas the other participants in this study went to school with many of the same national or ethnic background.

   But I hit university, and I ended up meeting, like, literally four of my closest friends ended up being from East African and of Indian origin. And it’s like this instant connection. ‘Cause even though they’re not Muslim, they’re Hindu, but even though they’re Hindu, and they’re from East Africa, they don’t actually relate to India in any way, the same way that I don’t relate to India, despite them being Hindu. And there was a few Muslim friends as well who were from East Africa, but I actually have yet to meet a Sunni Muslim who was born in East Africa, who had Indian origin, who’s outside of like my family’s circle of friends. Meeting them on my own – never happened. So I’m still waiting on that one.³⁵

None of the participants reported feeling inclined to attend ethno-cultural community events or gatherings, and Ahmad and Shireen gave two explanations as to why that was. However, through the interviews it became clear that twice migrant participants in this study connected to their respective cultures in different ways.

³⁴ Shireen, 10 September 2014.
³⁵ Ibid.
There are numerous festivals and parties that are specifically meant to cater to people of a Pakistani background in the Greater Toronto Area. Regardless of his (albeit reluctant) familiarity with Pakistani culture, Ahmad has not attended any sort of cultural event or festival that has catered specifically to people of South Asian origin. The only form of gathering of Pakistani people that he has attended, are so-called “family parties” with friends and acquaintances who are also of Pakistani origin. Apart from the food, he does not enjoy these parties, where the discussion often steers onto news and politics and is dominated by the older generation. He avoids attending such parties unless he is compelled to go by his parents. Such parties are often parts of community socialisation and bonding, whereby the older children either absorb the discussion of the elders or instead keep the younger children company. Below is the transcript of myself, Ahmad, and his friend (also a Pakistani twice migrant) discussing the thoughts they had about going to a ‘Desi’ event that one of Ahmad’s friends had invited him to:

A: If I wasn’t busy, I’d probably go to an event like that. But, I guess if it was too traditional, then I wouldn’t go, but if it’s more -- Westernised I guess, a little bit more Westernised, I’d feel more comfortable.

I: Can you explain those concepts, “traditional” and “Westernised”? What do these terms mean to you?

A: Well, traditional would be more like a Pakistani marriage atmosphere. If you know what I mean? Right?

I: Like people go there primarily to find someone to marry, is that what you mean?

A: Well, I don’t know about that ((chuckles)).

Friend: I think what you mean is that when it’s like a huge hall where the marriage ceremony happens and lots of people can come-

A: -And there’s this atmosphere, like everyone dances and stuff.

F: And you meet people you’ve never met before.
A: Yeah, exactly. And you’re supposed to talk to them and stuff. If it was that kind of atmosphere, like those really traditional Pakistani stuff, dances and-

F: -It’s fine [to go to that].

A: No, I wouldn’t. I would do it if I had to, but I just wouldn’t feel comfortable doing it ‘cause I’m not used to it, right? I would probably make a fool of myself or something.

I: Why would you make a fool of yourself?

A: Well, like if your friends are like, they forced you to dance, especially if you know people who are getting married, and I don’t understand the dance. I can’t dance, anyways. So, I don’t know, I’d rather not.

F: Well, you gotta imagine it like a club.

A: It’s not really a club, though!

F: ((laughs)) I’m kidding.36

Thus Ahmad is willing to consider ‘Desi’ events where young South Asian Canadians meet to enjoy aspects of their cultures, with a “Westernised” feeling, but is very reluctant to go to more “traditional” events, as he is not able to fully participate in the activities there.

Shireen similarly reports feeling that the traditions of the older generations of Memons are different from those of the younger generation. According to Shireen, there are not many Memons in Toronto, and the Memon community “is not as strong as it used to be.”37 Although there are some community events for Memons in Toronto, these few events have not led to Shireen connecting with a group of Memon friends. It is thanks to this, she notes, that:

A lot of the ideals and traditions that my family had, or my parents had, growing up, those are changing. Very quickly. Just based on who I surround

36 Ahmad, 27 July 2014.

37 Shireen, 10 September 2014.
myself with, and to be honest, how close in proximity I am to other Memons. I’m not, so.\textsuperscript{38}

Additionally, Shireen grew up in a neighbourhood with few others of East African or Indian background (let alone both):

It’s interesting that I grew up in, I mean, a completely different environment from what one would grow up in, being of Indian background. And so most people that you meet in Toronto that are of any type of Desi background are actually either in like Brampton or Mississauga or Scarborough. And I live [more north in GTA].

Other than religious events, none of the other participants reported being actively involved in or participating in activities that targeted their specific ethno-cultural community. Not attending cultural events did not mean rejecting or being cut off from the cultures of their respective personal start locations, however.

Attachments were much more complex, as is demonstrated by Leyla:

[My husband] was born in Pakistan. And he came here when he was 10. Yeah, he lived here. He’s really like Canadianised, but he still has his heart in Pakistan, kind of thing. So he loves his country [Pakistan]. And he always wants to go there. He’s connected into his country. It’s not like the people who come here and they just forget about it. And I would say, one thing I really like, because he’s connected, he wants to teach his child, like the way in Pakistan, not the way here. Like, languages as well. I’m very, very particular about the languages that you teach your child. I get upset with parents who say, “I just taught them English, you know”. No offense, I don’t know if you know anyone like that. I pass by a lot of people who are from different countries, and they just taught their kids English. I would say: I’m Egyptian, my husband is Pakistani, and my kid is getting born in Canada. I would focus on teaching Arabic and Urdu, before they go to school and learn English eventually in school. I want my child to have that feeling of back

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
home, and not the feeling of here. Not that I don't like here, but it's different. When someone has a connection with their back home country, it gives them this heart, you have a different feeling. You know what I mean, right?\textsuperscript{39}

Murtaza, on the other hand, brings up visiting Pakistan, and discusses, similarly to Leyla, the “feeling” of a connection to a “home country”:

I like it, I don’t know why, but just every time I go there [to Pakistan], I like it. I have no idea what it is. It’s like when you're there, it’s hot, there’s mosquitoes everywhere, there’s no electricity, I don’t know, roads are like completely destroyed, I dunno, [but still] I just like it. I think because there’s family there. Just go and meet them and stuff. And we usually end up going back to our village, so, there’s not much going on there, just relax there. But like the last time I went there, pretty much fifty percent of the people I met before I came to Canada, they moved to England. My whole family just moved to England.\textsuperscript{40}

Mahnaz, however, did not feel the same way as Murtaza about Pakistan. It is interesting to note that Karachi, where Mahnaz was born and where her family is, was mentioned by Murtaza at some point during the interview as being “really bad right now”, and this might put some context to Mahnaz’s feelings below. Murtaza elaborated on the situation in Karachi:

It’s pretty bad there. Politically, it’s unstable. I know people here [in GTA], in Canada in general, there’s a lot of educated people in Karachi, and Canada mostly took professionals in, even from back then, so educated people from Karachi came here. So a lot of people I know from Karachi, they tell stories, their family member gets kidnapped or assaulted or something... It’s because the population there is so big, and they don’t really have any

\textsuperscript{39} Leyla, 11 August 2014.
\textsuperscript{40} Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
leaders there, the leaders are corrupt, the people don’t know what to do. Pretty much all educated people left from Pakistan anyway.\footnote{Ibid.}

One of my interviews with Mahnaz was at her home, and her mother would occasionally check on us to see if we were comfortable and had enough food and drink to continue the interview session. During one of these visits, she interrupted the interview:

M’s mother: Why you don’t like to stay there [in Pakistan]?\footnote{I asked for permission to include Mahnaz’s mother’s comments, and she kindly obliged.}
M: Mama… She didn’t ask that question yet ((laughs)).
I: Well, that’s a good question, that’s also a question.
M: Yeah, why I don’t like Pakistan? I don’t know, because I never lived there? I’m not attached to that place even though I’m from Pakistan, but… Yeah, never lived there. I always used to go there for like a month every year, and I don’t know. It’s just-
Mother: -But you don’t enjoy there.
M: Yeah. ‘Cause of the crime rate again, and so much pollution and traffic. Yeah these are the main reasons why I don’t like Pakistan, and we don’t have electricity sometimes, that sucks. It’s like I’m living in a -- cave age ((laughs)). I don’t know.\footnote{Mahnaz, 27 June 2013.}

From this discussion, Mahnaz continued by explaining that she felt more connected to Saudi Arabia, having lived there since she was one year old. Her mother also added her thoughts:

Mother: You know what, I tell you… The children, the people where they are born and where they are grown up, they get adopted to that place. Whatever is circumstance and whatever the environment and
whatever, and they have adopted to that place and they feel comfortable there. This is what happened to my children. What I feel. Because though there is restriction, there is other things, there’s no so much entertainment and all that, but still they like that place, they like Saudi Arabia. They don’t like Pakistan, and my younger daughters, they are now in 8th grade, they are twelve years old. And you know they’re always complaining, “Oh Mama I like to stay in Khobar [in Saudi Arabia], Mama I want to go back.” ((laughs)) I don’t know what is the reason. I’m telling, I’m comparing the things: “You have so many things to do, this and that”, but still.

M: Yeah it’s funny, because you feel, living in a place for more than 20 years, you feel like you belong there. You know everything about that place. You know how people are, you know the culture, the traditions of that place, everything. Like, I don’t even know so much about my own country, you know. I know about Saudi Arabia, so there’s a sense of belonging over there that I have. And I don’t feel that in Pakistan or even over here. I know I just moved over here, but I know I won’t get the same feeling over here. And I still hope, like you know -- Yeah, I would, maybe would get that feeling here if I live here for like 10 years or 20 years.

I also discussed with Ahmad his views on how he navigated living in different countries and encountering different cultures:

I: Can you tell me more about the three years you lived in Canada? You said it was a very tough time.
A: Oh yeah, because it was a totally different culture, right? Like, I’m moving from, like Pakistan to Saudi Arabia, I was not the best at English at the time... The whole method of teaching was totally different. It was much more engaged, and less, um, less theory based I guess, or memorisation based. And that was kinda hard for me to get used to. Because you’re supposed to interact with people that you can’t really communicate with, at that time. Yeah I guess that’s what made it tough. Plus, we were living like in a basement for the whole three years. So there wasn’t like a lot of privacy.
I: You said it was a totally different culture. In what way?
A: Well, let’s see.
I: What stood out as something that was new to you, or something about you that made it difficult for you to sort of bridge the culture gap by the people?
A: Well, the whole way they behaved, I guess. Because in Pakistan it was much more constrained, and it was much more rule based and family based and much more focused on ethics, while in Canada it was, more of, like, expression, like expressing yourself, rather than just conforming to set patterns. So I guess I wasn’t used to that, and that’s what made it hard. And obviously, the language barrier, too.

I: And do you feel like, in those three years, did you pick up some of that culture, or did you find an alternative to both, or, how did you deal with having to engage with two different cultures?

A: Hmm. I think I took much more of that [Canadian culture] in. And left my Pakistani past behind. I still feel that way. Like I don’t really feel Pakistani, I guess. I felt that, especially when I was in Saudi, too, ’cause I used to hang out with the “brown crowd”, right? And they’re- Not patriotic, but they’re like very-- Always talking about their country, what was bad with it, how to improve it, and I had no interest in that at all. And I felt kind of cut from that culture, in a sense. I didn’t really relate to that, much. So yeah, I think I took much more of that [Canadian culture] in, and left, the past behind, I guess.44

The participants in this study also elaborated on the extent of their ties to others of the same religion. Leyla explained how her network of Muslim friends grew substantially once she moved from the United States and to Canada:

And when I came here to Canada, I had a lot of Muslim friends. In [the US], I had none, only the Moroccan friend, and he was not very religious either. Like, we never really had a conversation about Islam. When I came here, all my friends were Muslim, most of them hijabis, most of them only ate halal.45

Leyla had mentioned earlier in my interview with her that she avoided involvement in the MSA at her college in the United States, because of the activities

44 Ahmad, 30 June 2014.
45 Leyla, 11 August 2014.
they appeared to be involved in according to their Facebook page. She did not join the MSA in Canada, either, and explains below:

I: The MSA we’re talking about, was that the one in [the USA], it wasn’t here in Canada?
L: No, I wasn’t really into anything. My Arabic girl that I told you about I was introduced to the second day I was here [in Canada] – she and the other Arabic girls were actually in Palestinian groups, and I totally can support them all I want, but I don’t like getting involved with them, ‘cause I know there’s a risk... Like, I told them put my name on the group, but plus I’m not really into the meetings anymore. I used to do it in school when you have to go to the group meetings, but I’m not into that anymore. So I haven’t really been to any MSA or anything.

I: Are they really political at [town where she lived in Ontario]?
L: No, no, no, actually, Canada they’re really – and I don’t think I mentioned, after I got married, I told you I had a year left, right? I did it at University of Toronto at [town]. I didn’t do a transfer, I took courses. But I didn’t do well, that’s why I still have a year left. But when I went to University of Toronto [town], there was this like club day when they have stalls outside and they tell you to sign in etc. And I signed in in MSA, and other things, but still, they ask you to come to fundraisings and – I told you, it’s a 20 minute ride, and I became lazy after I got married, so I just don’t go anywhere. I became part of and receive emails from them, but I don’t really take part in it. From the political side, even on Facebook, you keep, these days especially, you keep getting those events, protesting for Palestine, and everything right now. But I don’t want anything to affect my future plans, you know, I don’t wanna take a risk. I don’t know if whatever I will do will even matter.

As MSAs are found at almost every university in Canada, with some holding weekly events and activities, I tried to gauge the extent of Murtaza’s involvement in one.

