Seeking goals in the urban estuary:
How a personal migrant subjectivity is reified into productive strategies and generative social effects

Peter O'Keefe

Advisors: Iriann Freemantle & Loren Landau

O'Keefe #728516

Declaration

This work is submitted for the Masters' Degree in Migration and Displacement in the Graduate School of the Humanities and Social Sciences- University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

I declare that this thesis is my own work, that recognition has been given to the references used, and that this work has never been submitted for any other degree in any other university.

Signature------------------------------on the -----------------------------------

Peter O'Keefe

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my classmates and fellow graduate students at ACMS for the time spent learning and working together this past year, including Peter, Darius and Aline for your assistance on this project. Thank you to Kyle, Matt, Myo, Paula, Thapelo and other colleagues from Thailand and Chicago for your ideas, insights, inspirations, and edits. Thank you to JP Misago, Ingrid Palmary, Jo Vearey, Padma Dayah, Lenore Longwe, Simphiwe Goba and especially Iriann Freemantle and Loren Landau for your guidance, administrative help, frank assessments, and advisement- both on this thesis and over the course of the program. It has been a great pleasure to learn from each of you. This research only occurred because my eight research participants willfully volunteered their time, and opened their life stories to this stranger. Thank you. Finally, thank you to my parents and family, and especially my wife, Renee. Without your support, persistence, and love, this paper would not be possible.

Contents

I. Introduction

Migration is about peoples, migration is about places. My goal is to isolate- however briefly; on however insignificant a scale- that migration is also about a person and it is about a place.

Using a micro-level frame of analysis, and working from in-depth interviews in Johannesburg's migrant-rich 'urban estuaries' (Landau, 2012), this thesis considers participants' personal, subjective, understanding of their own 'migrant-ness.' I will argue that theirs is a migrant subjectivity linked to the praxis of goal seeking, rather than the achievement of belonging.

The goal seeking subjectivity is reified into pragmatic social strategies of network building, trust, and opportunity creation that undermine the concepts of generalized trust, communal social capital, and the host/migrant dichotomy. Personal subjectivies are rendered social.

Denizens fill the social space with presentations and assessments of 'mutual beneficence,' and seek out demographically ambivalent networks of commonality. The place of inward migration is altered. Personal strategies have a positive, generative, social space effect.

What this thesis forgoes are historical and critical inquiry into the apparatuses that make a place what it is; that transcribe the spaces appropriate to migrant settlement, and explain those settlement patterns through race, class, and social desirability. This thesis does not take a Barthian eye and question why mobile peoples are placed on the Othered side of social boundaries, nor a Foucauldian analysis of the powers and discourses shaping a person's social and political subjectivity. Each is necessary, each is happening, each could easily form a future iteration of this research project. But, draw away the curtain of structural forces, institutional integration regimes, meta-data on migration, and descriptive research into urban estuaries: actual lived experiences and purposive strategies remain as an under-explored component of a dense and complex migratory story.

Inner city Johannesburg is the loci for my eight research participants' inward migration experiences. They are experiences within, in response to, and generative of that place- a space at once physical and social.

I focus on person and place for two reasons. First, inward migration is under-examined at the micro-level. Most integration literature- influenced by both the sites of inquiry and the political and academic context they are produced within- examines macro-level institutional, structural, and policy concerns. Second, and by extension, key topics on inward migration receive descriptive treatment and- more importantly- normative conclusions, *because* macro-scale analysis is used. As a transition into my own research and analysis, the following pages will briefly present those topics: migration, integration, diversity, and social capital and trust.

Migration

'Migration,' is a process, not a momentary act. Van Hear, *et al* (2009; 2-3) separate migration into distinct temporal phases: outward, inward, return, onward, and staying put. The authors allow for

concomitance: onward migration *to* point B concomits with outward migration *from* point A. Returning home is also leaving and also a choice to not migrate onward instead (*ibid)*. This thesis is principally focused on the 'inward' component of migration,[1] and the related concept of 'integration.'

Van Hear, *et al* (2009) chose to theorize the phases of migration to show that *each* phase contains some agency and some compulsion.[2] This is no less true when a migrant stays put: it is an active component of migration, even if passive in appearance. Bakewell (2011) asks migration scholars to think about when the condition of 'being a migrant' and process of 'migrating' conclude. A similar query also requires close consideration: when do the condition of 'being integrated' and the process of 'integrating' come to an end? Their origin lays at the moment of entry into a new place. Their cessation is more nebulous. When does an individual stop being an integrating migrant and start being a local?

An agency-driven model allows for a circumscribed use of the term migrant: 'individuals who have moved.' It is thus a label defined by an action that always stems from personal volition. It is not a demographic category. It is not an essential characteristic externally imbued, as when the children of migrators are called 'second generation migrant,' even though they are born and reared in a single place. In that spirit, when I discuss a 'migrant subjectivity' or 'making meaning of one's migrant-ness,' what I am referring to is the sense of self originating from very specific, powerfully formative actions and decisions. This is different from, for example, ethnicity or gender, whose meaning is primarily socially constructed (Bottero & Irwin, 2003). Without discounting the importance of 'migrant' as a socially constructed and bounded class of individuals, I will claim in the analysis chapter that there is also a real, personal, sense of meaning that is developed in relationship to the material and social experience of moving.

Integration

Throughout this paper I use the term integration. It is the most commonly deployed term for capturing what occurs after inward migration. Yet, the term contains embedded normative assumptions. And these assumptions are often determined by whether research and policy focus on the act of integrating or the political and social entity integrated into. Two general schools of literature originate around this distinction.

The first, and dominant, school of integration literature- which is reflected in government integration regimes (Ager & Strang, 2004; 2008), and links back to the early-20th century work of Robert Park (1928)- can be thought of as a discourse of integration *as* belonging. It focuses on that which is integrated into.

---

[1] My point in this thesis is not to isolate inward migration from migration's other phases. For example, the meaning individuals attach to one phase of migration can be influenced either by experiences in prior phases, meaning attached to a concomitant phase, or by projecting ahead to future migration possibilities.

[2] Related to agency and compulsion, migration studies has seen debate about the labels 'migrant,' 'forced migrant,' and 'refugee,' and whether they are interchangeable (Turton, 2003; Hathaway, 2007). For the purpose of this paper I treat scholarship on differently labeled migrants as one unitary body of knowledge and reference fluidly within it. Empirical data continues to show that forced and voluntary migrants experience a similar migration process (Bakewell, 2011). The majority of all types of migrants have multiple reasons for moving, and they employ similar channels for doing so (Van Hear, *et al*, 2009).

In the analysis I will discuss a perceived host/migrant dichotomy at the place of inward migration: of migrants integrating into the host. But a migrant-receiving place is much more than a host population. Migrants integrate into networks, into labor markets (Wimmer, 2009), into documentation and citizenship regimes (Ager & Strang, 2008), and into norms of conduct and culture.[3] They integrate into the physical space. They integrate into the social field. Integration as belonging also assumes that migrants should, and should want to, be included in the physical and social space of the host. Translated into policy, a focus on belonging normatively declares that migrants should find inclusion in modes defined by the hosting society.

Academically, the integration as belonging school is able to take an empathetic view towards the migrant, but as I will discussed in chapter four, it is a school that, *a priori* to investigation, is shaped by the interests of institutions- governments, organizations, journals- that are more interested in the receiving place than the migrant in its midst. For the belonging-based school, what is to be measured is how belonging might look, how it might be achieved, and what the consequences are of its failure.

A second school of literature, which I refer as the negotiated integration discourse, focuses on the process of integrating, and on those who are migrating in. Inward migration leads to continual and strategic negotiation by the migrant- negotiating access to resources, opportunities and relationships. I see an affinity between this school and Georg Simmel. (1950, *original, 1908*). His 'stranger' enters into a new social space intending to interact and exchange. For the negotiation school, Polzer puts forth the central question around the person/place nexus:

> How do refugees (actively) get what they need to live? This question is empirical and situational, not normative and universal: *what does enable* refugees to access the things they need, rather than *who should protect them*. We should consistently be looking at how refugees gain access to actual power and resources locally, as achieved through negotiation with a variety of actors. (2008; 9, *original emphasis*)

For Polzer, the relationship between the place entered and the migrant can be fruitfully researched and understood by looking from the vantage point of micro-level goals and relationships: the way interactions occur, and the location migrants are able to strategically produce for themselves in the existing social space. I am particularly drawn to the above quote because Polzer makes strategy and negotiation situational concerns. Every environment will involve different actors and different resources, thus making different tactics and decisions more or less effective. The integration as negotiation school of literature compliments a micro-level frame of analysis, and it forms the conceptual basis for my research.

Diversity

Inward migration enhances diversity. The meaning of diversity depends on the context in which it is being examined (Faist, 2009), and this is often reflected in research methodologies. Uslaner (2011), for

---

[3] Zhou (1997) discusses the idea of 'segmented assimilation,' which is the propensity for different migrant groups in different places to eventually join the majoritarian mainstream, slip into the existing underclass, or create parallel systems of tight retained traditional networks and cultures. While I am avoiding this macro-level of analysis (for reasons further explained through the first three chapters), I mention her concept because the sort of micro-level research I have conducted can only go so far in explaining the empirical conditions of migrant lives.

example, creates a dichotomous majority/minority boundary by defining diversity as the share of the minority population.[4] In contrast, Vertovec (2007) explores the 'super-diversity' of contemporary London: multi-level overlapping differentiation within and among populations previously aggregated under demographic headings like 'minorities' or 'migrants.' From the belonging school's macro-level perspective, diversity is the intermediary determinant of how human mobility effects two key structural forces, social capital and generalized trust.

Subsequent chapters critique and condone specific authors' conceptions of diversity, and in particular the way methodologies bind together essentialized traits into demographic groups. But avoiding commonly used groupings such as ethnicity and language is nearly impossible. As Wimmer & Schiller (2002) note, they are hegemonic constructs that permeate not only our collective but also our personal understandings of the social world. Countries of origin and languages regularly entered into my interviews. They were used to delineate between social groups- both by myself and by my participants. They were used because there is not a phrase to capture the idea of 'the specific people and culture I, in particular, came from' that is more convenient and concise than, for example, simply saying 'Cameroon(ians)' or 'Eastern Congo(lese).' In most cases, I let the participant self-identify that label, that population or society of pre-migration belonging. In the following pages, when my analysis brings together multiple participants' thoughts and responses, I use the term 'traditional community.' But, to reiterate, the phrase traditional community- to the best of my ability- captures a concept as expressed by the participants themselves, as ephemeral, complex, and contradictory as that concept may be.

Social capital and trust

Integration's social scientific importance, beyond the walls of migration studies, is due to inward migration's perceived impact on social capital and trust. Each school's frame of analysis: the macro-level, 'that which is integrated into,' or the micro-level, 'those who are integrating,' instigates normative claims about social capital and trust, as well.

When a society, place, or population receives inward migrants, there is a perceived effect. On an intermediary level, migration increases diversity, and diversity has consequences. For authors like Putnam (2007), Fukuyama (2001), and Uslaner (2011), social capital and 'generalized' trust are both attributes of a political community and determinants of that community's civic and material success. The migrant benefits from social capital and trust, but the benefit is moderated. It flows through the collective and to the migrant *as member* of that communal whole (Putnam, 2007). Diversity's impact occurs at this the communal-level, as well. The normative claim is bare: when the impact of migration-related diversity is negative, community success suffers. In this view, the main rationales for studying integration are to understand and reduce negative communal or macro-level impacts of diversity. This project is inseparable from the interests of governmental and institutional funders, and in return,

---

[4] Putnam (2007; 154) states, "in gross terms, variance in [America's] basic measure of ethnic diversity can be partitioned into two distinct factors: the percentage of blacks in a given area and the percentage of immigrants in a given area" whereby the latter may produce slightly more complex diversity in a locale. Putnam, though, essentializes general migration patterns by connecting racial categories of migrants (Asian and Latino) with geographic areas in the United States.

O'Keefe #728516

authors like Putnam and Fukuyama have had a substantial influence on domestic integration and global development policy.[5]

For scholars more concerned with interaction than policy, social capital and trust are conceptualized as individual strategies, rather than communal traits. Portes (1998; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993), on social capital, and Dasgupta (1998), on trust, are therefore less concerned with migration's impact on the civic collective. More interesting is the actual praxis of interacting and exchanging resources with alters,[6] along with the texture of social relationships an individual might deploy their strategies in. A central point of analysis in chapter four will be the way trust strategies compensate for an absence of certainty (legal contracts, and the social sanction of tight-knit or traditional communities (Williamson, 1993))[7] and therefore allow relationships and transactions to develop between individuals of diverse backgrounds. Recent research by Laurence (2013) and Wessendorf (2013) provide valuable insights into the way a place's diversity interacts with personal social capital deployment and trust strategies. Wessendorf, in particular, finds individual strategies scaling-up to effect the social space, rather than the sort of normative claims made by Putnam and Uslaner about what communal-level, ideal-state, social and civic space ought to entail.