He gave a somewhat similar answer to Leyla:

I: In university and stuff, are you part of the MSA, do you take part in activities, or?
M: No. Probably gonna join some groups and stuff this year. I would have been part of the MSA, but I don't think I would have offered them a lot.
I: No? Why not?
M: I don't know. I have no idea, actually. I wasn't interested in it. I understand people who do like a lot of group activities and stuff. Even though the MSA is probably the biggest club in [my university] now, 'cause there's so many Muslims there. I just never got into it. Probably because I never joined like a lot of clubs. I just play sports.
I: Are any of your other friends in the MSA?
M: Yeah, people from my high school.
I: Don't they like bug you, “oh come to this event”?
M: One of them actually signed me up for something. I just never went, I forgot about it.

MSAs are not the only way young Muslims in university socialise with other Muslims. Shireen expands on the different (groups of) friends she has had:

It was more so [Muslim] family friends than actual friends, yeah because in elementary school, obviously [I was] not around Muslim people. In the first two years of high school I did not have any Muslim friends. In fact, I felt like in high school, culture ended up being the main reasoning of how you ended up having friends... And it wasn't until later that I became really close friends with an Italian – so she's Italian by culture, but her parents met and grew up in South America, and so they speak Spanish at home, but her grandparents are Italian. So she was a close friend of mine, and then this Pakistani Muslim friend. And so I kind of ended off high school with those two friends. And then I jumped into university, and actually ended up having a lot of Hindu Indian friends, but a lot of Muslim friends, and that's how I kind of started exploring Islam a little more. But it wasn't until graduating and then starting to work in the work force, and then being around, to be honest, like a white corporate Canadian environment, that I felt like I needed to go back to my Muslim friends and re-evaluate my priorities, and you know. I feel like my company at this point of my life was really important – company as in who you surround yourself with. And so I tried to make a conscious effort of being around more Muslim friends now more than ever...I was never surrounded by people who were constantly, you know, who were drinking or into that, 'cause I was always able to choose who I surrounded myself with. And so when you're working, you can't choose your company. And so I started questioning, like “why do you do that? What incited you to lead that type of lifestyle?” And I feel like when
you’re around people who do that, you either sway towards that and you're tempted, or you hang on tight to your own beliefs. And alhamdulillah I decided to hang on tight to my own beliefs. But I wasn’t able to do it alone, because now I'm surrounded by people who are very different from what I have grown up with, but I kind of need that sense of community. Especially since you’re at work all the time, and it’s a second family, almost, so after work, I felt like I needed to be around people who had a mental model that was similar to mine, or a way of life that was similar to mine.

It was thus mostly after university that Shireen made a conscious effort to (re)connect with Muslim friends in particular, as she was no longer in an environment where she would naturally meet other Muslims. She elaborates further in the excerpt below:

I’m trying to find like different pockets of Toronto that have hubs like [a Muslim scholarly learning centre]. So Mississauga, I mentioned that most Muslims live in Mississauga, but I’ve never even been to Mississauga or like hung out there, yeah. So I wanna get more involved with [a Muslim scholarly centre], and there’s this thing called RIS [Revival of the Islamic Spirit], the conference, so I wanna volunteer there. I’m trying to do more, in terms of getting involved, and that’s also, a side passion project, just like volunteering and getting involved more within the community. I mean, not necessarily the Muslim community, but I think the overall GTA community. So I mentioned I was part of [a Muslim community organisation]. That was another thing. [The organisation] is a non-profit group, it’s completely volunteer group, everyone’s a volunteer. Their entire mission is to basically incite civic duties within Muslims… But the entire point of the group is to instil volunteerism within the Muslim community in Toronto, and then also give back as a Muslim community, and then also connect community within ourselves.

46 “All praise and thanks to God.”
47 Shireen, 10 September 2014.
Dawud also has many Muslim friends, some who are not Ahmadi like himself. In Kuwait, his family had contact with other Ahmadi Muslims:

There are many Ahmadi people in Kuwait. We would go to mosque every Friday. There were mosque activities, religious activities. It was an Ahmadi mosque. In reality, it was more like a rented apartment than a designated mosque building. We did not advertise the space; you would have to know it was there.\(^{48}\)

Although Dawud does not fear persecution as an Ahmadi in Canada, and subsequently can freely worship in mosques that are ‘openly’ Ahmadi, this does not mean that Ahmadis are integrated into the wider Muslim community:

There is a separate prayer room for Ahmadis at my university. That’s the one I use. I have used the other one [which other Muslims use], but only if my [non-Ahmadi Muslim] friends are there. I mostly pray at the Ahmadi mosque. One time I was hanging out [in Mississauga], on a Friday, about to watch the FIFA game. That day I prayed Friday prayers at a non-Ahmadi mosque. I left just before the prayer started [and after the sermon]. The imam was talking about how we should be one ummah\(^{49}\), that the people who believe in the khilafah\(^{50}\) are wrong, but that we should incorporate them [into the ummah]. My friends didn’t mention it [that I had left the prayer] later. I’m still open to hearing about non-Ahmadi stuff, and going to other mosques.

\(^{48}\) Dawud, 31 July 2014.
\(^{49}\) Arabic word for community. Generally, and in this case, refers to the worldwide ‘Islamic community’, i.e. the totality of Muslim believers.
\(^{50}\) This refers to Ahmadi leaders of the Ahmadiyyah movement and communities. The imam at the mosque was thus talking about accepting followers of the Ahmadiyyah movement as Muslims despite doctrinal differences.
4.4 Faith and Philosophy

Participants made several direct and indirect references to the concept of ‘religious practice’ and what that term meant to them.

According to Dawud:

I’m more practising than the average Muslim, and I’m very interested in my religion. Wouldn’t say very practising. I know a lot of stuff about other religions. I don’t pray 5 times a day, but I try to. I eat halal food. I’m active in my mosque. I don’t drink, but I do date. I’m not very practising, but I’m knowledgeable... I follow “Faith Matters” [a YouTube series]. Ahmadis have a dedicated channel, MTA, with live Friday sermons, and it’s also on YouTube. The show I watch has a Q&A session and a panel of speakers. I like hearing their stuff.

Dawud does not refrain from drinking alcohol only due to religion, however:

I think the reason I would say I’m more opposed to drinking, probably because I’m brought up in a very extremely religious family, that encourages thinking about religion, so I understood why these things [drinking, drugs, etc] weren’t healthy. The decision not to drink and do drugs etc for me was more logical than religious.

Alternative reasons for following Islamic prescriptions also come up when Leyla discusses the issue of food:

I had a shock with food when I went to [the USA]. ’Cause in Saudi, you eat anything, you don’t care, everything is halal\(^{51}\), you don’t really have to worry what you’re eating. There’s no pig, nothing pork, whatever. But I went to [US], and first of all I was like, “halal, haram\(^{52}\) stuff? I’m not gonna look for halal food.” ’Cause in [the US], it’s not as easy as Canada. Actually, I don’t think there’s any halal restaurant there... I was in the cafeteria [at college in

\(^{51}\) “Permissible.”

\(^{52}\) “Impermissible.”
the US] and this Moroccan friend of mine comes, and I’m eating a pizza. He’s like, “What are you doing?!” I’m eating! “You’re eating pepperoni pizza!” I’m like, “yeah?” And pepperoni pizza back home is like meat, I don’t know, they make like chicken or beef. And apparently it was pork and I didn’t know, right, ‘cause I never had to like think about it... So in [the US], I didn’t really think of the halal/haram thing, I was only worried about [not] eating pig... When I came here [Canada], all my friends were Muslim, most of them hijabis, most of them only ate halal. Actually my husband only eats halal, as well. From then, I was like, “ok, I’m used to saying ‘no pork’, now I have to say halal and haram”. But I’m still not in that zone yet. I still eat everything [except pork], ‘cause there are some restaurants that I really like, and I can’t stop. But I know the difference, like health wise. I know that, not just religiously, to stop and only eat halal, but health wise, I know it’s a big advantage to eat halal... So I’m still not into the halal-haram food, but now that I’m in Canada, it’s making it easier. I started only eating halal a bit, until I found out that I’m pregnant. And then I was like, “whatever is there, I’m gonna eat.” [My husband] still gets pissed at me whenever I eat haram food. He’s like, “you’re feeding my child haram food!”

Mahnaz’s take on food is somewhat different. In Malaysia and Saudi Arabia she was able to eat popular fast food (e.g. McDonald’s) because the meat offered there was zabihah halal, but this is not the case in Canada:

I miss all that [fast food] over here... The other day I had McDonald’s with [her brother], but it was the fish burger. I don’t like eating fish burgers, but that is the only thing I can eat over here, which is like, I’m allowed to eat, so.

While Mahnaz continues to keep zabihah halal in Canada, she maintains that she is “not that religious”:

53 Leyla, 11 August 2014.
54 Permissible meat slaughtered according to Islamic prescriptions. Fish is excepted, and does not need to be zabihah.
55 Mahnaz, 27 June 2014.
I think I am religious, but not that religious, like that I’d start wearing abayas everywhere...I just pray five times a day, and that is what I’m used to doing in Saudi Arabia and Malaysia and over here. I didn’t let anything affect that.

Murtaza similarly keeps zabihah halal, and as I did not ask directly about religion during any of the interviews before participants themselves brought it up, his being Muslim had only come up indirectly. I probed to see what his views were on the concept of religiousness and being a ‘practising’ Muslim:

I: You mentioned that you would [in the future] go for hajj or umrah to Saudi Arabia.
M: Yeah.
I: So do you consider yourself a practising Muslim, or?
M: Yeah, I’m a practising Muslim.
I: What does that mean, a ‘practising Muslim’?
M: I don’t know, I try to follow the five pillars. I pray like five times a day, and I usually read Quran by way of my phone. I try to get more into it recently. I was very religious in Saudi, too. Prayed five times a day. When I came here first, I kinda didn’t pray for a while, probably a couple of months, but then I got back into the rhythm. Ever since then, I pray... People who ask me, you know, “why don’t you smoke, why don’t you drink alcohol?”, it doesn’t bother me... The most practising Muslims here are more practising than the ones back home in Pakistan and stuff. I went there, and it’s very Westernised. A lot of educated people left, and they think that what happens in movies, that’s how Westerners live. So a lot of people stopped praying and stuff.

56 Major and minor pilgrimages.
57 Declaration of faith; ritual prayer; fasting in the month of Ramadhan; obligatory alms giving; and the major pilgrimage to Mecca if one has the means.
58 Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
I inquired about the reasons why Murtaza had stopped ritual praying when he first came to Canada:

I: Was it just because you just moved, or?
M: Nah, it was -- pretty much just moved, so I was just-- And I just wanted to understand it more than like [just] follow it. 'Cause my parents didn’t really force it on me, it’s just my choice.
I: And do you feel like your connection with your religion or something has stayed the same or changed from living in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and here?
M: Living in Saudi Arabia, it really solidified it, I guess. But here, I don’t know, it just built on from Saudi Arabia. In Pakistan, I don’t really know, 'cause I was just a kid, right? Saudi Arabia is where I built it. And then I just kept it from there.
I: And do you find it easy to be a practising Muslim in Canada?
M: What, [in a specific town of GTA]? Yeah. I don’t think we’re the minorities in [GTA town], actually. Yeah, it’s not bad here. There are times, like you know, people ask like why. Most of my friends drink and stuff but it doesn’t bother me, though. I’m just not curious about alcohol or anything.

Ahmad is the only participant in the study who does not identify as Muslim. Ahmad “lost” his faith a few years ago, in his late teens. His main interest is philosophy, and when he lost his faith he began to investigate the works of different thinkers and philosophers. Ahmad explains how he first reacted to losing his faith:

I kind of lost my faith. But I wasn’t really satisfied with like, the opposite? Like those hardcore atheists, I guess. It just seemed like a reactive thing to me. So, first I moved to science, and that didn’t really give me anything. And then I moved to certain philosophers. And it seemed very interesting to me. And

---

59 My relative inexperience with the interview setting is embarrassingly obvious from this interview, as I inadvertently used some leading formulations when I asked questions.
much more, much deeper, I guess, rather than superficial reactions. And from then, I just went from one person to another person, to another person. And my interest grew in different fields.60

Despite not being Muslim, he nevertheless touches upon the concept of ‘religiousness’:

I: So you said that with your high school friends, they’re “more religious”. In what sense?
A: Well, religious in the sense, they would follow rules, like they would pray five times a day, like you’re not allowed to drink and stuff. They emphasise more on the ethics part, I guess. Right or wrong. And then, my university friends, they're more-- hedonistic, I guess is the word ((chuckles)). Just wanna go to parties, drink, enjoy themselves.
I: Can you explain the “ethics” part? What is that about?
A: Well, I guess, I said they're religious because they wouldn't do certain stuff even if they'd want to do it, because it's not allowed in their tradition, or their religion, sorry. Even though they're liberal, I'm good friends with them cause they're liberal, right, they don't really care, who they're friends with. What they do.
I: What kind of “stuff”? 
A: ...Well, you can’t really tell, because if you ask them, “do you want to drink?”, they would be like, “no.” Then there would be other friends, the guys, a couple friends, they would be like “well, I wouldn’t mind trying it, I don’t want to do it ‘cause it’s bad.” And I just take that to be because of their culture. Or, sorry, the religion.
I: You mentioned something about your high school friends being ‘more concerned with right or wrong’, whilst your university friends, in your words, were more “hedonistic. ”In what sense?
A: In what sense they were more hedonistic? Well, I guess, it's also kinda an influence of the university culture, too, ‘cause people want to enjoy themselves, you know, there's always parties going on, there's always like all these events, even from the university, that you can participate in. So I guess that’s kind of an influence. And most of the friends I have in university, they're not that religious? So, whenever we do something, most of the time there will never be this

60 Ahmad, 30 June 2014.
conversation about “Well, it’s not the right thing to do.” It’ll be more like, “do I wanna do it or not? Is it safe for me or not?” And so on. In that sense I guess it’s a bit different.