My own analysis attempts to follow in a similar vein. I will work upward from the individual to the place as social space, from first the personal subjectivies and then the personal strategies (including the deployment of social capital and trust) of individual migrants. Portes & Vickstrom (2011) have severely questioned the validity of Putnam's (2007) findings on diversity and community-level outcomes. But Putnam's normative claims and his conceptual, macro-level, frame of analysis continue to hold sway within academic and policy circles. Localized qualitative studies such as Wessendorf's remain the exception rather than the rule in integration studies. The analysis chapter will return to each of these points in far greater detail.

I have presented an overview of the above concepts because they are the pathways between my research and contemporary academic conversations. Their problematic assumptions, conceptual conflicts, and spaces for exploration shape this essay's analytical and methodological decisions. But

---

[5] The World Bank has had fixations with social capital's utility in developing countries (Woolcock, 2001) and Ager & Strang's (2004) "Indicators of Integration: Final Report" for the UK Home Office explicitly includes a Putnam-esque reading of social capital and generalized trust. The research/funding context of both documents is aligned with prescribing policy-level solutions to person-level conditions.

[6] The term 'alter' is taken from social network research. Its paired term is 'ego.' (Willems, 2005). A dyad, or two-actor link, between one's self and another person would be an ego-alter tie. 'Alter' is, in my mind, a clean crisp word that can replace 'the other,' 'someone,' 'anyone else,' et cetera. 'Ego,' on the other hand, has too many colloquial meanings and its use would add far less to the clarity and the flow of this essay than 'alter' is capable of providing.

[7] Social sanction supposes that low-cost relationships exist within a traditional community because of a mutual belief between two actors that they are affected by similar social forces, including those that provide sanction and thus certainty to their engagements (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). These relationships have a further reduced cost because the forces creating certainty dovetail with network structures which allow two members to credibly believe that they 'know' their alter at a far lower cost than is required for an equivalent amount of knowledge about an outsider.

O'Keefe #728516

those academic conversations either strive for a false generalizability (Morgan, 2007) or derive from and are shaped by research sites that differ from my own. My approach towards this literature- a skepticism of Putnam, an appreciation for Polzer, and a fellowship with Wessendorf, for example- is also determined by the conditions found in the particular place of my interviewees' integration experience. It is that place, inner city Johannesburg, to which I now turn.

II. Place: Johannesburg and 'urban estuaries'

This paper is about the relationship between person and place. Place is as social as it is geographic. Place is filled with social networks as much as physical infrastructure. For this thesis I use the term 'social space' as a richer term for 'place.' In its use I mean to capture the way individuals concurrently experience physical location, the persons within it, relationships among those persons, and the presence of structural forces. Social networks, therefore, are treated as a part of the place itself- a characteristic of the social field with which the person interacts. And just as individuals generate social networks, the meaning and the material of the environment are shifted by the way space is used (Lefebvre, 1991). Gieryn (2000, 466) employs a similar conception to state: "place is not merely a backdrop, but an agentic player in the game- a force with detectable and independent effects on social life." I find this to be a valuable way of understanding the inner city: not a container with convenient spatial boundaries for defining my research site, or a "bundle of analytical variables used to distinguish one neighborhood from another in terms of its economic or demographic features" (*ibid*), but an active character: instigator, abettor, and impeder in stories of inward migration. I adopt the phrase 'urban estuary' in part because I enjoy the way these two words capture the *character* of the inner city social space.

I am purposively avoiding an analysis of the forces of power and control that situate most of my participants in a space of abandoned high-rises, exited bohemian enclaves, and limited formal economy; in a condition of working in uncertain and underpaid industries; a condition of struggling to prove claims to asylum. As I discussed in the introduction, the rationale for this paper is not to submit inner city migrants to a poststructural or neo-Marxist dissection of power, hegemony, and control. Watts (2005) is particularly critical of the absence of such analysis among key writers like Simone (2004) and Mbembé & Nuttall (2004). Nuttall & Mbembé (2005; 199) reply that, "an analysis based on political economy alone can hardly account for the changing inventory and the rich textuality of Johannesburg's citiness, its unsettled appearances, and its restlessness: the simultaneity of order, disruption, and abrupt interruptions." Watts would prefer that the question, "under these conditions, what is happening and how?" were replaced by "why is it happening under these structural and repressive systems of control?" There is a vastness underlying the latter question. I leave it to far better minds then mine.

As a place of peoples and their personalities, their cultures, their demographics and density, and especially in their raw tendency to move rather than stay put, Landau (2012) terms migrant-receiving areas 'urban estuaries.' Urban estuaries are spaces of intermixing and mobility. The term, first and foremost, refers to a condition of the social environment. As such, different groups in the same physical place can reside within or without of urban estuaries. For example, Somalis in Johannesburg occupy a more stable social space than most other nationalities (Jinnah, 2010).[8] Working from data provided by

---

[8] It is worth stating that Johannesburg is a very large city with a great variety of physical and social environments. Migrants move to all corners of the metropolis and therefore experience their surrounds in all manner of ways. For example, Harrison, *et al* (2012) chart the geographic dispersion of Chinese migrants at different income levels.

the African Cities Project, Landau (2012; 6) describes urban estuaries as spaces "shaped by multiple agents bound largely by their transience and marginalization" where "ethnic/national heterogeneity and cultural pastiche are often the empirical norms." Urban estuaries lack a static, rooted, 'local' host as much as they lack migrants intent on establishing permanence. This creates "extraordinary levels of heterogeneity (super or hyper-diversity) and mobility coupled with remarkably low levels of social capital" and urban estuaries are thus "devoid of hegemonic cultures or social authority" (*ibid*; 7). It is important to note the seeming 'negativity' in these findings. The factors missing: stable hosts, social trust and capital, permanence- are the ingredients that the belonging-based integration discourse relies upon. They are the solid ground to which migrants are assumed to anchor their lives.

For Simone, the 'negative' estuarial environment is the necessary material for positive opportunity and innovation. Of particular importance is the lack of clearly defined regulation and "notions of how the city is to be inhabited and used" (Simone, 2004; 407). For Simone, denizens of such spaces create regularity- they anchor themselves to their environment- precisely by circulating, redefining, and collaborating within "a broad range of spatial, residential, economic, and transactional positions" (*ibid*, 408).

Landau and Simone both find governing and institutional structures noticeably absent- incapable of guiding the use of space or the social realm of interactions and transactions. The state is unable to enforce its will in estuarial environments. At the same time, there is a central empowerment of non-governmental actors and structures. A chilling example is the causal relationship between weak state authority and South African xenophobic violence of 2008. Misago, *et al* (2010; 178) found that two key differentiating factors between similar locations with and without violence were "the micro-politics of township and informal settlement life" and the weak penetration of state power.

As a physical environment, inner city Johannesburg is fairly straightforward and legible. Hillbrow's streets are in the shadow of high-rise towers that taper downward, across the neighboring suburb of Berea, and into the mixed residential lots of Yeoville. These were discernibly once spaces of greater affluence: Yeoville sits perched on a rise of land overlooking exclusive secondary schools filled with the children of Johannesburg's elite. Hillbrow's now-informal apartment blocks were once the playgrounds of the city's bohemian young professional class. The economic and spatial transition out of apartheid is present in the absence of walls, the openness of property in the area. Be it the distant Sandton or the neighboring Observatory, the opposite form of enclosed affluent living is never far from the mind (Bernard; Denis, interviews). [9]

This openness expands into the street. Hillbrow can feel like an open-air market settled on top of a community meeting hall. Both Denis (interview) and Simone (2004) describe the way trade and presentation to the social field are enacted on the street corners and shop doors of the inner city. It is a place that seems custom-built for the chance encounter and the discovered opportunity. After finishing my conversation with Bernard, we walked out the front door of the Yeoville library, onto the jostling

---

While lower-skilled workers center on the ethnic enclave of Cyrildene, staff of state-owned companies move close to their offices in Sandton and often remain there for the course of their time in South Africa (*see also,* Zhou, 1997).

[9] Real names have been replaced with pseudonyms throughout the text.

sidewalk of Rockey Street- the suburb's main commercial avenue. He immediately greeted a former classmate and the man's young children. As we spoke a neighbor passed by and joined in the conversation. She had warranted a brief mention in our interview, a woman of a different national background who often watched Bernard's children. Twenty minutes earlier he had stated, "Yeoville, Berea- this place is my village. [...] If we go down there- if we stand up with both of us [on the street]- even now- you'll see people will be greeting me." With every visit to Yeoville I see people engaged on street corners far removed from Rockey. Just people who stop to talk. I started noticing that it was from the corner that individuals can look down both streets. They can make such conversations possible by seeing others from afar.

On a ridge at the top of Yeoville, divided by height and by a four-lane thoroughfare from a popular football pitch in Hillbrow, is a small open field aside the two-story skeleton of a never completed apartment block. This, ridge, too, was once a chic address in Johannesburg. The view. The exclusivity of the mount. The small field provides one of the city's most stunning views across the Central Business District (CBD), and the stadium where Mandela famously used rugby as an olive branch to the post-apartheid Afrikaner. Today, this spot at the top of the ridge is filled with constant prayer: small groups of men and women, mostly non-South African, mostly from Zionist churches that amalgamate Christianity with traditional African beliefs (Zulu, 2012; 33). A number are always alone, practicing the pastoral technique; independent churches flourish. Such is the run, from north to south, from valley to mount, in Yeoville: the manicured collegiate reminder that in the time of segregation the rich and influential allowed their most precious possessions to study in Yeoville's shadow. Northward past snippets of constant conversation on the suburb's gridded streets, alongside the few Johannesburg abodes without walls and electrical fencing. Across the unending activity of Rockey Street. Uphill past stout apartment blocks, which one participant says remain in the hands of South Africa's "old military-industrial complex" (Fela, interview). Past unassuming single family houses that have been converted into ethnically-defined social space: The Nigerian House, now a restaurant, where I met with Denis; The Ivorian House, with a proprietor but little for sale, football on a television, remnant decorations from some celebration months earlier, and my participant, Sébastien's, first entry point in the suburb. And above all of these, looking over the city center with its critical proximity of commerce and transportation, fall the prayers and practices of an illegal, unwanted, population unafraid of repercussions from enacting their faith in so public a manner.

Johannesburg is a space of opportunity and exclusion. There are practices taking place in the inner city which would be impossible elsewhere. There are opportunities built upon, built almost only upon, the very presence of so many people from so many backgrounds- what Simone (2004) terms 'people as infrastructure.' It is a space of precarity and challenge. It lacks cohesion and trust between and among migrants and locals (Landau, 2006). The inner city is a mélange of ethnicities and economic activity, a space to increase opportunities by engaging with the skills and networks of others (Simone, 2004). Both the neighboring business district- which is itself now filled with semi-formal residence- and Hillbrow were sites of xenophobic violence in 2008 (though as I will discuss below, such attacks were generally warded off within the migrant-rich inner city corridor) (Duponchel, 2013). Part of my research rationale is to reconcile this opposition of opportunity and exclusion. How is it that a social space such as

Johannesburg can provide opportunities while also being the site of xenophobia, discrimination, and distrust? As Smart (2001; 31, in Watts, 2005) states, "we need to pay more attention to areas in which control seems to be conspicuously absent, where neglect is more apparent than surveillance." In the mixing of the estuary, this attention needs to begin by understanding the logics and intentions of the person located therein.

III. Methodology

Migration is about person, place, and the relationship between the two. Each of these three points demands its own methodological and paradigmatic approach, and in this sense my research is rooted in a mixed-methods, 'pragmatic,' paradigm (Morgan, 2007; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Research into the place, inner city Johannesburg, is largely pre-existent and is presented above. This chapter will begin by looking at the methodologies and paradigms attached to the two other broad research themes. The interaction between person and place is captured in material facts about experiences and strategies. Approaching these facts requires a post-positivist paradigm, acknowledging that participants may not present a complete and objective 'truth,' but within opinion is useful data on the external world and personal interactions with it (Ponterotto, 2005). The person, as independent topic of research, will be considered through the perspective of individual subjectivies, for which I will apply an ontology based upon the work of George Herbert Mead and a narrative mode of analysis. After describing these two paradigms and giving examples of how they were translated into the fieldwork process, the second half of the methodology chapter will present the practical details of my research project: a summary of the eight participants follows a description of how they were selected, after which I briefly explain technical details of the interview and coding and analysis processes, including addressing the topics of ethics and privacy. I close by looking at limitations that provide avenues of further research.