I: And where do you find yourself, between the high school approach and the university friends’ approach?

A: Well, it’s hard to say. But I would say I’m somewhat in the middle? But I guess it’s much more complicated. ‘Cause I’ve been really into philosophy, too, since grade eight. So, both sides I see psychological motives behind them? Unconscious psychological motives. So even when someone’s trying to be ethical, or someone’s trying to be hedonistic, like there could be a lot of self-deception going into that. So in that sense, I don’t really know where I stand, other than just try to be attentive to my own motives.

In the second interview with Ahmad, I sought to clarify some of the issues that had been brought up in our first round of discussion:

I: You said in the last interview that religion - or ‘ethics’ - wasn’t really “enforced” on you that much by your family. Can you get into detail-- was it because your family wasn’t really interested in it, or did they just let you--?

A: Well, they obviously told me like, what’s wrong and all that stuff, but they didn’t— like, I see a lot of families kind of telling their kids that, if you don’t pray or keep rozas61 or whatever, “this is bad”, and all that. My parents were never like that. Although they would obviously tell me, like this and that, but at the end of the day they would leave it up to me. So in that sense it wasn’t really impressed on me.62

I also inquired more about what kind of philosophical works he had been exposed to and was interested in:

61 Fasts.
Once I lost my faith, I got interested in a lot of new age-y stuff... And then I was exposed to a lot of Eastern ideas... Daoism, especially. I like Daoism. It’s this Chinese form of philosophy. And then Zen [Buddhism]. ‘Cause my idea of the Western philosophers was, I thought they were more of these atheist people... Especially Nietzsche, even though I find that weird now, ‘cause I really like him... Most of the people I’m interested in in Western philosophy have some similarities to Eastern stuff... Kierkegaard, I don’t have a word to categorise him. But, he’s still religiously motivated, so he interests me... That was the reason I kind of moved to the Eastern new age-y thing, cause they [atheists] didn’t have any substance. They just enforce it as a scientific “truth”. They pick on fundamentalist religion and throw every other religious person into that one worldview... When people become unreligious, or when they leave their faith, they go to the other extreme, like they’re so disillusioned: atheists.

Shireen, who has lived in Canada since infancy, grew up in a neighbourhood where the majority of the population was Roman Catholic and of Italian ancestry, and attended a Jewish school before she went to high school. She explains the way religion worked as an adhesive in her neighbourhood:

I think also growing up in my neighbourhood, my parents always made it clear that we were Muslim, and I remember always hearing like, you know, “it’s one God” and maybe when we were younger, everyone I was friends with, they used to go to church, so it was kind of like religion being a similarity as well, just by the fact that they were different religions but they were all Abrahamic faiths. I mean, mind you, everyone I was close friends with in my younger days in [the neighbourhood] is no longer as spiritual as I would hope, but I mean, when we were kids, it was something that bound us. And I think their religion is instilled in them, [the same way that I had] certain character traits that I had already instilled in me from my religion.63

63 Shireen, 10 September 2014.
As we saw above, when Shireen graduated from university and started working at a multinational company, the lack of diversity and the prevalence of a ‘drinking culture’ and similar things frowned upon in the religion of Islam, meant that she felt she had to increase her own knowledge of her religion and to spend more time in the company of likeminded people. In her words:

I felt like I needed to go back to my Muslim friends and re-evaluate my priorities... Kind of go back to religion as a main value.

Shireen expands on what the concept of ‘practising Muslim’, and how, in her case, the meaning of term has evolved:

As a child, I felt like practising to me as a child meant like going home and praying. And I felt like I was practising more so because I was young enough to not question things, but old enough to know it was important. And so, alhamdulillah I was blessed with a family who was practising, and we used to pray together. Ramadan was really exciting to me as a child. So when I was of age, and I used to fast during the school year. I had no problem explaining to people what Ramadan was, or like what it was to be Muslim or that I was Muslim. I never hid it, or covered it up in any way. But I don’t think I ever as a child looked for a prayer space or anything like that, ’cause I was still young. And high school, for me, practising then, again was more coming home and praying, so it was more like I had like my sacred space at home, because I couldn’t drive, it wasn’t like I could go to the mosque or anything. But a lot of it for me in high school was being true to who I was and speaking out about things and raising my hand in class and sharing my values and perspectives...I know that one of my main goals after graduating is to learn more about Islam, ’cause I hadn’t done that. I learned

---

Muslims perform five daily ritual prayers that are to be performed within designated time slots. Delayed prayers are acceptable but are not equal to prayers performed on time, and so there is much emphasis on making an effort to pray as soon as the time sets in for each prayer.
the basics, I went to a madrassah\textsuperscript{65}, which was [where I learned] basic theology and history and Quran, and belief, but nothing in depth. And I felt like I almost knew more about other topics than I did about my own religion.

Theme 5: “People Like Me”: Otherness and Structural Barriers to Integration

Three of the twice migrants of Pakistani origin who lived in GCC countries complained about the immigration systems there, particularly the barriers to obtaining citizenship and equal status in comparison to the local Arabs:

They give you this thing, it’s called iqamah. It has like, where you live. Basically you’re working there, you can’t own a business, you have to work under someone, you can’t work under your name, you have to work under a Saudi’s name. That person oversees your work, I guess. And usually, I’m not sure, the company gets the passport, yeah, that’s how pretty much it is there, because foreigners are not allowed to keep their passports... Even the high professions, they end up taking the passport. If a Saudi person is overseeing you, he takes your passport. If you’re going from one city to another, you have to show your paper. Saudis are allowed to move from one city to another freely. It’s like a monarchy there, so they make up rules... If you go for vacation or something, you have to ask for the passport. They usually give it to you, but low professions, they probably don’t give it to you, they probably ask you a lot of questions. My dad was an engineer, so it was no problem for him, they used to give it to him...But the thing is there, they don’t give it [citizenship] for a reason. They have a lot of money. ’Cause I know an Indian friend, his mom she has a citizenship even though she’s Indian, ’cause his grandfather was a doctor to the king. So if the king wants to grant you citizenship, who’s to ask? You got a citizenship. Benefits are ridiculous, ’cause his uncle, his mom’s brother, he came here to study medicine, and everything was paid by the Saudi government, and it wasn’t even a loan, they just paid. Then he got an extra 2-300 dollars each month, just for living expenses. That’s why. They have money. That’s why they don’t give it up.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{65} Islamic school.
\textsuperscript{66} Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
There is no possibility for people like me, who have migrated there, to obtain citizenship of Kuwait. It’s because of the egos of Kuwaiti nationals.67

Twice migrant interviewees also lamented the treatment they received in general vis-à-vis other immigrants such as those from the US:

In Saudi Arabia, if you’re a Canadian citizen or American national they pay you double the amount they would pay someone else.68

Trust me, Saudis, they treat them [Americans and Canadians] like kings. They make life so much easier for them. They’re very, I don’t know if racist is the right word, I don’t know, they have double standards, I don’t know. For Canadians and Americans, they’re very nice, they’ll do anything for them.69

I didn’t like Saudi Arabia particularly. My area was like very Saudi, many more Saudis than brown people, I guess. South Asians. [Saudi people] don’t like foreigners that much... They just didn’t like foreigners, they didn’t associate with them... That’s just the culture there. They don’t like foreigners... A lot of Americans live there, too, but they have a different compounds. And Saudi rules don’t apply there. They can, I don’t know, they don’t have to wear the hijab and stuff, they are allowed to drink there, that kind of stuff. It’s like closed walls. Their houses look similar to here, but they’re all metal, concrete. Like, you know, the A-shaped roof? They make that, but it has no use there, ‘cause there’s no rain or snow. Just to make them feel at home, ‘cause a lot of them are contractors and stuff, they work there. Pretty much everything is designed by Americans and built by South Asians... Americans [keep their own passports]. They can do whatever they want. I’m pretty sure they have some sort of agreement, ‘cause most companies they are American. They have a lot of business and engineering firms there, so they probably have something going on, but I’m not sure about that. I know about South Asians, you have to have iqamah to go.70

68 Mahnaz, 27 June 2014.
69 Mahnaz, 13 August 2014.
70 Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
My sister has always wanted to go back to Kuwait. She plans to go back to Kuwait. I didn’t like the whole discrimination thing there, but she wasn’t exposed to it as much as I was.\textsuperscript{71}

While Shireen’s family lived for generations in Kenya, she was only a year old when they moved to Canada. Although she has visited Kenya on several occasions, Shireen has spent almost her entire life living in Canada. Her exposure to otherness and marginalisation is, unlike the other participants who first experienced these in Asia, rooted in a Canadian experience:

I felt like I was always the minority girl growing up...And then eventually [her neighbourhood in GTA], where I actually continued to go to high school, became more diverse, and so suddenly now I’m seeing the Canada that I was told about. You know, growing up. ’cause you know, being in the Jewish school, I was like, “this isn’t Canada”, everything felt like a template and everything was the same. So by the time I got to high school there was more diversity, which was nice, and I think that positively impacted me. And allowed me to see different cultures and become very accepting of others. But especially because I felt like I was always the minority girl growing up. When you go through that, I feel like when you’re [then] surrounded by other people, you become way more accepting of them. Because you know what it’s like to be a minority.\textsuperscript{72}

Shireen recounts stories of growing up with the need to elaborate on her ethnic origins, and had difficulties explaining how she was both African and Indian whilst also decidedly Canadian.

\textsuperscript{71} Dawud, 31 July 2014.
\textsuperscript{72} Shireen, 10 September 2014.
But the fact that I was East African, with origins, like, ancestry from India, it’s like, it was so many things coming together growing up. It was, “you’re East African, but what does that mean?”, because my ancestors are from India, and I grew up in an Italian community, and I’m going to school with a bunch of Jewish kids – like, who am I?

She would amend her story and emphasise different things depending on who was inquiring about her background, and found that the term ‘Canadian’ when used in everyday conversations denoted European, and ‘older’, origins:

People who were [white] Canadian were like, “Oh, so where are you from?” I’d be excited for my Kenyan story, ‘cause I had nailed it down at this point. They’d be like, “Oh, I’m Canadian.” I’m like, “What does that mean?! Are we all Canadian?” They would actually end up having ancestry from, I don’t know, it was like Dutch and English. But ultimately they had several decades of family in Canada, and that’s how they’d coin themselves as Canadian.

And while Shireen found that she could, when prompted, present herself as Canadian abroad, back home in Canada, when she was asked where she was from, it’s kind of assumed that you’re from a different country.

Dawud, being Ahmadi, recounts a memory from when he was young in Pakistan:

In Pakistan, for Eid al-fitr\(^73\), when I was around age 14, I went to the mosque for Eid prayers. An incident had happened by an Ahmadi mosque – not the one I was going to. It was a shooting or something. I was told not to leave the house or talk to anyone else. I was told not to mention that we’re Ahmadi. I knew about the discrimination, but I didn’t feel the effects of it. I haven’t experienced any discrimination in Canada [from being Ahmadi].

\(^73\) End of Ramadhan celebrations.
I inquired about the general feelings the participants had regarding their transitional country/ies. In the following passages, Murtaza and Ahmad describe the people of Saudi Arabia as “they” or “them”, indicating that they did not count themselves as ‘Saudi’, as well. When asked to sum up his perception of Saudi Arabia, Murtaza said:

Strict, boring and probably no opportunities there...Another word we describe Saudis is “wasteful”...They have all the money in the world, and they have nothing to do with it. Princes and kings, they’re ridiculous. If you see the palace there. There was a stretch of highway, we used to go through it to get to the city, and the building, the palace was there. You’d be driving for 20 minutes on the highway, it would not end. That’s how big the palace is, in Saudi. It just kept stretching.

Likewise, Ahmad had a negative perception of Saudi Arabia:

I remember Saudis being much more abrasive - I guess is the word? - than Canada, even Pakistan actually. Their culture was very, spontaneous, I guess, and kind of crazy ((chuckles)), so. Yeah, that’s Saudi Arabia...There was a lot of violence all the time, I guess. Like you’d always hear stories about, you know, like Saudi fights, or, you would see conflicts going on. But I never really went out that much. I would go, I guess [the informant’s] house, or my other friends’ houses. We would every now and then go to gaming arcades, or malls. So, yeah the culture was very strict. I mean, rules wise, it was pretty intense. And, the Saudi people were kind of crazy. Well, I actually do remember when we were playing, we used to play for the soccer team there, and every now and then we would play the local Saudi teams, and they were like super aggressive, it almost felt like they wanted to fight rather than play. And, I don’t know, that’s how I thought of their culture, or at least the Saudi culture, not all the people there.\(^{74}\)

\(^{74}\) Ahmad, 30 June 2014.
Much of the negative impression Ahmad had about Saudi Arabia came from what he would hear through others:

I: Did you ever see any of the “violence” in Saudi, or experience it?
A: Oh, well, not me personally. But I would hear stories all the time.. I would hear stories from my brother. Also the driving there was very reckless. Like, pretty reckless.

Finally, I inquired about the actors’ overall feelings towards Canada, their personal start locations and transitional countries, and whether they would consider moving back to places they had lived before. Ahmad preferred Canada over Saudi Arabia and Pakistan:

I definitely do prefer Canada. ‘Cause if I was, I guess, this age in Saudi, I would have had very limited options, of I don’t know, going out and hanging out with friends or whatever. Places outside, ‘cause there’s not a lot of options. So in that sense, yeah I would prefer Canada, much more, than Pakistan or Saudi...when I was in Canada the first time I actually wanted to go back [to Pakistan]. But now it’s totally the opposite. Like, I would not stand living in Pakistan or Saudi.75

Murtaza said he would not live in Saudi Arabia again:

I: Would you ever live in Saudi again, do you think?
M: Definitely not... If they [Saudis] were a little bit more, if they were more liberal and treated people better, equal opportunities like Canada, then I would wanna stay there. I’m pretty sure, even if it was like that, I wouldn’t go with it, ’cause education there is pretty bad, after high school...In Saudi, I didn’t really do much, honestly. Just

75 Ibid.
went to school. Everything revolved kinda around school, come home and it’s just family, you stay there. I didn’t like it particularly much. People there are racists, mostly, basically. The culture is different. They don’t like foreigners. Couldn’t really do much there.

He does like Pakistan, but:

people say when you go to Pakistan, on vacation, you need a vacation when you get back, ’cause that’s how hectic it is there. But when you leave, you miss it. I think it’s just ’cause I grew up there, and I have family there, that’s why I like it.

Leyla explains the motivations behind leaving Saudi Arabia in the first place:

‘Cause I was thinking of staying in Saudi and having my education there, but I know it wasn’t gonna be good enough. To actually be accepted in other parts of the world, if I’d graduated from Saudi, I’d have to end up staying in Saudi my whole life. The Saudi degree is not accepted anywhere else. Yeah, and plus it was more expensive than [USA]. They made it really expensive, because they actually wanted to limit the people who come from outside to come and study in their schools. So I was like, I’d rather go somewhere else than stay in Saudi. So I decided to go to [the USA].

Mahnaz discussed Malaysia and Saudi Arabia:

[Malaysia] is a Muslim country, but it’s mostly dominated by Chinese and Indians. It’s nice, it’s very hot, it rains all year long. People are not so friendly and there’s a lot of racism over there, between Malays and Chinese and Indians. These three are the main races over there. What else? Crime rate is pretty high...Yeah, if you compare with Saudi Arabia, there are a lot of things to do over there [in Malaysia], like every other country. Saudi Arabia is like an exceptional place, we can’t do anything over there. There are no cinemas, you can’t watch movies, you can’t um I don’t know, a lot of things because of the restrictions and very conservative law, yeah. So I had a lot of

76 Murtaza, 27 August 2014.
77 Leyla, 11 August 2014.
fun there [in Malaysia] ... I felt racism over there [in Malaysia]. I didn’t feel anything like that in Saudi Arabia.\textsuperscript{78}

In addition to previous comments about Pakistan, Mahnaz elaborated on reasons why she would not like to go back, even to visit:

I think I’ll get married in Pakistan. Because you know, my fiancé, right, his family, his parents, they want us to get married in Pakistan. I don’t really like the idea, but whatever. I don’t wanna go back to Pakistan. I don’t really like Pakistan. I was never really attached to Pakistan, right? I never lived there... People in Pakistan, I don’t like them so much, ‘cause there is so much competition, and there’s so much jealousy. They would say. “Oh you have a bigger house than me, so you are not gonna come over”, stupid stuff. People are weird over there. I guess they’re different like that.

Mahnaz concluded our last interview with some remarks about Saudi Arabia:

Saudi Arabia is the only tax free country in the world. Yeah. Everything is cheap. And everything was, the quality of life is very good over there, very good, yeah... I miss Saudi Arabia so much, but I won’t go back. I mean, I \textit{would} if I get paid a lot over there, ‘cause you know, money ((chuckles)). They pay so much, you save so much, so I wouldn’t mind if that would be the case, ‘cause then I’d save up so much and I’d travel, like I wanna travel a lot.\textsuperscript{79}

4.5 \textbf{Chapter Summary}

In this chapter we have seen that the twice migrants who participated in this study each had their unique sets of experiences despite sometimes sharing a similar background and migratory route. The actors identified several instances where

\textsuperscript{78} Mahnaz, 27 June 2014.
\textsuperscript{79} Mahnaz, 13 August 2014.
new settings introduced them to other ways of living, and demonstrated that they quickly became used to new practices and beliefs. The twice migrants had complex relationships with the places where they had lived, and expressed how and why they connected with different people and places. In addition, they often actively sought to have meaningful and ongoing involvement in growing spiritually. Finally, structural barriers as well as feeling Othered are challenges that the actors had to face. In the next chapter, I will synthesise the findings with the academic literature to identify patterns and ambiguities, and determine some practical and theoretical implications of the results.
CHAPTER 5: DATA ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

In this chapter I will analyse the transcripts from the nine interviews I conducted between June and September in 2014, as well as synthesise my analysis with the academic literature that was reviewed in Chapter 2. The analysis of interviews involved using the data analysis software Nvivo to perform several methods and stages of coding, and thematic analysis. Below, the themes and their content are compared with the literature, to form conclusions about the research project. I will provide a summary of what we can learn about twice migrants from this study, and what the study adds to the study of identity and legal pluralism. In performing the synthesis of the literature and the findings, I found the most coherent way of presenting the analysis was through answering a series of questions that arose from this endeavour.

5.1 Do Twice Migrants Really ‘Belong’ Anywhere?

As we saw in the two preceding chapters, both the literature and the interviews indicated that physical and emotional distance from the dominant population in the places where participants lived were features of (twice) migrant life. One of the experiences that informants drew attention to, that I in turn have presented as the theme of otherness, is that of the structural barriers. These structural barriers include what can be called ‘official integration’ in some of the interim countries in
which they had lived, i.e. the bestowal of citizenship rights and the like. Citizenship rights have been identified in the literature reviewed above as something that facilitates engagement with the wider society of the country in which an individual lives. Participants in this study were not citizens of their transitional countries; the one exception is Shireen, whose family had Kenyan citizenship before they migrated to Canada.

In Chapter 2 we read Castles’ (1987) argument that nationality and the rights that come with citizenship are conditions that facilitate participation in society. Crucially, security of residence and civil and political rights mean groups and individuals (for example migrants to a country) have the means to play a part and engage fully in the country in which they live. Lack of such rights was how immigrants (and their children) to West Germany became alienated from where they lived at the same time as they were also “foreign” in their personal start location (Castles, 1987, 99). Participants in this study who grew up in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait experienced this alienation as well, and often tied the lack of full official integration to local politics and to issues of discrimination. For example, all but one of the participants who spent extensive periods of time in one of the Arab Gulf countries complained about the immigration system, particularly the barriers there to obtaining citizenship and equal status in comparison to the local Arabs, and even compared to other immigrants such as those originating in the US. Dawud, Mahnaz and Murtaza expressed frustration with the lack of citizenship rights for South Asians in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, either directly or indirectly. Directly, Murtaza
compared the benefits of being a Saudi national compared to someone with an *iqamah* (residency permit), and indirectly, Dawud complained about never being fully accepted as a Kuwaiti. Several of the interviewees who grew up in Saudi Arabia, found it unfair that Americans, for example, seemed to have a separate status and access to privileges that South Asians did not have there. These privileges ranged from exemption from certain Saudi laws to living in separate and gated American-only compounds, away from the rest of the (immigrant) population. In addition, the participants felt that both ordinary Saudi citizens and officials had a disproportionately high regard for Americans and other white Westerners, whilst simultaneously looking down on South Asian residents.

Al-Rasheed (2005) argued that transnationalism in the form of exchanges of labour and skills is encouraged by Arab Gulf states, yet in Saudi Arabia as well as in Kuwait, it is virtually impossible for immigrants to gain citizenship. For the participants who lived in the Gulf countries for most of their lives, frequent renewals of their *iqamah* were constant reminders of their status vis-à-vis Saudi nationals. The participants made a connection between these barriers to official integration, and to the reluctance by Gulf countries to share their (oil) wealth with newcomers, and to “the egos of [Gulf] nationals,” and this view affected their relationship with the Gulf states, as well as their view of Gulf nationals. The status of South Asians in Saudi Arabia is one where, according to Murtaza, “you can’t own a business, you have to work under someone, you can’t [be your own boss], you have to work under a Saudi [national].” This means the assumption that
immigrants to Saudi Arabia are not there to stay, is explicit. There is currently no official expectation that South Asian migrants will be staying for generations and becoming part of the wider society in the Arab Gulf states. Although the South Asians born in Saudi Arabia or other GCC nations, or who moved there when they are very young, expressed a desire at some point to become a part of wider GCC societies, there are few, if any, avenues through which this could be realised. The respondents’ attribution of their experiences of otherness to “egos” of Saudi and Kuwaiti nationals might be an allusion to what Al-Rasheed argued was an increase in identity politics in those countries, and as such indicate that the twice migrants’ being non-Arab contributed to the feeling of alienation and discrimination.

Al-Rasheed (2005) does not identify the affinity for Western people that my respondents had observed, and which they criticised. Mahnaz claimed that in Saudi Arabia, Americans and Canadians were paid double the amount that a South Asian would be paid for the same work. She also felt that there was a difference in how Americans were regarded as opposed to Pakistanis and other South Asians. This statement by Murtaza conveys the frustration of Mahnaz as well:

[American houses in Saudi Arabia] look similar to [Canada], but they’re all metal, concrete. Like, you know, the A-shaped roof? They make that, but it has no use there, ’cause there’s no rain or snow. Just to make them feel at home.

I have added emphasis to the last statement because it encapsulates the bewilderment one feels when reading about the absurd American houses in Saudi Arabia, that serve no function other than, according to Murtaza, to make the
Americans feel at home. This contrasts sharply with all the South Asian interviewees who instead experienced alienation and rejection. Thus it seems the identity politics of GCC countries did not affect, in the eyes of the twice migrants interviewed for this study, Western immigrants to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. In light of Castles (1987), who argued that becoming a minority is a political action of organising society - an action which rests on existing structures of racial exclusion, it should not be too surprising that only the South Asian respondents reported experiencing harsher restrictions.

In Chapter 2, Clifford’s (1994) argument was presented, which challenged the problematisation of “multinationalism” through which minority experiences are reduced to issues of culture clash. Instead, he argued, it is structured inequalities, racism and exploitation that are the reason why minorities lack a sense of belonging. The twice migrants in this study complained of several cases of inequalities experienced in their transitional countries, and identified these experiences as motivations for their families to move to Canada (as all the participants moved with their families, and not of their own initiative). Murtaza complained of being subjected to checkpoints while travelling between cities in Saudi Arabia. While Saudi nationals can move freely from one city to another, Murtaza and his family would have to show their iqamah and other relevant paperwork. Informants also reported that it is common practice among the companies for which migrants work to seize foreign workers’ passports, and if the workers want to leave, they have to ask for the passports back. Nevertheless,
Murtaza claimed that Americans were exempted from this practice and could keep their passports. “They can do whatever they want,” he claimed; whether this statement reflects a (common) reality or not, the very perception that South Asian workers were treated very differently from Americans impacted his and other participants’ attitudes towards Gulf nations and local populations during and after their stay. Americans were seen by the participants as trusted by the Saudis, as they could keep their own passports, were exempted from several state laws, and lived in well-maintained and separate compounds. South Asians, on the other hand, were constantly scrutinised. And while special cases existed that deviated from the norm, these were deemed to be exceptions that proved the rule and that confirmed the unfairness of the system. This reinforces the theory that South Asians in particular experience certain restrictions and structural barriers that Western immigrants to Saudi Arabia and Saudi nationals experience to a lesser extent, if at all.

Castles’ (1987) now somewhat outdated description of the situation of ethnic minorities in West Germany is reminiscent of the prevalent situation of South Asians in states like Saudi Arabia. In the Gulf countries as well, immigrants who migrate for work are seen as ‘guest workers’. Similar to (West) Germany, the children of South Asian immigrants are not granted citizenship by Gulf states even if they are born there. According to Vertovec (1999) and Portes et al. (1999), global capitalism and restricted immigration policies define the migration experience today, and I was therefore curious about the role of privilege (in the form of
monetary and socio-cultural capital). My study concerned twice migrants who all had the means to migrate to Canada, yet their resources did not make them immune to discrimination in the places to which they moved. Being affluent, having qualifications that make you an attractive immigrant, and sending your children to private school, however, apparently do not mean you will not still be “subject to institutional discrimination and ethnic exclusion” (Castles 1987, 97), whether in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Malaysia or Canada. Such experiences had significant impact on the social and political consciousness of the twice migrants in this study; Dawud’s main complaint about life in Kuwait was “the whole discrimination thing there,” and this “discrimination thing” dominated the account of his time there.

From the participants’ stories during the interviews, it seems being ‘othered’ acted as an important lens through which the twice migrants understood themselves vis-à-vis other members of the societies in which they lived. This confirms bell hooks’ theory (in Clifford 1994) that inequalities, and not solely issues of education and translation, contribute to tensions with the dominant population. Experiences of being ‘different’, and reminders of that difference cause young twice migrants to evaluate and re-evaluate their identities as they grow older. Through barriers to official integration, and by being labelled as immigrants or otherwise excluded from the grand narrative about the respective countries, the twice migrants came to see themselves as simultaneously being shaped and rejected by these places. None of the migrants identified themselves as ‘Saudi’ or ‘Kuwaiti’ or ‘Emirati’ though they had spent their formative years there. The only
exception was Shireen, who to some extent identified herself as Kenyan-Indian (but not only Kenyan) because the Indian communities in East Africa lived there for some generations and have distinct communities.