Person & Place: Experiences and strategies

The interaction between person and place- and in particular, place as the social space described above- is the realm of strategy and experience. The strategic and experiential content that I am particularly interested in includes networks, relationships, and working towards personal goals. Research with a larger-n sample could produce a comprehensive analysis of strategy and experience across estuarial denizens, capturing the relationship between key personal goals and economic status prior to inward migration, for example. Alternately, differ researcher methods may provide a detailed mapping of how social networks cross into non-estuarial social spaces. I mention these examples to show that no matter how individualized the interaction between person and place is, there is a materiality about this interaction that is distinct from individual subjectivies. Epistemologically, the way experience and strategy are presented during participant interviews may be mediated by the uncertainty and subconscious subterfuge of memory and representation. Ontologically, the content explored inextricably exists in the material world. My paradigm for analyzing these topics is therefore post-positivist, acknowledging "an objective reality that is only imperfectly comprehendible," as "human intellectual mechanisms are flawed and life's phenomena are basically intractable" (Ponterotto, 2005).

To capture strategies and experiences, I asked participants about the first days after arrival, and then continued on to later events. We talked about key personal goals, challenges, and opportunities. We talked about the management of social networks and relationships. Following from the post-positivist paradigm, for these experiential topics I used thematic analysis to identify key repeating themes- first within specific interviews and then (via coding) across participant conversations.

I focused on goals and opportunities in order to keep discussions of strategies contextual; to think not of trust-strategies but trust-strategies in particular situations and with particular people. Again, context is tantamount to social space. Contextualized strategies and experiences are the interaction between *this* person and *this* place. Situating conversations around personal goals did, ultimately, lead to the observation of a nascent subjective migrant-ness that I will later describe as a rooted in the praxis of goal seeking. But my primary and initial rationale for structuring the interviews around goal-related experiences was to contextualize subsequent questions and conversations.

Person: Individual subjectivities

The eight in-depth interviews allowed me to capture and analyze not only material relationships, strategies, and experiences, but also individual subjectivies around the participants' migrant-ness. To approach the question of personal subjectivities, I begin with the ontological perspective that individuals have a sense of self, a mean-making project that they are at least partially cognizant of. Though external factors shape such subjectivities, I am primarily concerned with how the individual self-generates and reflexively internalizes influences from without. Presently, much literature uses the term 'subjectivity' in a poststructuralist, Foucauldian sense, focusing on the way power, desire, and discourse shape the subject (Dunn, 1997; 690). I am instead using an older meaning of the term derived from George Herbert Mead. For Mead, the self is both subject and object- 'I' and 'me.' Dunn describes the relationship between the two as:

> The internal conversation of the self arising out of the reflexive relationship of the 'I' to the 'me.' As the active, subjective dimension of the self, the 'I' carries on a 'conversation' with those already formed aspects of the self- those past, socially determined elements Mead designated as the 'me,' which is the 'object' of the 'I''s deliberations. (1997; 696)

In Mead's formulation, the self has a greater capacity for shaping self-image, of shaping subjectivity, than is allowed for by poststructuralism. Importantly, though, Mead still acknowledges the internalization of "attitudes and dispositions taken from others, which become the basis for how one sees oneself as a social entity as well as a means for developing an identity" (*ibid;* 693)*.* Mead's subjectivity, then, is a combination of self-conception and received meaning. When using the term 'migrant subjectivity' I, too, aim to capture the internal meaning created as the individual reflects on their migrant-ness and the meaning received from others. I aim to retain two other precepts, each stemming from Mead's pragmatic view that "meaning remains in a continual state of flux as a consequence of processes of adjustment to changing social conditions." (*ibid;* 700). First, subjectivities can change. The migrant subjectivity is thus affected by the internal and external before migration and then differently affected after arrival. Second, multiple subjective understandings of the self can coexist within, or be expressed socially, by one individual (*ibid*).

I have opted for Mead's reading of subjectivity for three reasons. The first is practical. Regardless of ontological preference, isolating and examining the forces underlying a Foucauldian subjectivity is beyond the scope of this paper. The second reason is ontological. This paper is focused specifically on the relationship between individual and social space. Mead's subjectivity allows the personal to expand into a relationship with its surroundings. The third arises from my research setting. As Nuttall &

Mbembé (2005) forcefully lay out in an academic rebuke to Watts (2005), inner city Johannesburg is a social space that lacks the sort of hegemonic, discursive, and institutional forces that lie at the heart of the poststructuralist/Foucauldian project, while retaining enough non-hegemonic sociality to affect individual subjectivies in a Meadian way.

Expressions of personal subjectivies were rarely captured through direct questions. In fact, the search for personal subjectivies was not part of my initial research plan, but arose instead from the analysis process. Narrative analysis was the key methodological avenue allowing me to realize that what I was encountering in the text somehow ran deeper than participants attempting to describe material conditions or experiences. It allowed "in-depth understanding of the subjective experience of personal individuals" (Smith, 2000; 331-2), in this case the subjective meaning made of a significant personal experience: migration, coupled with an equally significant life process: being a migrant.

Narrative analysis acknowledges that "stories 'mean' more than they say" (Andrews, *et al*, 2004; 6). Two regular occurrences within the interview texts led me to think about what narrative structure might be 'saying.' The first was temporal sequencing and omission- when stories were told out of order (Franzosi, 1998), or omitted the role of certain events or characters that ought to have been present in the story (or, which I knew should be part of the narrative because of answers to other questions). The second was the way characters- mainly the interviewee themselves, but also alters- were represented over the course of a story or conversation.

Andrews, *et al* (2004, 10) touch on the fundamental importance of storytelling to the speaker: "our time-inflected phenomenology places creating and maintaining meaning at the centre of all human activity." Additionally, the interviews' narrative tendencies led me to think about how participants wanted their stories to be heard by me, the researcher. I am thinking of Mead here, as well- that the participant had a liminal sense of how they wanted me to hear the story, but also a sense of how they prefer inscribing it into their own memory. This is Mead's subjective/objective interplay: the subjective reinforcement of personal identity coupled with a sense of how I might view him as object.

Fieldwork

Participant selection

In order to capture an in-depth understanding of migrants' goals, strategies, and relationships- the portico I have chosen as entry into participants' integration, subjectivies, and social lives- eight migrants were interviewed for my fieldwork. It is a participant pool of non-South Africans, engaging or living within the inner city of Johannesburg, from different origins, and with different experiences. These parameters loosely align to Wimmer's (2009) argument that essentialized ethnic categories can be methodologically avoided by focusing on locality, and on individuals "of varying backgrounds as units of analysis without prearranging them into ethnic groups" (*ibid*, 263).

All eight participants speak English- though each as a second or third language. All eight are heads of households. All are male. The gender uniformity was not intentional, but is a reality of the final participant pool. Though I intended to only interview individuals residing in the suburbs of Yeoville,

Berea, and Hillbrow, in execution the pool is drawn from a more diffuse geographic area- with one participant living in the neighboring suburb of Bertrams and two participants residing in suburbs (Bedfordview and Randburg) that are at a geographic and social remove. But, all eight are active participants in the social world of the inner city. I aimed to find migrants who have lived in the inner city for less than 10 years, a length of time that prior studies use to distinguish between migrants and locals (Landau, 2010). The final pool includes four participants active in the area for 12 to 19 years. Longer-term participants provided valuable insight into how the inner city has changed over a turbulent last decade and a half. My hope was to interview participants from diverse origins, and with diverse integration experiences. Both goals are achieved within the final pool.

Participants were identified with assistance from two individuals knowledgeable of the inner city suburbs. Both are graduates of my graduate program in migration, but also hold additional roles within the inner city. They provided contact information for seven potential participants. One additional interview was facilitated by a participant. A pre-fieldwork conversation with one of the key informants acted as a form of pilot-interview and, though not included in the participant pool, helped shape my interview schedule.

Starting from participant recommendations from only two individuals, I was conscious of the possibility of homogeneity within the pool. As noted above, this homogeneity did not extend to personal experiences or success. A high proportion of the participants have (or are seeking) university degrees, but this is as much derived from my need to conduct interviews in English as from the Masters'-level background of my informants. Many of the participants are also active in community organizing. I was aware of both forms of homogeneity from the outset, and considered each during coding and analysis by, for example, assuming that a preference for other 'educated' alters was primarily a matter of homophilia, rather than a generalizable, population-wide respect for individuals with degrees. Regarding integration experiences, both statuses- student and activist- seemed to increase the diversity of participant experiences. For foreigners in South Africa, neither social science degrees nor community organizing is a path to economic prosperity; participants from all backgrounds are active in a variety of economic and social arenas, and all eight interviews included topics and experiences from outside the participants' academic and activist identities.

While I was hoping for a larger number of participants, especially for the purposes of understanding the wealth of motivations for migrating into inner city Johannesburg, the eight provided ample material for analyzing the other key research topics at hand. This study is exploratory. As noted above, little information is available for understanding migrant integration experiences in urban estuaries, and major conceptual and methodological issues demanded further research on the subject. Again, the information provided by the participants was invaluable for understanding this social world.

Participant overview

Table One: Basic demographic data of research participants

Participant	Origin	Arrival	Age	Location	Education	Employment	Activist	Leadership Roles	Civic Participation
Bernard	Congo	2007	30s	Berea	MA	Factory			
Louis	E. Congo	2000	40s	Yeoville[10]	PhD (present)	Entrepreneur (transport & media)		Pastor	Savings Group
Karl	E. Congo	1999	50s	Bertrams	MA	CBO	Yes		Election Judge
Thierry	E. Congo	2001	30s	Yeoville		Odd jobs/ IT			Clan Meetings
Sébastien	Ivory Coast	2011	20s	Berea	BA (present)	Student			Ivorian House
Jean	Cameroon	2010	30s	Bedfordview	BA	Entrepreneur (Security Firm)		Soccer	Savings Group
Denis	Nigeria	2010	30s	Yeoville		Soccer Academy	Yes	CBO	Volunteering, Clan Meetings
Fela	Nigeria	1994	50s	Randburg	MA	Business (Shop)	Yes	Nigerian Union	Clan Meetings

To help contextualize the data that the eight interviewees provided, Table One and the following paragraphs provide some basic background details on each participant. Pseudonyms have been used, and care taken to avoid personal identifying information.

Bernard

Bernard, from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), arrived in South Africa in 2007 and his wife followed shortly thereafter. Political factors pushed him to Johannesburg, where his cousin lived. He recently finished a Masters' program- entrance to which was a key goal after his arrival- and is now looking for more meaningful work. Bernard has had a greater-than normal tendency to connect with diverse nationalities in Johannesburg. He lives in Berea, but his social life revolves around Yeoville. He is open to onward migration.

Louis

Louis is from the Eastern DRC. He arrived in 2000, travelling with three classmates but without relatives in South Africa. Louis is presently completing his PhD, but concurrently runs a multi-faceted small business and is a pastor at a multinational Pentecostal church. Louis married after arriving in Johannesburg. Louis lives in Yeoville, where his business and church are also located.

---

[10] For clarity's sake, three Municipally-define suburbs- Highlands, Yeoville, and Bellevue- have been collapsed into the colloquially understood 'Yeoville' label.

Karl

Karl is also from the Eastern DRC. He arrived in South Africa in the 1990s, living first in Durban and then moving to Johannesburg in 1999 to help found a Congolese political newspaper. In the years since, he has been active in creating pan-migrant self-advocacy organizations. Among participants, Karl has the most significant connections to South African officials- in part due to living in Bertrams, which has a lower proportion of foreign migrants than Yeoville and Berea. Prior to arriving in South Africa, Karl was a teacher and governmental official. While the other three Congolese participants learned English in South Africa, Karl was fluent from arrival.

Thierry

Thierry has lived in Yeoville for five years, and prior to that lived in Bertrams. His move to Yeoville was motivated by a small business opportunity (which went awry). Thierry's background in IT has led to new business possibilities, though these have not translated into economic success. Hence, he expressed the greatest willingness for onward or return migration in the near future. In part because of the failed business venture and in part because of past experiences with crime, Thierry showed a strong tendency towards distrust. Paradoxically, he is quite socially active in Yeoville and across multiple demographic boundaries. Having lived in the Eastern DRC and Kinshasa, Thierry was a rare Congolese participant fluent in both Swahili and Lingala.

Sébastien

Sébastien is studying for his Bachelors in Law. On his uncle's suggestion, in 2007 Sébastien moved from the Ivory Coast to South Africa. He lives in Berea with two other Ivoirians, but spent his first four years living in Randburg with the same uncle. Of all eight participants, Sébastien is most embedded within a traditional community of co-nationals. Sébastien is the sole participant without a spouse or children.

Jean

Jean has lived in multiple Johannesburg suburbs since arriving from Cameroon in 2008. He arrived in South Africa believing that a firm job offer was in place (it was not). Now living in Bedfordview, within the pool Jean has the least linkage with the inner city. He also has the strongest negative attitude towards Yeoville and the surrounding suburbs, seeing the urban estuary as a place of "distraction" from more important personal goals. In his interview, Jean presented himself as the least social of the participants, though he is active with a Cameroonian savings group and assists unemployed soccer players from multiple countries of origin.

Denis

In 2007, Denis left Nigeria for Europe but ended up on the streets of Hillbrow. During the 2008 xenophobic violence Denis transitioned from informal economy to community activism. His wife is Italian, and in 2010 they bought a house in Yeoville. Denis runs a successful football academy for both migrant and South African youth. Though moving to Italy is an option, Denis is highly committed to staying and working in the migrant-rich inner city.

Fela

A leader in the Nigerian Union, Fela entered South Africa in 1994. With his institutionalized leadership role and his tenure in the area, Fela spoke about relationships between national communities, within the Nigerian population, and migrants' engagement with South Africans. Fela now lives in Randburg, due to education opportunities for his child, but continues to run a store in Yeoville- where he previously resided.

Interviews

All interviews were face-to-face, recorded, and conducted in places of the participant's choosing. Interviews lasted between 45 and 75 minutes, and were based off of a semi-structured interview schedule that started with the participant's initial entrance into the inner city, then moving on to more recent experiences. The schedule 1) identified a few key goals in the participant's post-migration experience; 2) delved into the strategies and resources used to achieve- or attempt to achieve- those goals, as well as moments of failure; and 3) captured perceptions about associated key relationships, including causal factors that allowed the relationships to occur. Separate questions looked at perceptions of the inner city social space, including the role of institutional actors and traditional community leaders, relationships between and within migrant populations, places of social interaction, and crime and xenophobia. Participants were then given the opportunity to add additional information and ask questions.

During the interviews I felt that participants were open and willing to discuss their integration experiences. We had little difficulty identifying specific goals that later questions could build off of. Similarly, in most cases there was clarity about the resources and capital that went into the process, including the relationships involved. Discussing the causal factors behind those relationships was sometimes more difficult as this required a good deal of supposition, counterfactuals, and guesswork. The causal conversations tended to be fruitful in their ability to represent the participants' attitudes and preferences. All participants openly discussed their attitudes and opinions towards the social space and the denizens living around them. There were times when language differences led to misunderstandings. Most were obvious during the interview process. In transcribing and coding the transcripts, I paid special attention to participant responses that seemed geared towards a misunderstood question. Even with the general openness of conversation, and as reflected in the post-postivist paradigm, I have no misbelief that all the information I received was unbiased or unaffected by my position as a researcher.

Coding and analysis

I analyzed the interviews on a number of different levels: first looking at answers *in situ*, then examining each interview as an independent but whole text, and finally connecting the eight interviews together into a single research project.

Beginning with their transcription, I returned to each interview on multiple occasions. I used a combination of content and narrative analysis to identify recurrent themes. Identifying themes involved a fair amount of finesse. The rationale for this research project is that issues like strategies and social

connections ought to be understood within specific contexts- in this case, the context of striving for specific goals and in the estuarial space. Therefore, when coding, I needed to think about participants' comments about establishing reputation, for example, in the context of forming a savings group (Louis, interview). I also combined various facts and attitudes into common themes. In the analysis chapter, I differentiate contextualized occurrences from amalgamated themes.

The final step of coding brought themes from individual interviews together into the central topics of the research project. This was a trial-and-error process of identifying topics, rechecking code lists, adjusting topics, and returning to the original manuscripts. Those topics were then whittled down to issues that tie into my central thesis and supporting ideas. Though this means information from the interviews has been left out of my report, I have done my best to include content that both supports and contradicts my claims. [11]

The following chapter includes examples and quotations pulled from specific conversations. These examples were selected because they capture an ethos or dominant theme that I encountered across various interviews and/or in the external literature. For clarity and brevity, I have limited myself to exceptions that add richness to the broader intentions of this paper. Needless to say, the analysis chapter represents the personal opinions and perspectives of my eight interviewees, and should not be mistaken for universal truth or experience within Johannesburg's urban estuaries. Nonetheless, it is my belief that the findings are representative of my interviews and true to my participant's responses; the conclusions relevant to a broader understanding of inward migration in the estuarial social space.

Ethics and privacy

Few ethical issues arose during the course of the interviews. All participants were willing to use their real names on the Consent Form even though written and spoken instructions stated that pseudonymous signatures (or verbal consent) were sufficient. All participants understood that they would not receive remuneration, and this was a not a problem. Taping recording was at the participant's discretion, and was agreed to by all eight individuals. Finally, participants were allowed to choose an interview location that they found suitably private and secure.

I allowed pseudonyms and non-recorded conversations to protect participants' potential illegality. Only two illegal acts were mentioned in the interviews. Both times were initiated by the participant and with the stated claim that it was important to acknowledge actions as they really happened. Nonetheless, the details around both illegalities were struck from the interview transcripts (and the enumeration of these details would have added no value to the analysis that follows). As an additional privacy safeguard, when participants discussed a third party by name, those names were also struck from the transcript.

---

[11] Themes that were somewhat common in the interviews but are minimized in this analysis include: an empathetic attitude towards South Africa's right to set its own immigration policies; police and bribery; inter-denominational religious distinctions and frictions; perceived differences between inner city suburbs; and documentation.

During the proposal process, there was concern (based on prior research in the inner city) about my personal safety. However, with basic diligence- including meeting during the day and in high-traffic areas- we were able to minimize safety risks to research participants and researcher.

Limitations, and opportunities for further research

There are three potential limitations that are connected to my methodology: selecting heads of household, a limited focus on economic status during analysis, and the research site as a place that is absent hegemonic control. Variations in each could provide an interesting starting-point for future research.

All participants were heads of households. My assumption is that other family members may give different meanings to the integration experience. This might be especially true for household members like grandparents, children, and those spouses who have little say in the decision to migrate (Portes, 1997a). Similarly, different findings would be expected among household members, or households, with constrained interactions outside of the home. I believe a reasonable argument could be made that the interests of such individuals are more important than heads of households, who have more control over their lives, or than socially active actors, who have greater access to both opportunity and social support. Similarly, I would be interested in seeing a similar research project without the uniform gender make-up of my eight participants.

While presenting the goal seeking migrant subjectivity, I intentionally shy away from too much consideration of migrants' economic status. There may be a correlation between economic success and subjectivities. I avoided looking at economic status because too much research into environments like inner city Johannesburg has placed too much focus on poverty, depravity, crime, and struggle (Nuttall & Mbembé, 2005). I do think that the goal seeking migrant-ness can be found among higher-income migrants, like financial services workers in London or New York, for example. But further comparative research could help illuminate this point.

Urban estuaries are a-hegemonic social spaces. No discourse, no actor, no population, no institution has the power to exert full control or coercion. The urban estuary is submitted to not one, but to many wills. It would be interesting to conduct this research in other migrant-receiving social spaces that contain many estuarial traits, but retain something approaching a hegemonic authority. How do migrants in Alexandra Township make meaning of their post-migration experience in social space with far more South Africans? What sorts of social structures is that meaning reified into? Are opportunity and connection secondary to protection and patronage?

Conclusion

The methodologies I have applied- in-depth interviews, participants selected primarily for their engagement with the inner city, a pragmatic meta-paradigm, and the limitations and research opportunities that remain- all interconnect. The end goal of the pragmatic paradigm is "transferability," rather than generalizable or context-specific findings (Morgan, 2007; 72). I write about lives under conditions shaped by their surroundings, but believe that the following analysis helps to understand not

only inner city Johannesburg, but also similar estuarial settings across the globe. This is why 'place' is important. The transferability of my findings is contingent upon other researchers determining the similarity between their research setting and mine. I write about a particular subjectivity within my participant pool. In-depth interviews, thematic and narrative analysis, are appropriate for studying something so personal. This is why 'person' is important. The goal seeking subjectivity is not the guiding motivation or meaning-making project for all migrants, or for all denizens of the inner city. But it does reify into personal social strategies. And I propose that it does have a causal effect on the social space, especially in a place brimming with fluid mobility. Applying a different methodology within the same space could (and has) provided information on topics closely related to my own- the role of religious congregations, documentation regimes, detailed social network mapping, the police. I do not intend to establish a definitive and comprehensive explanatory model for the inner city. This project is exploratory, but it is small-frame by intention. Beginning with the personal meaning-making project is a necessary and complimentary way of understanding my research site. I hope that my conceptual and methodological decision to remain at the micro-level bears fruits that are transferable to other peoples and places, too.

IV. Analysis

The themes that I have selected for analysis are divided into three sections around the basic topics threading throughout this paper: 'Person,' 'Person & Place,' and 'Place.' Due to their natural interplay, each receives reference in the other sections. To engage with existing theory, sections include regular and, at times, in-depth discussion of related literature. Taken as a whole, the primary goal of the three sections is to explore the example of a single personal subjectivity- the meaning a person makes of their own migrant-ness- within the urban estuary, and show how it 1) is reified into personal strategies that interact with the social space, and via those strategies 2) has a generative and transformative power on the place of inward migration.

Section one, 'Person: Belonging, goal seeking, and the migrant subjectivity,' questions belonging's importance to participants' understanding of their own migrant-ness, and specific forms of belonging found in their lives. A migrant subjectivity constructed around the praxis of goal seeking is described, including some causal factors in the subjectivity's formation. The second section, 'Person & Place: Strategies and experiences,' examines social capital and the host/migrant dichotomy, and trust. Each of these topics ties to personal strategies and experiences- the movement out of the self and into the social. Section three, 'Place: Goal seeking, networks of commonality, and mutual beneficence,' concludes the analysis with subjectivity's and strategy's positive generative capacity within the social space. I argue that novel conceived 'networks of commonality' create a social space of cross-demographic and inclusive social networks. Networks of commonality communicate 'mutual beneficence'- possible and plausible future benefits because of relational and/or network connections. Mutual beneficence's generative power arises when its presentation to alters is a cornerstone mode of pragmatic action in the inner city.

Person: Belonging, goal seeking, and the migrant subjectivity

Integration and belonging

In the introduction I referenced a dominant school of integration theory where 'integration' is synonymous with 'belonging.' Through the lens of Van Hear, *et al's* (2009) phases of migration, belonging-based regimes construct integration (and thus inward migration) as a finite process, ending with a migrant included in or excluded from the host society. To the benefit of both the migrant and the host, the objective of such a regime is to achieve inclusion rather than exclusion, to minimize what Park (1928; 885) refers to as "the breakdown of social order initiated by the impact of an invading population."

Integration as belonging carries two inherently normative claims. The first is a component of popular discourse, where 'integrated migrant' acts as a synonym for a 'successful migrant.' It is an achievement that should be 'identified' by indicators (Ager & Strang, 2008), and it is a 'solution' for refugee displacements (Jacobsen, 2001). The dichotomy between migrant inclusion and exclusion operates along this connection of 'integrated' and 'successful.' A second normative component is that integration can be defined as equality between migrants and locals as measured over time. This definition is outcomes-

based. It implies that integration is measured by checking, for example, whether migrants and locals received similar wages for similar work (Böhning & de Beijl, 1995). In this usage- which is distinctly tied to a reading of migration where immigrants permanently settle[12]- the term's normative weight lies in its convolution with 'equality.'

Convoluting integration and equality requires a presumption that migrants not only will permanently settle, but that they *want* to do so. Their personal migrant objectives are somehow fulfilled through the act of remaining in their new home for a long enough time to become a measureable part of the social and civic whole. Outcomes of belonging, like equality and social cohesion, are long term. They are therefore reliant on long-term settlement. Formal policies and interventions have a central role. Formal responses like labor market equality, documentation, and political inclusion are avenues for belonging. The host is of particular concern. Turton (2003; 11) points out that an actor cannot be 'migrated'- it is an intransitive verb. By contrast, an individual can be 'included' or 'integrated,' but this requires an active host.

I would argue that the focus on belonging is not intrinsic to the integration experience, but shaped by research content and the academic context of production. Scholarship focusing on formal responses to migration logically involves locations where the government has a major impact on the integration process.[13] Articles that assume permanent settlement tended to research integration in locations where permanent settlement is most likely to occur: affluent nations with favorable economic opportunities and pathways for legal residence or citizenship.[14] But this deeply embeds presumptions of permanence into integration regimes. For example, to measure if transnational activity affects social connections between migrants and hosts, 'political participation' is often used as a dependent variable (Portes, *et al*, 2008; Itzigsohn & Giorguli Saucedo, 2002). Doing so implies that inward migration is a long enough term condition that political activity, including voting, is a real proxy for measuring the effects of transnationalism on new home engagement. Fabos & Kibreab (2007; 8) take this idea one step further while discussing urban refugees: "expectations of 'local integration' for refugees living in London, Vancouver, Amsterdam, Sydney, and New York are only possible because immigrants are able—at least theoretically— to acquire the legal rights of citizens and the possibility of full citizenship." Fabos & Kibreab's quote begins to indicate the way 'formal responses' and 'permanent settlement' interplay. The conditions that give rise to the most likely, most stable, permanent settlements are necessarily granted through formal channels: legal rights and citizenship.