In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, it was not just being ‘Arab’ but also whiteness that was the standard against which the twice migrants in this study found themselves to be differentiated. In her statements, Mahnaz was reluctant to call the discrimination in Saudi Arabia ‘racism’, though she used the term in relation to Malaysia. Murtaza was less hesitant, and directly complained about racism in Saudi Arabia. Mahnaz’s reluctance might be due to racism being seen solely as overt and aggressive behaviour towards people with certain physical traits, instead of as a structural problem that affects minorities socially, financially and politically. In her speech in an Oxford Union Debate in favour of the (successful) motion, “This House believes that feminism has been hijacked by white middle class women”, a transcript of which appeared in the New Statesman on 13 February 2015, Myriam Francois-Cerrah argued that,

The term “white people” doesn’t refer to the colour of people’s skin as much as it refers to people’s identification with the dominant power relations which continue to subjugate people of colour to a second class status and relegates women of colour specifically to the bottom of the heap.80

80 Myriam Francois-Cerrah, "Feminism has been hijacked by white middle-class women," New Statesman, February 13, 2015, http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2015/02/feminism-has-been-hijacked-white-middle-class-women
While it was not ‘white people’ who acted as the dominant power in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, it is also interesting to note how interviewees reported that other foreigners, Americans and Canadians in particular, received much better treatment. Murtaza argued that this was in part due to the monetary and structural capacity of such immigrants, who in contrast with South Asian professionals who work for Saudi companies, instead often work for American companies. While Mahnaz only reported ‘overt’ racism in Malaysia, she was hesitant when it came to the structural discrimination she faced in Saudi Arabia, both as a woman and as a South Asian non-citizen. Dawud, like Murtaza, however, explicitly referred to not just their immigration status, but to their being non-Arab as reasons for the treatment they received. This is again consistent with Al-Rasheed’s argument that identity in the GCC is increasingly articulated as Arab, and not, for example, something else that would have included many of the South Asians who live there (e.g. a ‘Muslim’ identity).

In some cases, negative experiences in personal start locations and in transitional countries overshadowed the good ones, and meant participants were very happy to leave for Canada. Participants all want to live in ‘open’ and diverse societies where different points of view are respected. Almost all of the participants had complicated relationships with their personal start locations, being bound to them by ancestry and identified with them by others regardless of their own personal feelings and attachments. This contributes to twice migrant
desire for meeting other migrants like themselves and explains why they relate more to such twice migrants than to people who share their personal start location.

5.2 How Do Twice Migrants Relate to Other People?

According to Castles (1987), exclusion and discrimination mean immigrants are more likely to foster transnational relationships and identities. According to Mahnaz and some of the other participants in this study, hanging out with the “brown crowd” and gravitating towards people with a similar cultural background is “natural”, because of sympathy for each other’s experiences. Dawud claimed that it made sense to have people in your life who understand the kind of social navigations and issues you are dealing with. This has not meant, for any of the participants in this study, that they had difficulties forming meaningful friendships with people of other cultural, linguistic or religious backgrounds; quite the opposite. However, it is perhaps the availability of likeminded people that in part gives one strength and confidence to connect with different kinds of people. Hurh and Min (in Min and Kim 2009) had argued that ethnic and religious attachment do not in and of themselves negatively affect socialisation with the dominant population, and this was the case with the individuals in this study.

The participants all expressed a desire to be in diverse and open environments, and valued knowing and interacting with people of different backgrounds. While Portes (1999) argued that discrimination and hostility – which all participants in this study experience(d) to some extent – lead migrants to
reaffirm an identity with ‘their’ group of migrants, this was not quite the case as demonstrated by the data. While twice migrants mostly held on to a connection to their personal start location (through language, food, socialising etc), they did not, as Portes suggests, separate themselves from society and see themselves as different whilst in Canada. However, while this study did not gather enough evidence to support Portes’ theory, there were some indications that whilst living in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, twice migrants were involuntarily isolated from the local population and held tightly on to a ‘Pakistani’ or ‘Egyptian’ identity, collectively and individually. Mahnaz continued to do this in Malaysia, as she mostly socialised with other people of Pakistani background, but she had an added component of having lived in Saudi Arabia, which she felt separated her from those who had only lived in Pakistan.

Participants reported and demonstrated high tolerance of other beliefs and practices. Some of them directly identified the minority experience as what prompted their own tolerance towards people different from them; however the majority of the participants also asserted that it was part of their personality to be open to and wanting to be surrounded by a diversity of people. Despite all of this, all of the participants inclined more towards socialising with people who shared a similar background to them. For Shireen, this meant socialising with people with the same morals and aspirations, often Muslims. Although Ahmad is not Muslim, the majority of his closest friends are of South Asian origin and are Muslim, although he does have friends who are neither Muslim nor South Asian. All of the
participants experienced being part of niche or diaspora communities while in transitional countries and, to a much lesser extent, here in Canada. This ranged from attending community events and living in the same neighbourhoods, to attending the same schools and reconnecting with fellow migrants and maintaining networks from back ‘home’ in the personal start location and from the transitional country, once they arrived here in Canada. Despite (or perhaps because of) this, all of the participants have complicated relationships to their personal start location, in how they articulate identity and belonging vis-à-vis it.

Almost all of the participants felt very strongly that they were of the identity of the personal start location (e.g. they were ‘Pakistani’, etc), though the participants who lived in Canada longer, notably Ahmad and Shireen, felt strongly connected to the broader culture of Canadian society, and several of the participants had many issues with what they saw as the culture of their personal start location. As Rahemtullah (2007) suggests, Canadian ‘multiculturalism’ to some extent requires certain traits to be erased and a certain ‘difference’ to be produced, and Ahmad and Shireen were arguably also more exposed to this notion of multiculturalism than the other participants. As Ang (2012) argues, however, neither Ahmad nor Shireen, if they even have that desire, are able to become fully ‘authentically’ Canadian because they are not white.

In Shireen’s case, her desire and need to be fully understood as a twice migrant was met by Hindu Indian East Africans, who shared everything with her except their religion. The shared experiences of being ‘other’ in East Africa and
forming communities there, and being uprooted a second time to live in Canada, were enough to spark an immediate “connection”. Shireen discussed how she had made an effort to connect with Sunni Memons in the United States through social media, and was thus able and willing to utilise novel means of forging a global network of twice migrants with the same origins and persuasions. This supports evidence from Sreberny-Mohammadi’s study (2013), which showed that young migrants can establish strong attachments to their personal start locations and the countries they move to.

According to Ahmad, he did not “feel Pakistani”, and this was particularly the case when he was in Saudi Arabia. He notes that while in Saudi Arabia, he would mostly hang out with what he called “the brown crowd”, meaning people of South Asian descent, and who were “always talking about their country”, meaning Pakistan, something he had no interest in. Ahmad felt like he had a sense of belonging among his peers at school in Pakistan, and noted that “it was easy to get along with them, because we came from a similar type of culture.” ‘Culture’ here seems to mean something broader than mere national affiliation or links, and instead denotes common ground on social and political levels. However, culture here does not necessarily mean sameness to the point where views are identical, as many of his closest friends were and are Muslims, unlike him. To this day, many of Ahmad’s close friends now in Canada are either ‘Desis’ or have families who have migrated from somewhere else. This speaks to Hall’s (1990) notion of cultural identity as something that is produced and reproduced by experiences, and that
has less to do with connecting to a historic past and more to do with solidarity and positioning within competing discourses on history and culture. So although Ahmad feels “Canadian” above anything else, he displays the ability to utilise his familiarity with both Pakistani and Canadian cultures and environments to join and form and even connect several networks. While Clifford (in Brubaker 2005) discusses a South Asian diaspora that seeks to recreate culture in new locations, Ahmad’s experience (and that of the others) indicates that people from the same geographical region socialise not solely for the purpose of recreating a home away from home (Ballard, 1994), but because they long to connect with people who understand their struggles and joys, both those in the past and in the present.

Chapter 2 briefly touched upon both the security concerns (Brubaker 2005) and the pressure young Muslims may feel to break free from how others perceive them (Mondal 2008). While Leyla initially expressed her Egyptian identity partially through vocalising her stances on political issues in Egypt and Palestine, the fact that she no longer risks this means she might in future focus on other ways to make manifest her Arab-Egyptian identity. Leyla asserted the importance of her child being immersed in the Arabic and Urdu languages, and Egyptian and Pakistani ways of being. She chose a partner who had strong ties to his “home country”, though he did not need to be Arab. Her husband is also an immigrant to Canada, who moved here in his childhood years. Compatibility was partly deduced from the level of commitment to bringing up the children within a household where the totality of cultural and ethnic experiences were celebrated and expressed. Mahnaz,
who is engaged, similarly asserted that it was unlikely she would have felt compatible with her fiancé if it was not for the fact that he is also a Pakistani twice migrant. Thus both Leyla and Mahnaz wanted partners who could simultaneously understand what it meant to be a migrant and were rooted in a culture other than the dominant one. This again indicates that twice migrants form bonds of solidarity and connect with others across cultural and religious differences (Hall 1990), and that connections and identity can be formed through the shared experience of lacking “claims to territorial propriety or cultural centrality” in Canada (Chow 1993 in Ang 2012, 1).

When Murtaza’s family first moved to Saudi Arabia, they lived for a while with family friends whom they had known from their time in Pakistan. Eventually, these same friends moved to Toronto and when his family moved to Canada as well, they lived for a while in the basement of these friends. Thanks to this connection from Pakistan, Murtaza and his family immediately had a form of community support both in Saudi Arabia and in Canada. Such familiarity was used to form networks abroad, and these networks later aided Murtaza and his family when they eventually moved to Canada. Thus we see an aspect of the transnationalism (Portes et al 1999; Brubaker 2005; Vertovec 1999) and the utilisation of diaspora networks (Appadurai 2002; Vertovec 1999) in play. We also see an indication of Herbert’s (2012) understanding of migration as an incomplete process (Kelly 2013) whereby trans-national affiliations are forged.
None of the participants reported having close friends who belonged to the dominant culture in any of the places they had lived, including Canada. Although Dawud wants to have friends from more diverse backgrounds, and not necessarily just Ahmadis, he already has substantial ties to a large Ahmadi community, and can easily participate in events and communal prayers when he wants to. Thus the hostility he felt as an Ahmadi Muslim in Kuwait is not paralleled in the GTA in Canada. Only Leyla and Murtaza expressed having strong emotional ties to their respective personal start locations (Egypt and Pakistan, respectively), while Ahmad and Shireen both reported feeling consistently alienated from the ethnic community in which they grew up. At the same time, the latter two mirrored the others in actively seeking like-minded people, sometimes with a shared ethnic, national or migratory origin or experience.

Notably, Ahmad, who still has many close friends who are practising Muslim, rejects “reactive” approaches to faith or ‘people of faith’ despite having rejected the religion of his parents. Rejecting polemics, his positions on matters of faith are personal and inquisitive, and change as he is exposed to more philosophers. Ahmad sees limitations in so-called ‘New Atheist’ polemics, which often target Muslims or Islam in particular, and he is able to do this arguably due to extensive and life-long exposure to and interaction with Muslims and other people of faith. Ahmad’s views on religion and faith are thus not just philosophically or spiritually informed but are also shaped by social interactions. Through these
interactions, he is able to balance his own rejection of the Islamic faith with his continued close friendship with practising Muslims.

All of the participants in this study have friends and acquaintances from a variety of backgrounds, though they all also gravitate mostly toward people who share a similar background. This similarity need not be an exclusionist ideal where all acquaintances share the same ethnic and/or national origins, but is more than anything about twice migrants' ability to connect with people who share similar experiences. The twice migrants in this study referred to this desire to connect with people who would have sympathy for the totality of their experiences, the ruptures and continuities (Hall 1990) with their respective ethnic communities and with the dominant cultures in the transitional countries in which they had lived, and in Canada.

5.3 How Do Young Twice Migrants Navigate Life, Laws and Expectations?

Twice migrants are naturally members of multiple, sometimes global, social networks, and as demonstrated during the interviews, they sometimes must address conflicting or challenging demands and expectations. The participants in this study discussed to what extent their living in different places influenced and shaped their views on faith and on the practice of faith in particular.

Mondal (2008) argued that younger generations of Muslims in the West shape their own practice of the faith, in contrast to what he calls the “collective observance” of the parent generation. The Muslim participants who were part of
this study often displayed an acute awareness of perceived standards of behaviour to which they were expected (by peers and community members, and society at large) to adhere. According to Dawud, he is “more practising than the average [Muslim] person”, yet he “wouldn’t say [he’s] very practising”. On particular issues, such as drinking, he is “practising” (i.e. he does not drink), yet Dawud does admit to “dating”, which, depending on how it is defined, is also a controversial activity in many Muslim communities. ‘Dating’, as a general term for a wide range of activities, is less clear-cut in terms of its acceptability among Muslims than for example drinking, the latter being explicitly prohibited in Islamic jurisprudence. The participants seem to be more flexible on issues where orthodox sources are also more lenient, or where there are differences of opinion.\textsuperscript{81} This was also the case for Leyla, who discusses halal (permissible) versus haram (impermissible) food, and laments the difficulty she has had adhering to the religious prescriptions in the case of zabihah, or ritually slaughtered meat. At the same time as she does not limit herself to zabihah halal meat, Leyla is firm in her decision not to eat pork, which is an unambiguous issue.\textsuperscript{82} Leyla says she hopes to adjust to eating only zabihah halal

\textsuperscript{81} This could of course be a coincidence, but it is interesting to note all the same.\textsuperscript{82} There are various exceptions to the rule on zabihah halal food for Muslims. In case of emergency (e.g. if there is risk of starvation), Muslims are permitted to eat haram food, i.e. food which is not ritually slaughtered and/or which comes from animals that are impermissible to eat (e.g. swine or predators) in small quantities, if there is no other food available. This is due to certain verses in the Quran such as, “if any of you is forced by hunger to eat such [otherwise impermissible] food, with no intention of doing wrong, then God is most forgiving and merciful” (5:3). There
food in the future, but she is “not still in that zone yet. I still eat everything... I can't stop”. Both Dawud and Leyla exhibit awareness of the debates going on in Muslim communities, and the various theological positions, as evidenced by their mentioning these issues at all.