Integration as belonging also derives from the academic context in which scholarship is produced. For Bakewell (2008), too much migration research- especially research on forced migration- focuses on

---

[12] Equality of outcomes cannot be measured, much less achieved, in a short period of time. It is best measured by longitudinal research (migrants moving towards greater income equality) and sometimes the attainment of equality is only aspired towards in the lives of migrants' children (*see also*, Janjuha-Jivraj, 2003, regarding business networks among second-generation entrepreneurs).

[13] *See* Strang & Ager (2010), in the United Kingdom, Korac (2003), in Italy and the Netherlands, and Valenta & Bunar (2010), who's research site is Sweden and Norway.

[14] *See* De Wit & Koopmans (2005), in the Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain, Ramakrishnan & Espenshade (2001) and Portes, *et al* (2008) in the United States.

policy relevance. Bakewell finds the cause in a desire to produce scholarship that can have a positive impact on the lives of migrants. Government actions are an area "open to influence and change" (*ibid*; 435). Policy relevant research ends up focused on "areas where policy has a direct influence on peoples' lives" (*ibid*; 440), as well as using methodologies that conform to rigorous government standards. Policy change becomes an end-goal for research, acting as the audience for both empirical and theoretical conversations.[15] But Bakewell's argues, and is mirrored in Black (2001), Turton (2003), and Castles (2003), that such a focus can fundamentally blind the research project from other central elements of migrants' experiences. The authors are also concerned that (governmental and non-governmental) institutions reinforce this by funding research to change and improve policies and programming. Once again, this funders' goal is only achieved by research specifically directed towards those conditions where policy and institutions have an impact on migrants' lives (Black, 2001). For Bakewell, Black, Turton, and Castles (who has provided significant policy-driven research for the British government), what is lost is the local-level, or migrant-driven, social world: experiences disengaged from the effects of policies and institutions.

Throughout the above line of scholarship, the exact meaning of belonging- the ideal form it should take- is debated and reformulated, but its position as the axis of assessment is rarely questioned. On a most intuitive level this is because belonging is the preferred outcome from the vantage of that which is being integrated into. And yet the preference of the host does not fully capture the normative essence of this school of thought. Integration regimes are not a punitive system of control. From the Statue of Liberty's "give me your […] huddled masses yearning to be free," to the UK Home Office integration policy directive, "Full and Equal Citizens," belonging is also seen as a reflection of the desires of migrants themselves- a desire to become part of the place they have arrived at. Most if not all of the literature in the belonging school of integration takes an empathetic view towards that preference.[16] But, when empathy for the migrant is conflated with belonging, it is always worth asking whether the research content and context have simply assumed and reproduced this image of migrants as interested in a state of belonging; of belonging as the subjective meaning newcomers place upon their migrant-ness.

The problem with such assumptions is two-fold. First, seen from the perspective of the migrant, belonging and inclusion are actions as well as states of being, and as such they can be deployed as finite strategies rather than long-term outcomes. Second, there are other core migrant-subjectivities guiding how individuals make meaning out of the integration experience.

---

[15] In relation to Forced Migration Studies, Turton (2003) takes this concern one level further by noting that the very categories that we use to analyze different types of forced migrants are shaped by institutional bodies.

[16] I do not mean to claim that all facets of integration discourses are empathic towards migrant preferences. Rather, this was the case in the literature- and especially the academic literature- that I surveyed. A disregard for migrants and their preferences *is not* a definitional trait of the belonging-based integration discourse. That said, integration as belonging is just as much expressed in less migrant-friendly discourses, such as the colloquial belief in South Africa that foreign men are "stealing" local women (Misago, *et al*, 2010), which is laden with presumptions that these men are not only taking, but taking as a means of belonging, settling, and receiving documentation.

Tactical belonging

Does this reading of belonging into the host population, as an ultimate and personal objective, resonate with migrants in urban estuaries? Participants' experiences imply not. For the participants, belonging-through modes of connecting with the extant population, like language and civic participation- is a contextually deployed strategy rather than an aspirational goal. And when participants do make connections, the socio-demographic landscape they are including themselves into does not look like a classic hosting society.

Participants do interact with other denizens of the social space, and they do become members of networks and social milieu. Of this there is no doubt. But their reasons are strategic. Karl, who lives in a predominantly South African suburb, provides multiple examples of including himself into the neighborhood- offering rides from the CBD, attending funerals, acting as an election official, establishing a personal relationship with his South African landlord, learning a few words of Zulu. He describes these activities as a form of "bribery," as "signaling [his] presence," and ultimately as a protection strategy.

On tactical inclusion into the South African population, the issue of language is exemplary. Multiple respondents- Karl, Bernard and Jean- discuss the importance of learning Zulu. For Ager & Strang (2008), local language acquisition is a means of increasing social and material resource access- a seemingly pragmatic outcome. But, this outcome lies solidly and normatively in the 'belonging' regime, favoring the local-ness of said access rather than its utility. It assumes resources accessed via the local language are the sole or best resources for the foreign language migrant. Thierry makes an equally forceful claim about the need to learn English- not for practical purposes (Franco-Lingala speakers can, in his opinion, fulfill all their needs in Yeoville without learning any English), but because the absence of English means an inability to interact with non-Franco-Lingala populations. He did not provide details about why this is problematic, but the comment reinforces the idea that local language acquisition does not increase access to necessary resources, but rather to specific, 'local' resources- a normative rather than pragmatic claim.

The participants, on the other hand, grant a far more specific strategic value to Zulu, and to Zulu in particular. Generally, the value is symbolic- it communicates to the listener that the speaker is either South African or respectful of South Africans. This requires only a few words - enough to start a conversation before shifting to English (Jean, interview). Karl states, "[South Africans] don't like people to showcase their strangeness, their not belonging [… but also] they don't like you ignoring them."

The value of Zulu is instrumental, as well. Bernard mentions that he explains to new arrivals, "in Joburg there are places that, if you are black, you cannot speak another language than, Zulu, Ndebele, or English. If you speak another language, they'll find out straight that you are not part of South Africa; they can easily attack you." Whether the simple association between Zulu-speakers and xenophobic

violence is warranted, the strategic logic behind learning Zulu would not, for Bernard, similarly cause him to study Sesotho or Afrikaans.[17]

Another sphere of inclusion and exclusion is local political participation- a common dependent variable used for measuring the integration of migrants (Portes, *et al*, 2008; Itzigsohn & Giorguli Saucedo, 2002). Though local political fora are open to non-resident inner city denizens, participants rarely, if ever, participated in those events. Even Thierry and Sébastien, who are highly interested in crime, politics, and law, state that they do not attend meetings with Ward or Municipal officials. Louis gives the cause as foreigners and South Africans living in "two rooms" in the same space, with government officials only influencing the realm of the South African. In other words, there is no strategic value in interacting with local governance. It is irrelevant to participants' daily lives.

The prime exception to avoiding political inclusion[18] relates to Fela, who in his role as a formal Nigerian community leader worked with officials in the mid-2000s to reduce the proliferation of illegal guns in the inner city. This, too, held a strategic component. Fela describes the environment within the Nigerian population as one of fatigue- a sense that, insofar as Nigerian nationals were responsible for inner city crime,[19] Nigerian nationals were also victims. Cooperating with government officials was a means of achieving a specific goal: enhanced peace and prosperity, rather than an over-arching commitment to become a permanent part of Johannesburg's political community.[20] Fela gives no indication that this context-specific political partnership was viewed negatively by South African officials, either.

My point in focusing on strategic belonging is to show that, on a personal level, feeling included in the local- and especially South African- communal whole is not central to the way my participants make meaning of their inward migration. Sébastien discusses the personal importance of building friendships with his classmates. He needs to have people in that part of his life who he can talk to. But even in these relationships the objective is not belonging. Sébastien's engagement with other students is strategic. He states that "if I don't see that you can be of any help, I'm not going to bother coming to you," and the desire to discuss student-life with other classmates feels like a personality trait (as compared to Jean, for example, who is far more socially reserved). The classmates' potential to provide assistance- to help further his successful studies- is the ultimate determinant of who he does and does make friends with. His tactics fulfil a different personal need- scholastic goal achievement- that bears a closer, stronger, bond to his personal migration project.

---

[17] Bernard is drawing upon a discourse about perpetrators of xenophobic violence that was prominent around the 2008 attacks, the validity of which was dependent upon the specific geographic location (Misago, *et al*, 2010).

[18] Karl acted as an election judge, but he states that this was a gesture towards his neighbors rather than a true engagement in the political sphere.

[19] In Fela's narrative, other non-South African networks and leaders were equally active in reducing crime and gangsterism within their own co-national populations.

[20] As a further indication of the targeted engagement in local or host politics, Fela was equally willing to credit spiritual causes (increased "religiosity" in the inner city) for the reduction in crime. Not only was political partnership strategic and limited, it was one of many avenues that he and other inner city residents utilized to help reduce crime in the area.

Inward migration and goal seeking

My interviews began with participants' first experiences in Johannesburg. These experiences varied from person to person, but contained a combination of short-, intermediate-, and long-term goals. Goals varied. Goals often depended on connections and conditions met upon arrival. Over time, these *specific* goals shifted. They were achieved, and they were impeded. The following pages present the personal, goal-related, experiences of my participants and the association between these goals and inward migration. One of the dominant themes across the interviews is a 'goal seeking' ethos built into participants' subjectivity *qua* 'migrant.' By this I mean that goal seeking underlies both the way they identify themselves and the way they make meaning of their personal experience- and especially the jolting layered meanings around the decision to uproot their lives and migrate. The section on 'Person' will close with participant responses typical of this ethos, vibrant descriptions related to its opposite: 'wasting time,' and 'bad migrants,' and a consideration of forces that shape that subjectivity both before and after the act of migration.

Participants arrived in Johannesburg with different levels of welcome from individuals and networks capable of providing key material support. Sébastien and Bernard had relatives capable of providing housing and social linkages. Louis could muster only one night's accommodation. Pre-arrival expectations contrasted with inner city realities. Cohabitating with strangers (including other nationalities) was unheard of back home. Jean believed he had a job; both he and Bernard thought their savings would provide months of economic stability. In short time, most participants were thrown into what Denis, the participant with the least access to resources on arrival, described as "a land of struggle and survive."

Though pressured to fulfill immediate needs- income streams, housing, documentation, and safety- participants did retain broader, longer-term goals. Thierry, whose plan to start an internet shop fell apart, said, "[the failure] affected me. […] I said, 'ok, let me just look for a job.' I found a job, and then I moved on." But his goal of starting a business lingered until future opportunities arose. Bernard, too, found his day-to-day life overcome with fiscal need. But he was concurrently seeking avenues to continue his education. Jean's actions are still guided by a goal of opening a business in Cameroon.

It is overly simplistic to identify personal goals as the sole motivator for participants' entry into the inner city. For some, personal goals were at the center of the migration decision- migration occurred because of calculated desire to take advantage of a specific opportunity or connection in Johannesburg (Jean; Sébastien; Karl, interviews). In other cases, participants were more influenced by push-factors at home (Bernard; Louis, interviews). Yet, even in cases where mobility is best framed as onward migration- moving *from* home- there were still goal-related logics for moving *to* Johannesburg. For Louis, this logic lay in Johannesburg's representation as a place of opportunity (or as Fela says, a place to enact "the issue of quests"):

We are studying at school about the economy. […] We were having colleagues and brothers that were here, you see. The problem is that all of us, when we are talking, we are telling each other that South Africa is better than Congo. So when a person leaves Congo, by that time, to come to South Africa- no matter things are not easy, he cannot tell you that things are not easy. […] He doesn't like you to mock him, no?

Though the product of idealization and misrepresentation, this image of an opportunistic Johannesburg survives the challenges of Louis's first days and weeks. His comment is also a reminder that the goals and motivations of individual in-migrants are often based upon the prior experiences of family and peers. There is a transfer of information about Johannesburg to the DRC. There is also a representation of the migration experience: the purposive presentation of success to friends and family at home. Louis bought into that representation.

Denis left home because of a combination of push- and pull-factors. His dream was to continue migrating from South Africa to Europe. He had no connections in Johannesburg, but he also had no money. With onward migration in mind, he needed economic activity in the urban estuary. But Denis also had a separate, location-neutral, dream to "unite Africans together, to get one voice." And this was a goal that could easily take root in the city.

Long and short term goals can intertwine, as obvious as this may be. Jean came to South Africa because he was promised a job. But his motivation for taking a job in South Africa was to 1) become fluent in English and gain business experience so that he could 2) quickly move onward to New York and start a successful firm, to 3) raise funds for a return to Cameroon and 4) there provide employment and financial security to his impoverished friends and kin. After arriving in Johannesburg, the job offer evaporated. But the remaining long-term goals have either succeeded (he speaks great English and has gained valuable experience), evolved (New York is now a five-year goal and he has begun envisioning ways to provide similar job opportunities to unemployed peers in Johannesburg) or remained unchanged (he still values financial success in order to start a high-employee business in Cameroon).

The above examples begin to capture the connection between goals and the migration process. The choice to migrate out, to migrate in- together or separately- may be motivated by personal objectives. Additional objectives are added or altered after arrival. But the failure (or completion) of specific goals does not mean participants put an end to their migration projects.[21] They move forward with enacting, measuring, and reinforcing a sense of self- *qua* migrant- that transcends finite achievements.

The goal seeking subjectivity

Park (1928; 887) states that, "migration as a social phenomenon must be studied not merely in its grosser effects, as manifested in changes in custom and in the mores, but it may be envisaged in its subjective aspects as manifested in the changed type of personality which it produces." He argues that migration to a new place, concurrent with departure from the old (with its familiar customs, rules and culture), leads to new freedom for the individual migrant, but tempered by a loss of "direction and control" (*ibid*). For Park, the personal experience of migration is the experience of "a conflict of cultures"

---

[21] Returning again to Van Hear, *et al* (2009), the participants took the action of staying put.

leading to a "divided self" (*ibid*; 892). Park was one of the first sociologists to view migration through the individual's internal personal experience. But his analysis flows from an analytical framework that focuses on place's effect on the individual, rather than how something within the individual might thrive on an active change in place.

This 'divided self' differs from Simmel (1950), who also articulates an internal experience of migrant-ness. Simmel's 'stranger' enters into a foreign social space with a sense of purpose. He makes meaning from the act of movement and from the situational experience of negotiation and action within the new space. It is this, rather than Park's divined-down challenge of internalizing two cultures, which is apparent in my interviews. Like Simmel's stranger, participants focus on the pragmatics of being a migrant in a particular place. I first saw this link between praxis and self-identity in story formulations. Narratives singled out a specific meta-method for achieving goals. While analyzing certain transcripts, I had the sense that meaning and self-identity were inculcated *into the process* of achieving goals, and not just the outcome.

On Louis's second day in South Africa he left Johannesburg to deal with documentation issues in Pretoria. He ended up in a month-long Home Affairs queue. As Jean tells it, he survived in that queue by his own wits:

> From the first day that I came, I had to start providing everything for myself […]The way I was eating- because there was no one that was going to provide for me- to eat, there are these churches, […] they used to go to parks, to give people food. So, I had to join this queue. […]I knew these programs. […] For the whole month, that is the way I did survive.

Louis focuses the presentation of his survival technique on his own knowledge of- his own role in discovering- the various free food programs available in Pretoria. He must have heard about these programs from other individuals already in the queue. But his manner of discussing those earlier days aligns with a narrative 'self-made man' or 'rags to riches' structure. His description of finding and utilizing the free food programs is absent any helping alters. Self-strategizing rises to the fore. The 'self-made man' narrative repeatedly pops up in Louis's life story. He finally collects asylum papers by leaving Pretoria: "Personally, I had to go to Durban […] by that time in 2001, it was easier to get a paper there in Durban. The day I went, the very same day, I did get a temporary paper." Again absent from his narrative is the helping other- the person who recommend the Durban Home Affairs office- and present is the alignment between his strategy and success. Louis later moves from a "piss job," to a security job, to university, and to a succession of entrepreneurial ventures. Only his narrative of attaining the "piss job" includes active assistance from alters, and Louis always used that dismissive term to describe this particular employment. The connection between personal subjectivity and goal seeking praxis is further reinforced by the way Louis orders his narrative, presenting information-gathering and strategizing events in a non-chronological order that stress his own volition.

Sébastien's narrative structure similarly overstresses one praxis of goal-obtainment over others. Like Simmel's (1950) stranger, who leverages the meaning of his position as migrant outsider to succeed in trade relationships, Sébastien's narrative focuses on the praxis of leveraging the meaning of his migratory decision- becoming a student in South Africa- to obtain financial donations.

Sébastien receives regular financial assistance from leaders in his traditional community and church network. Asked why these individuals (four successful Ivorian friends of his uncle and his Congolese pastor) gift him money, Sébastien focuses on his social position as a diasporatic student. Regarding his four Ivoirian benefactors:

> The reason why they are helping [me and other students] is because, in us, let's say they see a future- not only of the community but the country, as well. Because […] when they came here […] they came to study, but they couldn't, because of the need. […] Each and every time they see us, they say, "oh good…" they will encourage us.

This is a classic example of social embeddedness and accessing social capital (an example Portes (1998) specifically uses to explain donors' motivations) and Sébastien shows no modesty about leveraging his social location. In fact, the only time he mentions feeling embarrassed is one extra-ordinary occurrence when a donor- who Sébastien had never borrowed money from, but who was known to lend on occasion- had a complex and probably unfriendly relationship with his uncle. Conversely, when every other participant discusses loans and gifts, they mention personal embarrassment and harmed reputations.

For Sébastien, the strategy of relying on the assistance of others reinforces a core subjectivity: of being a student in South Africa's Ivoirian diaspora. What his narrative representation shows is that he also independently imparts meaning to the strategy itself: of drawing on the social capital connected to his student-ness. For there is no question that Sébastien receives financial assistance from his father in the Ivory Coast. And he regularly works in one of the donor's store- yet he repeatedly states that the gifts are a separate issue from wages. But neither the help from his father nor his earned income are connected to the praxis of drawing on a student's social capital (the former given due to kinship, the later due to Sébastien's human capital). Both are separated out and removed from the narrative representation of his inward migration experience.

The rationale for this separation is easy to surmise. His subjective student-ness relates to the day-to-day experience of going to school, and maybe to the personal opportunities that his degree will allow. But a subjectivity around the praxis of drawing on social capital allows Sébastien to see himself as object, in a Meadian-sense. Sébastien actually attributes three distinct motivations to his donors: education can benefit the Ivory Coast, they see themselves in the students, and they believe he will be in a position to provide future direct reciprocity. All three motivations reinforce the normative claim embedded in Sébastien's narrative: that 'student-ness' is valuable within the diasporatic network. He is witnessing the success of his migrant-ness through the eyes of others.

Contrary to the above examples, where Louis and Sébastien connect goal seeking to positive personal strategies, the goal seeking subjectivity is also present in negative assessments of the praxis gone wrong.

Jean expresses repeated skepticism about the inner city as a social space, and especially denizens living without goals in mind. In a conversation about his personal decision to avoid "distractions,"[22] he interjects the following critique of other migrants:

> For myself, I don't think that someone who has immigrated to a new country can start going out to drink every time. Because… it's not life for somebody- because, if you move from one place to another place, you restart your life completely. So, you have to be concentrated. There are so many things that we have to stop doing- like distractions. I saw myself- if I start going to the nightclub- every Friday, or maybe every Saturday- my goal won't come true. [...] When I get what I want, maybe now I'll start to play. I think that's the problem. Most of the people, they think they can play, and have what they want at the same time. You have to choose. It's a sacrifice.

This is a damning criticism of non-sacrificing migrants. But Jean is strictly limiting his critique to life-choices that distract from goal seeking. He even extends his point to say, "it's like you go to school, and you want to do business. You can choose. […] You can't do business and go to school at the same time. It won't work." As an educated individual starting a small company, Jean has no bias against school or business. He certainly does not think a person who chooses to work while going to school is a bad *person*. But they are a bad *migrant:* to have left their home, restarted their life, and then consciously made choices that impede the very goals that initiated movement in the first place.

'Bad migrant' is not only equated with the goal seeking failures of others. Thierry, after 12 years in Johannesburg, is seriously considering returning home to the DRC. His reasoning is simple: friends talk about opportunities at home and he feels that his activities in the inner city amount to "wasting time." Permanent settlement was never within his plans, nor was onward migration, but it took this feeling of no longer working toward goals (however nebulous) for Thierry to decide that "now, if the time has arrived for me to go home, then I have made up my mind." In doing so, he is not retroactively questioning his goals up until this point, but the present state of his migration project.[23]

Thierry's self-analysis is similar to Jean's comments about education. The essential critique is not a failure to envision a goal grand enough to warrant "restarting your life completely." The critique is that there has been a muck-up in the doing. Both men connect stagnation and distraction back to the meaning-making project, and neither locates that meaning in a static outcome: for both have repeatedly 'failed' (and 'succeeded') at achieving specific goals. Yet they carry on. What I feel their comments about "wasting time," and Jean's point about "distractions" show is that this goal seeking subjectivity is not about a specific end-state of success. Rather, like Louis and Sébastien, it is about an over-arching approach to the praxis of seeking, strategizing, and striving, whereby the daily process of doing so makes positive meaning out of the decision to migrate into the inner city. As praxis, goal seeking puts participants' meaning-making into contact with material conditions- faulty partners, serendipitous encounters, discriminatory hiring practices, and failed opportunities. But as a personal subjectivity, it

---

[22] Other participants made related points under rubrics like "needing to stay disciplined" (Louis, interview) and "focus" on dreams (Denis, interview).

[23] Outside of our interview, Bernard expressed a similar sense of stagnation in his goal seeking project in Johannesburg, coupled with an openness to move on.

means effort in the face of these conditions is alone enough to feel satisfied with the migration experience.

The 'bad migrant' theme, and Sébastien's and Louis's narratives, all rely upon normative claims ('making your own way' and 'chasing your goals' are good, or 'communities should respect and help students'). These claims are built around strategies and agency, and are ambivalent towards immutable traits and demographic characteristics. They are normative, but they are not exclusive. In the section on 'Place,' I will argue that there is an ongoing process of drawing network boundaries that capture critical commonalities while allowing for broad heterogeneity. Normative claims based on agency and praxis, when used as boundaries, fulfill this function. Inclusive network building is the personal, migrant, goal seeking subjectivity expanded into the social field.

Shaping the subjectivity: before and after movement

Returning to Mead, making meaning of one's own migrant-ness is never only an internal and personal project. In closing this section, I will briefly consider ways that the migrant subjectivity is shaped by externalities both before and after the act of migration. Two examples occur above. Louis's association of migration *into Johannesburg* with opportunity and success began with the stories he heard from returned migrants. Sébastien's subjectivity is adjusted by external social responses to him as a migrant student. Similar examples are found in migration literature.

Meaning is attached to inward migration before the outward migration moment occurs. Discussing a town in Cameroon with substantial patterns of outward migration, Simone (2011; 4) notes, "in everyday conversations, an enormous amount of knowledge had been built up over time as to where people were going, what they were doing, as well as a voluminous range of details about various practices and events." The movement of an individual actor is a concern for both their household and their neighbors. Circulated stories and discourses about past migrant cohorts influence the meaning future migrants will make of their own mobility. Furthermore, individual migration may connect to complex household economic strategies, including, "designating a particular child from early on as the one who will eventually leave and have invested in their capacity to do so" (*ibid*; 5). Families also loan money to migrators, "ensuring that [the family] will share in whatever benefits the migrant attains by his or her mobility" (Adepojou, 2006; 38). These external actions create a sense of obligation. They reinforce the connection between migration and economic success. But the distance between familial investor and outward migrant supports the viability of focusing on success-seeking praxes rather than the finite results of a specific economic opportunity. The family at home is neither interested in nor able to monitor the success of particular ventures. The migrator is like the manager of a mutual fund, tasked with producing results and tasked with negotiating the day-to-day messiness of doing so.

The goal seeking subjectivity is also affected by life after arrival. The estuarial space has a key impact, its public spaces already filled with other actors striving to leverage connections and create opportunities wherever possible (Simone, 2004). Goal seeking is a visible, public, way of life- a way of life that is easily accessible, and requires only that you "start creating relationships with different people […]; to be sharp; be smart" (Denis, interview). Economic precarity has an impact. The goal seeking ethos has a future-projecting essence, but is reinforced by the day-to-day act of seeking specific goals. Bernard must

follow his time in university with a search for employment and economic opportunity. Karl must manage his reputation as responsible, as a means of creating leniency from his landlord for the late payment of rent.

Bakewell (2011; 22) writes that, "when we speak of migration, we are implicitly referring to movement. […]Someone who has migrated in the past will still be regarded as a migrant, but it is not a continuous, flexible state." He is expressing a discursive view that migrant-ness is connected to a finite period of motion. I would argue that this view derives from analogizing integration and belonging: that soon after mobility ceases, the active migrant-ness of the mover begins to fade away. The above analysis of participants' goal seeking subjectivies is meant to counter that claim. Their actions and meaning-making show a strong retention of their subjective migrant-ness long after they arrived in the inner city. It is not Park's 'conflict of cultures,' during efforts towards inclusion, but the subjective understanding of self *qua* migrant that Simmel's (1950) stranger translates into both mobility and post-movement strategies.