Both Leyla and Dawud cite alternative reasons for their reluctance to eat haram meat and drink alcohol, respectively. Dawud notes that the decision not to drink and do drugs was more “logical” than “religious.” Similarly, Leyla attends to the difference between halal and haram food not just on a religious basis, but also “health wise”. She states that “it’s a big advantage to eat halal” both from a religious perspective and from a health perspective. These alternative explanations do not just reflect how few ‘religious’ prescriptions are ‘just religious’ without further justifications, but also allude to the need to explain to oneself and others how one has chosen to opt out of the more common norms in the society one lives in.

Mondal (2008, 5) argued that this was an example of the children of migrants being given room to “breathe” and to articulate their own morals.

I propose that in addition to ‘group’ understandings of law, we should also, as Vanderlinden (1989) suggests, take into account the personal struggles of individuals, who often have experiences and understandings particular to them.

is a difference of opinion among religious scholars surrounding kosher meat and meat slaughtered by observant Christians. Thus necessity or hardship and differences of opinion contribute to Muslims in non-Muslim majority countries eating food generally designated as impermissible (though many Muslims opt for vegetarianism if no zabihah halal meat is available).
alone, despite being members of one or several groups. Moving and living in
different places influenced the practice and understandings of each of the
participants in different ways. Ahmad’s disillusion with Islam is to some extent
related to his experiences in Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Ahmad disliked the
strictness of life in Pakistan, found both at school and in the societal and self-
imposed rules of daily life. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to know where
Pakistani culture ends and Islam begins; the two are in many ways intertwined
today. We see this with his numerous self-corrections when he speaks about
Pakistani Muslim friends; he corrects “tradition” to “religion” and later replaces
“culture” with “religion,” appearing confused as to what exactly it is that compels
his friends to act the way they do (and perhaps he is aware of the difficulty in
locating what is culture and what is religion). The experiences of sternness and
hypocrisy that Ahmad reported during his time in Pakistan made him disillusioned
not only with what he saw as Pakistani culture, but also with the Islam that was
practiced there. In Ahmad’s experience, his friends in Pakistan would generally not
know why they were conforming to the normative framework in their society. His
own parents did not force him to conform, however, and according to him that
“was probably a catalyst for me to leave the past, the Pakistani culture [and Islam]
behind, I guess, and integrate with the Canadian culture more.” As we have seen,
legal pluralist scholars have addressed the issue of legal implants – legal practices
that migrants bring with them to countries they move to (Menski 2006, 26), and
the plurality of manifestations of a seemingly uniform legal ‘system’ (e.g. Islamic law).

Informants reported push-back from their families on these issues. Leyla’s husband is uncomfortable with her consumption of haram food, and he is furthermore worried about the presumably physical and spiritual effects of this on their baby, which Leyla was carrying at the time of the interviews. Similarly, Ahmad mentions how his parents, while aware that their son does not consider himself a Muslim, “still don’t want me to eat haram food and [to do] all [other impermissible things]”. While Ahmad is not well-versed in Islamic theology or prescriptions, he is nevertheless encouraged by his family to adhere somewhat to their vision of Islamic practice, and as such becomes to some extent immersed in an evaluation of and discussion on right and wrong that is happening within Muslim communities and families. Ahmad is thus forced to some extent to confront Muslim regulatory orders to which he does not subscribe. While this shows that young twice migrants follow their own ways whilst not straying particularly far away from the established norms, Islam remains an aspect of social and communal life, as well (Mondal 2008).

Though Mahnaz notes she no longer has access to her favourite (fast) foods, this has not prompted her, unlike Leyla, to stop eating zabihah halal food. Yet Mahnaz asserts she is “not that religious”. Just as Dawud links the concept of a “practising” Muslim in his statements above with the degree of conformity to normative laws, Mahnaz also notes that, “I think I am religious, but not that
religious, [to the extent that] I’d start wearing abayas everywhere.” In these instances, the arguably subjective spectrum of religiosity is not defined by spiritual ‘level’, status or personal conviction, but by visible markers of conformity. This seems to be the case when Mahnaz argues she is “not that religious” despite conforming to all dietary laws and praying five times a day, which she herself had mentioned as important aspects of Islamic practice. Yet her statement that she is not so religious mentions dress codes, a very visible marker of religious adherence. Wearing an abaya and/or a headscarf would mean that others would not only be able to tell Mahnaz is Muslim, but also that they might on some level try to evaluate and assess her ‘religiosity’. The fact that Mahnaz prays regularly and only eats halal food is presumably not obvious to anyone but her, yet both are undeniably ‘religious’ practices. In Mahnaz’s words, however, she is still not “that” religious, and her choice of clothing is cited as a (partial) explanation, while Dawud links his similar statement to the fact that he “dates”. These two things - dating and not wearing loose-fitting clothing - are sometimes points of friction between not just the older and younger generations of Muslims, but also between Muslim peers. And while prayer is something that would be difficult to ‘argue away’ and is rarely challenged, dress customs and gender relations are constantly being re-interpreted and negotiated by young Muslims both in the West and in Muslim-majority

83 It is possible that frequent unfavourable media portrayals of Muslims contributes to her reluctance to wear a headscarf/abaya, however she did not mention any such reason.
countries. Conforming to expectations of how to dress and how to interact with the opposite gender stand out as visible markers of ‘piety’, and thus Dawud and Mahnaz can state they are “not that religious” despite spending personal time learning more about their religion and upholding dietary prescriptions.

While we saw in Chapter 2 that Griffiths (1986) maintained that ‘law’ is a term signifying social control, F. von Benda-Beckmann (2002) argued for a conceptualisation of law that encompasses subjective, normative and cognitive understandings. His conceptualisation still centres on the concept of control; Melissaris (2005) de-emphasises control somewhat when he argues that the normative order that underpins different legal orders can only arise when people share a coherent view of the world. Drawing on these and other legal pluralist scholars, I argued for a focus on law that regards it as not only what compels individuals and groups to act the way they do, but that also investigates laws’ impacts on social relations – and vice versa. The responses from the interviews in this study are also a reminder that research on law and legal pluralism should not, in aiming to widen the scope of what counts as ‘legal’, reduce socio-cultural and spiritual understandings to mere instruments of control or mediation.

When asked what being “practising” entailed, Murtaza responded that he tries to “follow the five pillars”. Murtaza’s faith goes beyond ritual obligations, however. Given that Murtaza mentions his desire for a personal reason and motivation to practice his faith after his move to Canada, and his regular and voluntary engagement with the spiritual text of his faith, the Quran, we can assume
that “practising” to him does not mean simply obeying religious or cultural normative laws, but is connected to spirituality and includes frequent ‘connections’ to and practice of his faith beyond what is obligatory. Similarly, Dawud does not in reality restrict religious ‘practice’ solely to obligatory acts. Dawud has a personal interest in engaging with matters of faith, including but not limited to learning the history of various religions. This paints a more complex picture of Dawud’s engagement with faith and practice, and by his own account he is informed to the extent of making active choices to follow the tenets of his religion.

As we have seen, the young twice migrants in this study displayed an acute awareness of how others expect them to behave, whether these others are parents, spouses, peers or their wider social environment. They thus keep all of this in mind whilst making decisions about their own life, though this in no way means that they do not make their own conclusions and choices. It does mean, however, that they sometimes negotiate and utilise loopholes and differences of opinion in religious matters, as is the case with Dawud when he knows he is not ‘supposed to’ drink, but does date girls. This confirms Vanderlinden’s (1989) assessment that legal pluralism is a condition that is reflected in one’s way of being. Through migration, generational shifts and exposure to a variety of ways of life through their social networks, the twice migrants in this study continuously confront their behaviours, choices and lifestyles.

The participants also sometimes struggle with some requirements of faith, as was the case with Dawud (whose dating practices are contested in Muslim
communities) and Leyla’s struggles with keeping zabihah and halal. Sometimes, like Ahmad, they reject them altogether. Participants are very familiar with ways of being that are different from the ones in which they were brought up; Mahnaz, Shireen, Dawud, Ahmad, Murtaza and Leyla have all lived in radically different environments and have personal connections with both places and people with divergent praxes. The Muslim participants struggle with determining what it means to be a practising Muslim, and in this pursuit compare themselves with others and sometimes, as was the case with Dawud and Mahnaz, underemphasise personal devotional acts in favour of more visible markers. Murtaza, Dawud and Shireen all reported being very interested in learning about the ethos behind their faith and practising out of conviction rather than just convention. Ahmad’s interest in philosophy means he continues to navigate and negotiate his understanding of how to live his life, as he does not identify with one specific spiritual or normative framework. Participants’ actions thus often reflect deep understanding of the social realities of different ways of life, and they actively choose and re-negotiate their own preferences and environments to assist and facilitate their own personal and spiritual growth. The twice migrants in this study usually reflect an understanding of religion that is beyond just regulations of social and personal conduct, and confirm its intersection with many other social, spiritual and indeed human needs. The participants are all still very young, and their views are constantly evolving in tandem with their own growth. In this pursuit, participants either rely on or reject – sometimes both -community support to aid their own understandings.
The participants in this study demonstrate skilful negotiation of identities and laws. They reject, reinterpret, merge and synthesise where they need to, and draw from different sources to continually learn and navigate their vast vault of values and practices. While most of the participants certainly derive laws from religion or philosophy and culture and experiences, they also derive more than laws: laws plus spirituality and meaning. Although Ahmad is no longer Muslim, he still articulates thoughts on what it means to be ‘religious’ that are a combination of practice in the form of action and of spirituality and philosophy, in line with mainstream Islamic thought (and arguably that of other faiths). On the one hand, he argues that his non-religious university friends are “hedonistic” and lack a framework for and interest in distinguishing between right and wrong. While he is reluctant to adopt a ‘fixed’ framework for himself, Ahmad claims his Muslim friends from high school are able to resist the peer pressure to for example drink and do drugs because they are “more religious”. This conceptualisation of religiosity alleges a dichotomy between lack of religion and presence of religion, as the ‘lawless’ and the ‘principled’, respectively. On the other hand, Ahmad does not reduce faith or religiosity to obeying norms: “I would say there’s something sacred... something you can’t talk about, I guess... So I guess in that sense I would be religious.”

This reflects the above understanding that culture and religion do

\[84\] Ahmad is referring to an earlier conversation on Daoism and notions of ‘Tao’ as a universal principle.
perform regulatory functions, but that they also cannot be reduced so just 'laws', as they go beyond social functions to also affect personal desires and understandings. Shireen noted how her religion primarily worked to shape her character, meaning not just how she would conduct herself and what she would prioritise in life, but also other mental and moral qualities. In addition, she argued that practising Islam was for her when she was younger also about "being true to who I was and speaking out about things and raising my hand in class and sharing my values and perspectives."

The social environment impacts on twice migrants in various ways to influence their practices and priorities: Murtaza claimed he needed to understand Islam more when he came to Canada before returning to practising his faith; Shireen wants to be in environments with more Muslims to counterbalance the environment at work; and Leyla stopped wearing a headscarf in the USA as she felt uncomfortable continuing to wear it there. Hence context is important in understanding why twice migrants make the choices they make, and helps us to make sense of attitudes and strategies in navigating several sets of values, expectations and idea(l)s. Thus, living in a country where you are frequently regarded as 'different' will affect one's behaviour to some extent. It can teach you to think a certain way about your and others' place in the world and within a social system, and it can also act as markers of departure from previously held beliefs, and as accelerators of change for the participants and their families. Menski’s (2006) note about the culture-specific elements of law ring true, at the same time
as variances in experience mean every individual expresses their own specific understandings.

As Dawud notes, being a Muslim in Kuwait is a given, and is facilitated in every avenue and aspect of life. It is primarily the move to Canada that prompts a need to actively seek food, spaces and resources that specifically cater to Muslims. Likewise, it is in Canada and the USA, and not in Egypt, Pakistan, India, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Malaysia or even Kenya, that one stands out as a Muslim. Living in a country where you are different affects one’s legal navigation; to be a practising Muslim in Canada can be more of an active choice than in Pakistan or certain other intervening countries (Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, etc). Certainly, being a minority is an opportunity to reflect, and to re-evaluate your and others’ place in the world and within a social system.

5.4 Why Twice Migrants?

As was elaborated upon in Chapter 2, I realised that the individuals in this study fit the category of ‘twice migrant’ rather than that of ‘onward migrants’. The latter has, in the scholarly literature, tended to denote migrants who migrate several times primarily for financial reasons. None of the twice migrants in this study reported having migrated for economic reasons when coming to Canada. Instead of economics having primacy and other concerns and activities following from that, the twice migrants in this study did hope to earn well after migrating, but monetary concerns are secondary to what are perceived as better cultural and social
conditions in Canada. The families of the twice migrants who participated in my project reported benefitting (monetarily) considerably from their situation in their transitional countries, and moving to Canada resulted in loss of jobs and much less secure financial prospects, not to speak of the heavy costs involved when one relocates to another country. As skilled professionals, several of the parents of the twice migrants had to spend years to become certified to work in Canada, and would have to depend on their saved income during that time. Moving away from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in particular, then, was in financial respects a ‘downgrade’ and a loss. While financial incentives certainly served as a motive for the move to the GCC states, Muslims from South Asia who are recruited for labour, in Saudi Arabia in particular, often feel an additional pull to the country due to its historical and present significance for adherents of the faith (Al-Rasheed 2005, 2). This was certainly the case for the twice migrants in this study.

It was the educational prospects and the wish to provide the ‘best’ chances for their children which led the families to eventually move to Canada. Permanent settlement in the GCC countries was unrealistic, with no chance of receiving citizenship or for their children to become fully ‘Saudi’ or ‘Kuwaiti’. Returning to the personal start location was not an option, as the children were rarely familiar with life there nor enthusiastic about living there. Shireen’s family had left India generations ago, and thus ‘returning’ there was not an obvious choice. Thus the concept of transnationalism, as defined by Portes et al. (1999) as a particular transnational activity of an economic nature, does not adequately describe the situation
of twice migrants, whose second/third migration is too disruptive to be motivated by economics alone.

The present study concerns itself mostly with migrants who have not lived in their transitional countries for generations, unlike Gujarati-East African or Indo-Guyanese twice migrants. Although one of the individuals who participated in this study is a Memon Gujarati twice migrant, the dynamic of the East African Indian diaspora in Canada seems to be somewhat different from that in the UK as it is reported in Ballard (1994). The profile and demographics of the twice migrants in Caravelis’ (2007) study is also different from that of the migrants in this study, as was noted in Chapter 2.

The twice migrants in this study have varied experiences, each with a unique story that does not negate their commonalities as individuals who have experienced immersion into numerous and diverging spaces and cultures. While all of the respondents reported open-mindedness and adaptability as some of the characteristics they acquired through their experiences, they all still struggled with articulating where on the spectrum of ‘here’ and ‘there’ they fit. For twice migrants, the whole spectrum of who they are is kept alive through speech, actions, habits, solidarity, connections, and so on. As they often do not fit anywhere in the understandings of national and cultural imaginaries, and subsequently face being othered in multiple contexts, twice migrants are perhaps well situated to recognise and resist exclusionary narratives by virtue of their own experiences.
5.5 What is Identity and How is it Formed?

In Chapter 2 we read that, according to Portes (1999), migrants who maintain ties to their personal start location, and who have an interest in the politics of that place, can have a disconnect with their “host society”, i.e. the transitional country. The findings from this study, however, show something different. Only two participants, Murtaza and Leyla, expressed more than a cursory interest in the socio-political happenings of their personal start locations, yet Murtaza and the other participants who had lived in both Pakistan and Saudi Arabia/Kuwait still felt alienated from Saudi/Kuwaiti society, largely as a result of not speaking the language, from being physically isolated from the native population and from being othered. Shireen, on the other hand, feels no connection to India where her ancestors are from, though she does visit Kenya occasionally. Despite growing up in Canada and being Canadian her whole life, her identity was questioned by other (presumably white) Canadians. This, she explained, coupled with her growing up in ethnically homogenous neighbourhoods, was a confusing experience, especially given the reputation Canada has for being diverse and multicultural. She is expected to both participate in a larger ‘Canadian’ culture and have her ‘Canadian-ness’ questioned. As Ang (2012) points out, Shireen can never become white, which is why she will be not become quite Canadian enough. Although Canada presents itself as a multicultural society, through interactions with white Canadians, Shireen has found that being Canadian means being white Canadian. As a white Canadian, one does not need to explain one’s origins or cultural heritage, one just is. A white
Canadian’s Scottish or German or English ancestry is of peripheral importance, hardly worthy of side note, while Shireen’s appearance puts her Indian-ness (since few know about the existence of people of Indian origin in Africa) at the centre of how others see her. This is doubly ironic since Shireen does not identify with India whatsoever, though she does identify with being Memon. As Castles (1987) pointed out, the line of foreignness begins and ends with skin colour; it is only Shireen’s ‘foreignness’ by virtue of the colour of her skin which prompts white Canadians to interrogate her about her ancestry (as she has no accent, she dresses like most Canadian women her age, etc).

None of the participants exhibited any notion of being ‘caught between cultures’ per se. Ahmad, who is on his own personal philosophical path, is fully capable of managing a life where his family and many of his closest friends are practising Muslims. Dawud, who dates girls but doesn’t drink, neither hides this from his family nor expressed being distressed by doing something less orthodox. Leyla, who struggles with eating purely zabihah halal meat, does not hide this fact, but presents it as a challenge she hopes to overcome with time. While Leyla argues that a “whitewashed” person of Iranian origins is no longer regarded as Iranian, her husband exhibits an acceptable level of being “Canadianised” in his enthusiasm for things like camping outdoors. Leyla draws the line quite clearly, maintaining that a healthy relationship with one’s cultural heritage includes visiting one’s “home” country/ies and being able to communicate in the languages of these places.
Through analysing my data and reviewing the literature, I became interested in how identities are shaped by life events and racism/othering. What many discussions on identity lack is an understanding of the action of othering, and its impact on the discourse on cultures and identities. In the literature (Castles 1987; Portes et al 1999; Hall 1990) we saw that migrants, and other marginalised groups in society, become groups on two levels: they are envisioned as a homogenous group by the dominant societal groups, and they themselves react to the categorisation and discrimination experienced by forming bonds of solidarity.

One way the participants in this study understand themselves is through contrasting their experiences with the dominant populations of the countries they have lived in, which often rejected them or treated them as strangers. This leads to participants formulating alternative identities. Difference, as with the Martiniqais and Jamaicans (Hall 1990) thus becomes a point of convergence for diverse groups of (twice) migrant youth, who use reminders of that difference to evaluate and re-evaluate their identities as they grow older. Related to this is ‘brown’ twice migrants in meeting with ‘white supremacy,’¹⁸⁵ in the preference for Americans in

¹⁸⁵ Used here following Ansley (1997, 592 in Gillborn 2006, 320): “[By] ‘white supremacy’ I do not mean to allude only to the self-conscious racism of white supremacist hate groups. I refer instead to a political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings.”
Saudi, and in ‘Canadian’-ness as whiteness. Discrimination and lack of cultural understanding on the part of others are thus among the reasons why twice migrants eventually to some extent seek and create communities with people like themselves. At the same time, they reject whatever of their parents’ or personal start location’s cultures and understandings that does not make sense to them.

The literature also made me interested in whether identities and belonging were multi-centred, and whether they were changing over time. For Leyla, Saudi Arabia is not ‘home’, though Egypt is. For Mahnaz, Saudi Arabia is a home that is distant, that offers some attractive benefits but that ultimately might be too difficult to return to. Pakistan, however, as a place, is somewhere Mahnaz has never felt she belongs, though she identifies with a Pakistani-Saudi identity created by memories and meanings that make her experience uniquely trans-national. Thus I accept the notion that the making of identities always “involves a construction, rather than merely a discovery, of difference” and should be understood not as something owned or possessed by individual or collective actors but rather as “a mobile, often unstable relation of difference” (Gupta and Ferguson 1997, 13 in Bhambra 2006, 34).

The production of a “locality” as defined in Chapter 2 becomes increasingly challenging due to “a condition of transnationalism” which creates a “growing disjuncture between territory, subjectivity and collective social movement”
What emerges instead are “new translocalities” (ibid.). Consequently, one can say that the understandings of transnational migrants could become super-localised or specific, and the pool of people who share their experiences and multiple transnational exposures, shrinks correspondingly. At the same time, they are able to relate to an increasing number of spaces and people and cultures, and are able, should they wish to do so, to forge personal and professional connections transnationally. There are benefits to being a citizen of multiple nations, and likewise there are certain benefits in claiming multiple identities (Sreberny-Mohammadi 2013, 117). All the participants in this study were familiar with and able to engage with at least two physical spaces, in addition to managing increasingly diversified and specific cultural and spiritual affiliations. Even Ahmad, who argues that he has “left behind” his Pakistani “past” in favour of a more Canadian identity, is immersed in experiences specific to young South Asians. This is epitomised in his exchange with his friend in Chapter 4, where they complete each other’s sentences as they rush to explain what a Pakistani “marriage atmosphere” is like.

The practice of looking into the specificity of minority or migrant ties and affiliations is highly relevant in relation to twice migrants, who often have conflicted feelings about the countries they have lived in, but, at least in this study, also express an affinity and sense of attachment regarding the specific cities they have lived in. Just as Sephardic Jews longed for their familiar cities in Spain (Clifford 1994), Mahnaz’s sisters longed for the city of Khobar in Saudi Arabia, and
Murtaza admitted that his life would probably have been easier in a Saudi city with more South Asians. Likewise, Shireen spoke affectionately of Mombasa.

Furthermore, the individuals in this study highlighted positively the high number of immigrants of South Asian heritage in the GTA. Murtaza noted how, in some areas of the GTA “we are not the minority” – “we” could signify South Asians or Muslims (or both), or brown people or immigrants in general. Shireen noted that places like Mississauga have more Desis and offer a different environment for young people of “Indian background” to grow up in.

As twice migrants experience their personal start location at a distance, compared to their parents who might have more tangible connections to those places, they are better placed to critically engage with the past and present manifestations of the collective cultures in which they find themselves, and this is true also for the places they move to. As such, they do not long for a distant, unattainable and mythical origin, but understand their connections to places in relation to actual life in these places.

In the literature, ‘hybridity’ was suggested as an emancipatory alternative to either-or identities (Vertovec 1999; Hall 1990; Ang 2012), but can one measure or record hybridity? It can be argued that twice migrants who have moved twice (or more) have gone through a double (or triple, or quadruple, depending on number of migrations) process of hybridity, gaining meanings and understandings from more than two places. In contrast to studies of racialised youths in America, who identify as “hyphenated Americans” (e.g. “Mexican-American”) (Portes 1999, 470),
none of the participants who lived in Saudi Arabia identified as ‘Saudi’ in any way, though many of them still bear affinity for the country. This is not strange, given the different nature of debate (or lack thereof) on immigrant ‘identity’ in Saudi Arabia compared to the United States, whereby the former has no official policy of ‘integration’ of migrants, and the latter has a culture that demands that immigrants become ‘American’. Twice migrants in this study who lived in Saudi Arabia or Kuwait were never expected to either adopt or adapt to local ways of life, beyond obeying state laws. Their limited exposure to Gulf Arabs means they were always maintaining ties to their personal start location, as ties to the Gulf countries were uncertain and delimited from the start. Instead of adopting hybridity as another type of identity, that may or may not be appropriate in this instance, we can look to how the individuals in this study negotiated a lifetime of change and difference. Ahmad said he had left behind his Pakistani identity and adopted a Canadian one, without specifying what either of these are. Shireen had “nailed” her “Kenyan story”, weaving her family’s migrations and her own into a more fair representation of the complexities, to be presented to someone unfamiliar with the existence of Indian East Africans (and their specific sub-groups). Neither Dawud nor Murtaza expressed a specific identity affiliation, yet when they shared their stories, they told of memories of life in three different countries, and the friendships and spirituality they had formed along the way. Leyla, who has lived in four countries, identifies as Egyptian, and maintains that her child will be Egyptian-Pakistani-Canadian; Leyla’s and her husband’s identities and cultures will be a
heritage her Canadian-born child will also be incorporated into, through language, food and visits abroad, despite (so far) having lived only in Canada. Mahnaz, who experienced in Malaysia that she had far more in common with fellow Pakistani-Saudis than with other Saudi-born or Pakistani-only people, doubts she’ll soon – if ever – become ‘Canadian’, as she connects identity to places and times where her personality, habits and beliefs were formed. Growing up or living in different cities, moving back and forth between places, and belonging to a minority group within a specific context, were ways in which each life became shaped differently. These differences in identity articulation persist alongside continuity; this is precisely why awareness of differences matters. What is a common feature is the complexity – as Shireen said, there is nothing easy to explain or straightforward about their backgrounds and lives, no lazy stereotype or convenient category that can accurately and fairly let outsiders and analysts know the answer to the question, “Who are you, and where are you from?”

As we saw in the literature review, cultural identities are highly political, and reflect the social and political climate of the countries these are negotiated in. We saw this in the case of Tham in Rastogi (2009), a Chinese-Pakistani individual who ‘discovers’ a Chinese cultural identity after living in the United States with its current discourse on identity, though she had previously staunchly identified as Pakistani. This highlights the difficulty in resisting dominant narratives on identity and belonging, and in formulating meaningful alternative understandings. Experiences of ‘identity interrogation,’ and highlighting the politicised nature of a
concept such as ‘identity,’ should be at the forefront when articulating theories about personal or diaspora identities and affirmations of belonging, as they seem to be the first instance for many twice migrants in making them question their identity and assumed ‘difference.’

Ahmad connects “leaving behind” aspects of what he saw as Pakistani culture with “integrating” with ‘Canadian culture,’ thus signifying an outward shift in practice that reflected his inward mentality better. According to Ahmad, he had had reservations about what he disliked in Pakistani culture since he was very young, and it is possible that his first move to Canada at the age of ten further convinced him to seek alternative ways of being. This rejection of ‘Pakistani culture’ ties in with his adoption of ‘Canadian’ as identity, and it seems that Ahmad does not feel that the two can be completely reconciled, though this is not the experience of Dawud, Murtaza or Mahnaz, who are all also of Pakistani heritage and at the same time identify with many of the same qualities that Ahmad likes about ‘Canadian culture’. Clifford (1994, 311) argues that “diaspora cultures” live in a tension created by simultaneous separation and entanglement, “of living here and remembering/desiring another place.” The twice migrants I interviewed did often reminisce about their past experiences and, through the many negative ones they had had, remembered fondly the ‘good times’, and often had much affinity for their personal start locations or transitional countries. Rarely were they seen to express a longing for ‘going back’ to an ‘original homeland’, except perhaps when Murtaza elaborated on his affection for a ‘lost’ Pakistan that he felt no longer
existed. Rather than ’recreating’ a lost home in the new places they move to, twice migrants I interviewed were mostly yearning for a place where they would be accepted, stripes and all, so to speak, wherever that was.