By extension, I would argue that a major post-migration influence is a retained willingness to move- an ambivalence towards the site of goal seeking that differentiates out the migrant subjectivity from the meaning-making project of other non-mobile individuals. Thus Bernard has an internal sense of what wage would lead him to move out of Johannesburg, and has weighed the benefits of staying put versus the benefits of moving on. Thus Jean has decided to stay put, for the time being. I would even argue that Denis' decision to forgo onward migration was an expression of openness towards the location of his migration project. For each of these participants, the willingness to take a migratory action reinforces their understanding of self as migrant. Their approach to success in life transcends changing occupations or exploiting opportunities. They have moved once to increase their prospects and options. They are well aware of their capacity to do so again. This is, obviously, a difference of attitude from a desire to belong and set down roots. 'Person and Place' will look at how life can continue on, and productively so, in a social space where neither the actor nor the alter is fully committed to a permanent life in the urban estuary.

Person & Place: Strategies and experiences

The preceding section presents the goal seeking migrant subjectivity constantly arising in my fieldwork. I do not mean to propose that this is the sole way migrants make sense of their experience. Belonging plays into the meaning-making project of many migrants, as evidenced by individuals and populations who could initiate further migration acts but instead decide to remain and settle. And additional alternatives to the belong-based integration subjectivity have been proposed. In inner city Johannesburg, Landau & Freemantle (2010) theorize tactical cosmopolitanism- a rising above the hostile social space, and Landau & Monson (2008) look at migrant identities based upon pan-Africanism and a reciprocal claim that African states and peoples were supporters (and victims) of the anti-Apartheid struggle. A more distinct example is a migrant subjectivity based on parenthood- a rejection of personal inclusion in the new society in favor of inclusion for subsequent generations.[24] Furthermore, Jean's goal

---

[24] Though seven of the eight participants are parents, this particular discourse or subjectivity arose only once, when Fela stated that he had moved to Randburg because of "educational opportunities" for his child.

of starting a business in order to employ disadvantaged kin may indicate a 'success as altruism' subset of the goal seeking subjectivity.

The remainder of this paper will analyze how one subjectivity is reified into action. I will look at how it is reified into strategies and relationships- what I am describing as the interaction of person and place as social space. I then further scale up to show how both strategy and subjectivity have a generative effect on the place itself. The point of this exercise is not to claim that the reified goal seeking subjectivity is the sole force shaping in urban estuaries. The point is to show the relevance of thinking about inward migration, of integration, from the micro-level analytical frame. To quote Portes & Sensenbrenner: "the material presented is not intended to 'prove' the formal propositions […], but rather to demonstrate their plausibility" (1994; 1327).

The host/migrant dichotomy

Analyzing the interaction of person and place must pass through the role of social capital and the host/migrant dichotomy. The dominant construction of social capital within the social sciences locates it as a communal-level force (Putnam, 1995; 2007), and mirrors many components of the belonging-based school of integration. For social capital to adhere in a community, its members must participate in civic and institutional associations (Putnam, 1995). The primary concern of this communal-level construct is the effect of social linkages "that give the collectivity cohesiveness and thereby facilitate the pursuit of collective goals" (Adler & Kwon, 2002; 21).[25] Individuals are secondary beneficiaries of social capital's communal effect. A more nuanced concept of social capital is created by dividing it into two subtypes- bridging and bonding.[26]

Bonding capital is characterized by 'thick ties,' and occurs within "homogeneous, tightly knit groups with whom the individual shares certain exclusive characteristics such as ethnicity, nationality, and kinship" (Madhavan & Landau, 2012). Bonding capital is often seen as a characteristic of migrant groups in places of inward migration (Portes, 1998; Cheong, *et al*, 2007).

Bridging capital stems from either "interactions with people from a broad sampling of the population" (Stolle & Hooghe, 2005; 28) or- in more migration-centric uses- linkages from migrant to host (*see also* Cheong, *et al*, 2007). These two definitions of bridging capital converge when migrants are a finite and bounded minority within the collective host whole.

---

[25] Putnam gives the example of neighborhood watch groups. In Putnam's formulation, his neighborhood has high social capital- a sub-population of its members come together and protect all the houses in the neighborhood (Putnam, 2007; 138). In his seminal work, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital", Putnam similarly states, "life is easier in *a community blessed with* a substantial stock of social capital" (1995; 67*, emphasis added*).

[26] Woolcock (2001; 11) introduces a third subtype, 'linking capital,' "linkages that connect individuals to resources and support from formal institutions." For the sake of clarity, and because the convergence of migration and social capital theories often sees bridging capital in terms of migrants' connection with the host society- which is the font of formal institutions- I have included linking as a part of bridging capital. The bipartite division is as common, if not more common, that the tripartite division (*see* Stolle & Hooghe, 2005; Adler & Kwon, 2002; Putnam, 2007).

Like belonging-based integration, communal social capital does not align with my participants' interaction with the social space. Communal social capital theorists work upwards- asking how an increase in diversity forces a reshaping of the structural social characteristics of the polis (Putnam, 2007; Uslaner, 2011). But they are unable to twist the issue down to the lives of residents: the intimate interaction between social space and actors' personal identities and objectives. My participants' ability to create meaningful, fruitful, relationships is not determined by social networks structured within a bonding/bridging capital dichotomy. Their ability to achieve personal goals is not enabled by a communal-level social cohesion buttressed by denizens participating in civic associations. Rather, migrants are purposively strategizing modes of engaging with the social space, including strategies of assessing whether to extend trust while concurrently presenting their own trustworthiness to others. They are creating relationships across demographic lines of ethnicity, language and- most importantly- the supposed host/migrant dichotomy that the bridging and bonding concept is contingent upon. As I stated above, I see each of these interactions with the social space as the reification of the goal seeking migrant subjectivity. To assess and present trustworthiness, and to use characteristics other than rote demography as the basis of relationships, are pragmatic strategies for increasing the possibility of future goal obtainment. There are two problems with attempting to think about the person and place nexus in terms of a host/migrant dichotomy. First, such a dichotomy requires some boundary between the two sectors of the population, and ideally that boundary would have empirical or socially constructed salience. A person would know who a migrant is, and know who is a host. In an estuarial space lacking hosts, at least one's own thick-tie traditional community ought to be definable and agreed upon. Second, the actual relationships within the social space ought to somehow align with demographic traits- there should be some meaning attached to a relationship with a South African versus with a migrant. If relationships meld together, then what descriptive value is there in labeling one sector of the population as host and another as migrant? Similarly, if the utility of a relationship and the strategies needed to determine its probable success cut across demographics, then what value is there in saying certain relationships bridge access to new resources while others have a lower cost because of thick-tie bonds?

In so far as there is value in these distinctions, its origin lies in the macro-level view of the society integrated into- Putnam's concern over a breakdown in social cohesion and a feared breakdown in generalized trust that I will discuss below. For the individual migrant guided by the goal seeking subjectivity, what matters is the utility of particular alters, or the probability a social connection can help the personal making meaning project.

Defining the traditional community

Bernard and Thierry, if captured in survey data, are demographically similar: Congolese, Franco-Lingala speakers, male, in their 30s, migrants to South Africa. But they have opposing views towards their language community. Bernard sees language as a positive link among ethnic and national groups. Thierry- who also speaks Swahili- sees it as a division between the inner city's Eastern and Western Congolese. Both men regularly reference a 'Congolese community.' Bernard never mentions East/West barriers within that population. Thierry does. The barrier is rooted in political issues back home. Thierry nonetheless acknowledges multiple contexts in which the national community comes together as a

unified whole. The two participants have nuanced differences between their understanding of the Congolese and the Franco-Lingala communities. Their comments were often inconsistent and shifting.

The difference in boundaries set by Bernard and Thierry reflects broader literature on the inadequacy of traditional communities. Wimmer (2009; 244) argues that 'ethnicity,' is not "as an unproblematic *explanans*—providing self-evident units of analysis and self-explanatory variables," but a far more fluid social boundary that is created through the actions of both majoritarian and 'ethnic' groups. 'Language,' which ought to have even greater empirical grounding- a group bounded as persons speaking the same mother tongue- is no less problematic. Blommaert & Rampton (2012; 11) find that "the facts of linguistic diversity, mixed language, and multilingualism" indicate that individuals use "linguistic repertoires" adjusted to specific social and communicative contexts. As a result, surveys collect constricted, socially constructed, responses ("French"; "Swahili") in place of answers that are too complex and contextual to be captured, aggregated, and turned into a variable of statistical analysis.[27] If a survey question asked Bernard and Thierry, "do you feel close to members of your own ethnic/language community?" what idea of community would the answers capture? If their answers were used to conceptualize bonding capital among inner city Congolese, would the findings not wildly over-simplify the complex layers of understanding that both men ascribe to their national and linguistic networks?

Perceptions of a traditional community's outer boundary can differ, and that boundary is porous. Equally important, social networks with a seemingly coherent demographic boundary (what inarguably appears to be a community of co-nationals, for example) can consist of sub-networks of greater social significance than the bounded whole (Wimmer, 2009). Were Sébastien asked, "have you received loans from members of your community?" the answer would be yes- he has received assistance from five Ivoirian men. But he receives assistance from two distinct networks: four primary benefactors who are friends with his uncle and a fifth fully removed from that social group. The social consequence and the meaning of the fifth loan is categorically different from the other four, even though all five donors shared the same demographic traits.

Bonding capital and traditional communities

On arrival, many migrants receive support. The support's utility is material, but it also represents a migrant's first experience of their new social world. Their future success may "depend heavily on the structures in which they become incorporated and, in particular, on the character of their own communities" (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993; 1332).[28] Fela, Denis, Karl, and Thierry participate in clan- or (home) state-level fora that help assist newcomers. These fora are a valuable safety net for newly arriving migrants (*see also* Woolcock, 2001), but they are also a system for managing the burden on

---

[27] The US Census, for example, provides data on 'Languages other than English spoken at home,' divided respondents again into 'Speak English very well' and 'Speak English not very well.' Response options for this cohort are extensive- including 'French Creole,' 'Yiddish,' and 'Gujarati' (though all African languages are amalgamated into the option of 'African'). But each of these individual response options- which, again, are far more extensive than the responses captured in many surveys- essentialize diverse linguistic strategies and repertoires. (http://robparal.blogspot.com/2012/05/hard-to-find-census-data-on-chicago.html; accessed: 12/3/13)

[28] Portes & Sensenbrenner's quote refers to the migrant's economic prospects. Jacobs & Tille (2004) extend the same idea to the migrant's successful political participation.

donors- identifying which members are best able to provide assistance, and acting as a communication channel with similar fora in other migrant networks. The fora ensure that the resources of the existing population are not overly stressed. In participants' personal experiences such safety net assistance tended to come not from a community, but from family and pre-arrival friends. After Bernard realized his savings would not last as long as anticipated, his cousin helped procure a security-firm job; Sébastien, Bernard, and Louis all received some amount of housing. But as relationships expand out into a supposedly bonded traditional community, expected network traits are less visible. For example, thick ties ought to create greater certainty and reduce the cost of exchange (Coleman, 1988). Portes's explanation of this phenomenon should be especially applicable to the urban estuary:

> [For immigrant communities] economic transactions both internal and with outsiders tend to occur with little initial information about the trustworthiness of exchange partners and the character and reliability of state regulation. This high uncertainty creates the need to "stick together" and to stay with the same partners, regardless of tempting outside opportunities, once their trustworthiness has been established. (1997b; 8)

But I repeatedly encountered participants assigning thick relationships into separate, less instrumental, categories. Participants explicitly state, or narratively imply, that they found a particular alter to be "useless," "not as smart as we," "not dreaming big" and then refer to that same person using phrases like, "but he's still a brother to me," or "he is like a father." Specific labels: "brother," "friend," "father," remove these alters from of the realm of goal seeking and purposive network building- the very locations where the certainty contained in thick bonds might be of instrumental use. They are placed in a realm of sentiment rather than utility (Williamson, 1993; Hawthorn, 1988).

When participants do engage in instrumental relationships, trust-related mechanisms (discussed below) are almost always employed. Thick bonds, communal ties, and possible social sanction cannot eliminate the necessity of trust in interpersonal activity. Wimmer (2009, 261) extends this point in noting that "the accumulation of [family or village solidarity] does not automatically lead—in an emergence effect of sort—to ethnic solidarity and community" in the sense implied by Portes (1997b).