Although “ubiquitous in migration literature,” words such as ‘home’ and ‘family’ “appear self-evident but, on reflection, signal a domain of problematic assumptions, methodological complexities, and hegemonic discourses and ideologies” (Aguilar 2005 in Sreberny-Mohammadi 2013, 120). Home is always imagined to be somewhere else, whereby migrants have made a journey from ‘home’ and to a ‘host’; yet the twice migrants in this study, though most of them were born in their personal start location, do not identify that country as their home. But neither do they see the countries they lived in before they came to Canada as home. For some, home is a place to be discovered, and maybe it is in Canada where it will be created. Twice migrants, who often continue to preserve ties to transitional countries and/or personal start locations, are positioned in such a way whereby their continued exchanges helps them construct an idea of ‘homes’ and ‘origins’ that are centred in the present, instead of yearning for a (real or imaginary) past ideal.

5.6 Chapter Summary

Instead of engaging in a discourse where ‘diversity’ and ‘multiculturalism’ are undefined ideals, twice migrants have in actuality lived a multicultural reality their whole lives, and embody - through their engagement with different ways of being -
deep understanding and appreciation of a range of thoughts, ideas and identities that exist ‘out there’. In this sense, twice migrants are subjected to the condition of legal pluralism, whereby they become aware of and are confronted with other ways of being. In this chapter, I have highlighted the several patterns that are apparent from the synthesis of the data and the literature: the influence of ‘otherness’ in facilitating twice migrants’ understandings of themselves as different from other migrants and ‘natives’; the diverse and sometimes global social networks that supported participants through adjusting to life in new lands and provided new ways of being; the gradual and skilful navigation of conflicting expectations and norms; and the ongoing process that is identity formulation and navigation.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND REFLECTIONS

The synthesis of the literature and the findings of this study indicate that providing immigrants with the social and political tools and avenues to participate fully in the countries to which they move is an important incentive for them to stay and to form meaningful and long-lasting bonds to those places. Racialised twice migrants experience exclusion from the grand narratives about countries in which they live, yet are also shaped by their other experiences there. Identities are continually produced and reproduced, and are shaped by solidarity and a particular positioning within competing discourses. Future studies on identity negotiation of young migrants should take into account the role of discourses that marginalise racialised migrants and the role of such discourses in shaping identity formation. Twice migrants display an ability to use their familiarity with several cultures and environments to create interconnected, transnational social networks, which in turn shape (and are shaped by) and inform their views on how to live their lives. In order to understand how twice migrants navigate their condition of legal pluralism, individual experiences and struggles must be taken into account, and researchers and policy-makers should take into consideration the subtle differences that arise from the circumstances of each person’s life. Multiple migration is a disruptive experience that is motivated by a variety of factors, and not by economics alone. Yet multiple migration also allows for direct immersion
into numerous cultures and ways of being, providing young migrants with the tools to recognise and resist exclusionary narratives and dominant discourses.

In intentionally and involuntarily forming and joining multiple and sometimes global social networks, the twice migrants in this study not only connect with people who can relate to their experiences, but also utilise these skills in navigating laws and life. What began as a project on twice migrants’ navigation of normative legal frameworks evolved to include narratives on the experiences of discrimination and otherness that often inspired transformations and informed ideas of identity and belonging. Instead of unmasking clever circumventing of state, religious and societal laws, the moving stories of the twice migrant individuals in this study revealed barriers to identifying with the dominant population of new homes due to racialisation, and the difficulties in negotiating a legitimate personal identity and space when one is seen as a foreigner. Bearing no visible markers of their multiple migration, the individuals could neither readily be identified by others as twice migrants, nor could they always with ease present themselves as ‘just another’ migrant from their personal start location, as in some cases they had next to no experience of the place associated with their ethnicity.

The stories of the twice migrants in this study tell us about the double pressures of societal judgement and xenophobic discourses, and their effects on these individuals. The dominant discourse on migrants and ‘brown people’ in the West, as well as the pressure this discourse applies on them also while they live in the East, encourages actors to imagine themselves as either-or, loyal-versus-
unfaithful to old and new places and ways of being. Breaking free of this paradigm becomes a highly personal and challenging exercise. In places where twice migrants are welcome to stay - as when Leyla moved from Saudi Arabia and to the United States of America - they are ‘tolerated’ but are still faced with a remarkable lack of understanding by wider society, creating pressures to conform and fit in with the dominant cultures. The othering of their brown bodies and minds by wider society means these young migrants become increasingly excluded - or increasingly aware of their exclusion - from the imaginary of the countries they live in: in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia they are ‘too brown’ to be allowed to establish these places as their homes; in Pakistan and India they are out of touch with local dynamics; and in ‘multicultural’ US and Canada, they are always ‘from’ somewhere else, having to perform their supposed otherness to take part in the display of ‘diversity’. Although neoliberal economics is largely the reason why these twice migrants were able to move to Canada, they do not benefit to the point of being perfectly accepted into the fabric of Canadian society despite their monetary and social capital; even here, they are not ‘Canadian’ enough. Twice migrants are faced with the choice to accept an outside view of themselves, or to fully reject it for its opposite, or to embark on a reflection and self-discovery process; the latter is ultimately the product of a lifetime of exposure to difference.

The twice migrants in this study expressed different ways of coping with these challenges, and ended up embracing the totality of their experiences, even when they were not able to connect with it fully, as was the case with Ahmad and
his disconnect with his Pakistani origins, and Shireen’s virtually non-existent ties to India. This suggests that twice migrants are not subjugated by the discourse or unable to take control over how they are defined. They report feeling empowered by being able to exercise and express not only their cultural and religious or philosophical identities, but their young and migrant identities, all of which are manifested in their rush to embrace openness and diversity and to not judge others when they themselves have been judged. In this way, twice migrants themselves participate in creating a new reality and status quo of lived acceptance of multiculturalism, moving beyond ‘tolerance’ that pays lip-service to a mere idea, and are instead deeply in touch and in dialogue with and informed about other ways of being. Diversity is not simply a ‘nice idea’ for twice migrants, but describes their actual life experiences in the past as well as in the present. When I posited this interpretation to one of the participants, Shireen, she had this to say:

I think that’s incredibly on point. I think [we twice migrants are] so used to adapting ourselves and being on the other side of the table, that we realise what it means to be a minority and how to effectively become a part of the mosaic [of the society we are in]. So even when we’re not a minority, i.e. in some boroughs of [Greater] Toronto, we know how to treat those who are minorities so that they don’t feel as minorities. I think that is the beauty of being an immigrant. You know the importance of [that] and how to treat someone so that they shine as their true selves... Whilst allowing them to feel they have adapted to some common cultural values of their new land. Because it’s something we’ve wanted, having done it more than once... We know the effects of adaption and cultural balance, so when we see someone else go through it - we assist? That might be the hope [in the potential of twice migrants].

This is reminiscent of Edward Said, who wrote of a “plurality of vision”:
Most people are principally aware of one culture, one setting, one home; exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision gives rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions (1984 in Clifford 1994, 329).

Again I am faced with the question of terminology. Is it fair to call it a transitional country when twice migrants clearly have undeniable ties to the place(s) that qualify as such, especially if they have lived there for decades? In the case of Mahnaz, Malaysia may better be labelled a transitional or interim country, but Saudi Arabia was home at one point, and she still sometimes thinks about going back there. What is a good and appropriate term to use? Is there even one?

At first when I started, before I began collecting data, it seemed like a great term. But now, even thinking about my own relationship with my transitional country where I lived for almost twenty years, it does not feel like it is a term that is quite justified. It denies the strong ties and impact and the wealth of experiences derived from these countries we decided not to stay in. Perhaps this is also why people sometimes do call their personal start location their ‘home’ country - it is still home in as many ways as it isn’t home any longer.

While certainly privileged, the older generation of twice migrants took their whole families and children to another country to become prosperous or benefit in other ways, and by moving to Canada they – we - have started – no, continued – life in yet another place. It seems unlikely from my findings that parents of young twice migrants realise the ramifications of some of the negative experiences of their children, from being foreign and different. Being a ‘migrant’ is not an uncommon
condition, but it is one that carries much heavy baggage (Salem, 2013), and that appears strange and rupturing in the face of nationalism, patriotism, and ideologies that emphasise sameness.

With this study, the aim has not been to make identity another problem, to focus on difference rather than sameness, to engage in dividing rather than uniting. The aim is not to Other further by drawing more lines that reify concepts of “us” and “them”. Yet identity was proven to be an important context for how and why people act the way they do, and why they sometimes change their behaviours. Does migration have a pluralising effect or does it make more people conform? The study indicates that the effects are pluralising, generally. People are exposed to a diversity of ways of being and so the routes they take will be - if not always radically different - prone to expressing unique and different manifestations and rationales compared to what they would have been if there had been no migration. Interviewing young twice migrants provides a window into the legal and identity navigations of individuals who are still very much in the process of confronting how their past and experiences can inform their present and futures. However, it is not a study that can pick up the full extent of life cycle tendencies, or that can illustrate adequately whether older, more settled (in life, not space) individuals behave differently and make different choices based on other rationales. As we saw, work, pregnancy, marriage and engagement added certain layers to decision-making processes; later in life, additional layers might emerge to further influence twice migrant behaviours.
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APPENDIX A: Project Description and Letter of Informed Consent

Project title: Assembling Value Vaults and Navigating Normative Orders: An Ethnography of Urban Twice Migrants
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Questions, concerns or comments about this research project?

Please contact Dr Linda Eyre, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, email: leyre@unb.ca, or Steve Turner, Chair UNBF Research Ethics Board, email: turner@unb.ca.

Research Description

The purpose of this research is to examine how twice migrants (people who have, either personally or indirectly via their families, migrated more than once) create and negotiate their identities in relation to the pool of values they have accumulated through migrating. This research will collect information, opinions, expectations, and behaviours from urban twice migrants with an exposure to the university experience. This is to better inform theories of migration and integration, of the nature of “law” and culture, and to evaluate whether current policies are relevant and helpful, or whether they should be amended to reflect the reality of the complexities of migrant life.

The information collected is intended to inform the researcher’s graduate thesis, and it is expected that a brief report will be submitted for publication in appropriate academic journals and presented at academic conferences. In addition, the information may be used for future research undertaken by this researcher. No information that could directly identify the source will be included in data collection or any reports of this research.

This study will include a level of observation of your physical environment and actions. It will also include informal discussions. Primarily, the study includes long (more than 1 hour) semi-structured interviews, which will include questions regarding your experiences as a migrant, how you have adapted to life in different countries, and how you deal with different and conflicting expectations, values and
experiences in your life. Specifically, the discussion will centre around how you have constructed your habits, opinions, outlook on life, and expectations in life, as a consequence of what you have seen and learned so far. You are encouraged to add any information you feel will help describe and explain who you are and your sense of self. You are not obligated to answer any questions that you find objectionable, or that make you feel uncomfortable.

If you agree, this and subsequent interviews will be recorded to ensure accuracy and completeness of the information provided. Your personal information will be held in strict confidence; recordings and identifying information will be kept in a locked, secure location accessible only to the researcher, and all records of the interview will be maintained in this secure location upon completion of this research.
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I understand that participation in this research is completely voluntary, that I may withdraw my consent at any time until the project report is written, and that if I do withdraw, I am entitled to have any information I have provided erased or destroyed.

I understand that my name and any information that could identify me will not be included in any reports or publications resulting from this research, and that all recordings will be safely stored.

I understand there are no known risks to participating in this study.

I understand that information collected during the study will not be destroyed upon completion of the research, but that it will be safely stored for no more than 10 years, for future research.

I understand that the researcher might collect data from informal discussions and observations during and outside of the interview setting, and that the researcher will notify me when this happens.

By signing this document I hereby indicate that I have read this Project Description and Letter of Informed Consent, that I have had all of my questions regarding this research answered to my satisfaction, and that I agree to participate in semi-structured interviews and to be observed by Nora S. S. Fathalipour, a graduate researcher with the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton.

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2014-043.
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Signature:

Date:
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APPENDIX C: Interview Guide for Semi-Structured Interviews

Date:            Name:            Consent provided:

• Can you tell me about your life so far and how you ended up here? What would you highlight and why? Where have you lived – which countries and which cities?

• When did you move to Canada? Why did you move here? Have you lived in other cities in Canada before you came to Toronto? Did you ever consider moving to a different city or country? If yes/no, why (not)?

• How would you describe your relationship with “culture”, and what does that word mean to you? Would you say you belong to a culture, or perhaps many cultures?

• How would you describe the communities you’ve lived in, and the one(s) you live in now? What kinds of communities have you been part of, and can you describe them and how you would place yourself in them, if at all? Did you/your family purposefully decide to live in a certain area now or previously? If yes/no, why (not)?

• Can we talk a bit about some major and minor decisions you’ve made in your life? What kinds of things did you have to consider when making them? How would you describe how you ended up making the choices you made? Do you think living in different places influences how you review situations, and the decisions you make?

• How would you say your experiences were, compared to other people who are also from X country, but who haven’t moved as much as you? Do you engage with people with a similar background at all, and why (not)? What is that like, when you engage with community X/Y/Z? Are there experiences/values/things you share? Can you discuss whether there are types of people who you think have a similar or different experience growing up than you, and why you think that is?

• Has living in different countries affected you in any way? Did you change your outlook(s) or habits when you moved from country Y to country Z, and/or after you moved here? Why do you think that is/why not? How does that play out in your ordinary life? What’s it like to visit country Y?

• Additional comments? Do you have any other thoughts about what we’ve discussed today?
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