There may be cases when inward migration leads to inclusion in a network that mirrors the social structures out-migrated from. Those networks may retain thick ties, social sanction, and low-cost relationships. Johannesburg's Somalis may be one example (Jinnah, 2010). But thick traditional networks certainly cannot be assumed (Wimmer, 2009). Vertovec (2007), and Harrison, *et al* (2012), persuasively show that complex migrant receiving areas (both the super-diverse spaces of urban estuaries and surface-level homogenous spaces like Chinatown enclaves) have to be interrogated not only for their type and degree of diversity, but also for whether that diversity allows a traditional community network to remain intact to the extent that a distinct bonding capital can travel through its conduits. Again, this is an idea permeating not only bonding/bridging capital theories, but the host/migrant dichotomy.

Serendipity and cross-cutting social connections

Relationships that are claimed to arise within the traditional community are occurring independent of demographics. From the moment of inward migration, the inner city throws new arrivals into apartments with foreigners, onto taxis with South Africans, and upon streets filled with diverse meters

of homo- and heterophilia. Participants still enter relationships replicating the roles and outputs- low cost and increasingly thick- that the bridging/bonding model attributes to in-group members (Fukuyama, 2001, Moroşanu, 2012). Other relationships serve a bridging function, but without reliance on a unified host population. The following examples illustrate the ways urban estuaries allow for serendipitous relationships that complicate the bridging/bonding and host/migrant dichotomies.

Two weeks before we met, Jean sat down with the owner of a successful security company and received important advice on how to run his own business. The man was his roommate five years earlier. They spoke on the phone every month or so- just calling and saying hello, asking about life, keeping in contact. Never over the course of those conversations did the roommate mention he was the successful business owner- Jean found out through a mutual acquaintance. Jean, Cameroonian, met his roommate, Ivoirian, by chance. The relationship built quickly over the few months they lived together. It hibernated. They reconnected at random. The man's advice is essential for Jean to reach his personal business goals. The man had given Jean food in the earliest days. When asked why, Jean said, "I think he helped me, because himself, a number of years ago, he went through this same situation." When Jean called and asked to discuss the security industry, the man said, "Oh, you know you helped me [with my family issues] some years ago! Just come and I will try to show you what to do….." Their relationship could have easily occurred in the context of a traditional community. It reads like the growth of a grade school friendship or early-life exchanges between cousins. But their paths entwine in Johannesburg, at midlife, rather than at home in their adolescent years.

A few years after arrival, Bernard was interested in pursuing a tertiary degree. He asked around in his existing networks, but no one knew the steps he needed to take to go school in South Africa. While at Home Affairs in Pretoria, Bernard sat next to a South African gentleman. The man asked why Bernard's English was so good. Bernard said he had attended university. The man said he was a student at Wits. He gave Bernard his phone number, and told him to be in touch, the South African told Bernard he would call next time he was in Johannesburg. One day the man called Bernard and asked to meet at a taxi rank in the CBD. They walked the two kilometers to Wits, where Bernard ran into Congolese students who explained the various steps needed to gain admission and apply for bursaries. He followed one of those men to his eventual Masters department. About the South African, Bernard said, "You know, that guy gave me life. He gave me life. He gave me hope. Because- […] the best I have in South Africa is my studies."[29]

Thierry's plan to start an internet café was scattered when his potential partner- a classmate from the DRC- became untrustworthy. Years later, Thierry lost his phone in the taxi he took to work every day. The next morning another passenger, a South African, stood waiting for Thierry and returned the phone. Over the next months, they spoke in the taxi. They exchanged numbers. They discovered they a mutual

---

[29] The way Bernard narrates this event is fascinating. He starts by saying that he received a small amount of information from his pastor, four years after arrival, but that he met the South African two months after arriving in the country. The man really only brings him through the school gates- the Congolese students provide the majority of the information that Bernard needs. But it is to the South African that he attaches this idea of "giving me life" and "giving me hope."

interest in IT. The man became "a mentor" to Thierry. Eventually, they decided to start a business and are presently trying to bid for tenders. Thierry said of the man,

> [The incident with the phone] made a huge impact in my life. Because the perceptions we had about South Africans in general not being approachable. Actually, I was shocked to see… such a human being in this country. […] I thought to myself, you never know- maybe this is the right person.

Through one event, the South African partner overcame Thierry's justifiable sense of distrust- not only towards South Africans, but also from the betrayal of his previous partner and friend. Six months after meeting the man, Thierry reentered the very type of partnership that had previously broken his aspirations.

The above serendipitous relationships cut across neat demographic categories. They are made possible by the churning public spaces and populations of the inner city and the low cost modes of making, and growing, new contacts that this churning creates. They are also fully in line with a range of research and social theory that questions the validity of seeing homogenous 'communities' in networks of individuals with shared external traits (Glick-Schiller, *et al,* 2004; Wimmer, 2009). Yet, a further question is whether migrant-receiving areas contain a viable host/migrant division. For, even if the concept of homogenous communities is exiled from migration discussions, social networks comprised of non-migrants may exist, and have access to greater resources than a similar network of inward movers. Within the belonging-based integration discourse, this 'host' network is viewed as the extant native population and its aligned institutions. The host can draw upon resources derived from a long-term presence within the social space, and proximity to authority and legitimate state power.

Survey data shows that, in any meaningful sense, the above is not the case in the inner city (Madhavan & Landau, 2011). Denizens of all backgrounds- from South Africa and abroad- migrate in and then out of urban estuaries. Households from all backgrounds face material difficulties. In urban estuaries, expansionary 'bridging' relationships (of the type sometimes referred to as 'linking capital') do not reside with a host. Importantly, few social connectors can draw a newcomer closer to institutions of structural authority**,** the sort of authority capable of replacing precarity with certainty: documentation, contracts, and social stability that transcends the whims of local-level actors (Williamson, 1993). There are exceptions. South African business partners can act as a legal "face" of a partnership, for example (Denis; Theiry, interviews). In the few cases where more substantive bridging happens, the key social connectors are just as likely to be migrants as South Africans. In Bernard's story, the alter helps him access structural resources in line with the idea of bridging capital. But, his ability to do so is distinct from the fact that he is South African and the real institutional information is provided by the Congolese Bernard meets on campus. Jean's old roommate is Ivoirian, but bears the technical knowledge of a local. That Thierry's new partner decided to return the phone has nothing to do with his South African-ness. Demography and bridging are no more aligned than essentialized traits and thick-tie bonds.

Participants are concerned with the accessing resources and opportunities, not demography. This forms the basis of a second idea of social capital, found prominently in Portes (1998), and with the sort of micro-level focus absent from Putnam. This 'transactional' social capital differs from communal theories by locating social capital solely with the individual. For Portes (1998)- working off the ideas of Bourdieu-

social capital operates like other forms of capital. It is a means and material for facilitating interaction and exchange. An individual's ability to leverage social connections is determined by their location within a social network. The state of being in that networked location is an actor's 'embeddedness.' Connecting back to the idea of person and place, interaction and exchange are both made possible by, and in return shape, the location of the person in the networked social space. The incident with the cell phone created a bond between Thierry and his future partner. But it was not a basis for partnership. Their subsequent conversations allowed each actor to mentally map the social location and utility of the other- to determine their relationship and how they could leverage it.

Transactional social capital draws upon a tradition of thought that stretches back to Simmel (1950). The stranger fills a role, linking his adopted home to outside resources and opportunities. The stranger's social capital- his value to the host and his ability to utilize his position within it- is instrumental (Portes, 1998). Its value is *a priori* enmeshed within the transactional process. Social capital is not a good-in-itself; a benefit for the collective whole. Without exchange the idea of social capital is meaningless. Furthermore, transactional social capital is ambivalent towards the boundaries of social networks. The stranger's externality is an issue of utility in trade rather than diversity in traits.

Transactional social capital provides a valuable mode for understanding the estuarial social space. In an environment lacking the macro-level institutional and societal structures that benefit from communal capital, individual denizens are still able to find micro-level benefit from interaction and exchange.

Trust

But for interaction and exchange to exist, actors require trust.

Trust requires uncertainty (Luhmann, 1988). If sanction and certainty are in place, the messiness of trusting is unnecessary (Williamson, 1993). If sanction and certainty are absent, trust is a precondition for cooperation and complex exchange. Trust requires two actors and two factors. Levi (1998; 2) provides a simple starting axiom: "A trusts B to do X." Within this interaction of A and B, A is trusting and B trustworthy. Hence, definitions of trust can be approach from A's trusting: "the subjective probability with which an agent assesses that another agent will perform a particular action" (Gambetta, 1988; 217), or B's trustworthiness: "an actor offering a definition of herself, and an audience choosing either to interact with (trust) or not to interact with (distrust)" (Williamson, 1993; 465). Discussing trust absent either actor A or B is nonsensical, as is excluding the trusting or trustworthiness factor. These definitions are given in terms of A trusting and B appearing trustworthy. In reality, the two roles are concomitantly reversed. As B attempts to present his trustworthiness to A, he also tries to assess whether trust should be extended. Under normal conditions, neither actor can be certain about the other's conclusions.

'Trust,' as action, manifests itself at multiple points during a relationship. There are many contexts in which A's trust and B's trustworthiness can interact. In conditions of precarity, decisions to engage and

extend relationships, and to transact, all involve risk, and therefore are all trust-related moments, as well (Luhmann, 1988; Williamson, 1993).[30]

Generalized trust or personal strategies?

To the macro-level eye, social capital affects civic cohesion through the creation of 'generalized trust,' "measured by the question, 'Generally speaking, do you believe that most people can be trusted, or can't you be too careful in dealing with people?'" (Uslander, 2011; 226)- would a person trust others in their community, irrespective of individual traits and personal knowledge? would they be willing to join with strangers for a common good or a highly trust-contingent exchange? (Siisiainen, 2000). Generalized trust is central to migrant belonging: any institutional effort to promote integration must be measured by its ability to increase generalized trust among hosts and newcomers (Ager & Strang, 2008).

With generalized trust, communal social capital strings between diverse networks, uniform social norms are present, and the risk of discord is replaced by the possibility of collaboration. Generalized trust does scale down to the individual level (Siisiainen, 2000), but due to the presence of larger-scale social forces. These forces are constructed amongst a stable population over long periods of time: absent time and stability, a neighborhood or society can never build the social norms and connectivity that are generalized trust's antecedent.

For Putnam and Uslaner, generalized trust is vastly important- a structural precursor of civic participation and, most importantly, social cohesion. It becomes entangled with integration around the issue of diversity. Putnam (2007) claims that when diversity rises, social capital, social cohesion, and generalized trust fall. Putnam sees a process of 'hunkering down': a pulling back from public and civic engagement as diversity increases. The social forces undermined by diversity- shared norms and civic-mindedness- are mechanisms for the effective functioning of society, but also the effective integration of newcomers into that society (Putnam, 2007). Putnam finds the solutions to this rupture in "wise policies" and "immigration reform" (*ibid; 164).*

But Putnam has a tendency to use a dualistic measure of diversity: as majority (with the extant demographic traits) and minority (with demographic traits that impose diversity and change). Uslaner (2011) critiques Putnam's conflation of ethnic diversity and decreased trust, but cannot wrench free of this majority/minority paradigm. Uslaner blames spatial segregation, rather than overall neighborhood diversity[31] for the Putnam's decrease in trust, yet still focuses on the integration of the minority into the majority. Uslaner states that segregation can cause minorities to "build local institutions and political bodies that enhance [a] sense of separateness" (*ibid*, 228). He is concerned with generalized trust as a communal good. Uslaner therefore makes normative claims about integration, such as "trust presumes a common culture" (*ibid*, 240).

---

[30] Traditionally, A risks that B will not do as he promises. But in a space like the inner city the risk of deepening relationships lies in what B will or could do: including exploitation, tarnishing a reputation, or crime.

[31] *See* Morris (1999), who analyzed post-Apartheid Hillbrow and found that the suburb had a range of race groups within its boundaries, but almost every apartment block was racially homogenous.

The reason I continue to present inward migration as an intimate relationship between person and place- rather than as an individual migrant experience- is because this problem of normative claims based on social space presumptions continues to come up. The way Putnam and Uslaner think about place- that its diversity is majority host/minority migrant, that it bears a social structure where civic participation matters- leads to normative claims that shape policy and public discourse. As Karl notes, it is the South African government and international organizations advocating for a comprehensive integration compatible with Putnam and Uslaner's view of social cohesion, social capital, and generalized trust. The reason why empirical data (Madhavan & Landau, 2011) shows an absence of generalized trust in urban estuaries is clear. It is a concept that by definition requires factors- stability, institutions, collective norms- that are unlikely to be present in a social space of transience, weak governance, and super-diversity.

But the problem with generalized trust theory also lies in participants' personal strategies. There is no denying the importance of trust within the urban estuary. But the modes of trusting that are enacted are greatly different from the generalized trust described above, and are inseparable from managing specific relationships with specific alters in the social space.

The relationship management strategies that participants do use allow both for growing trust and cessation when alters begin to appear untrustworthy. The most common strategy manages channels of communication: to meet on the street before giving a cell phone number; to give a cell phone number before an address; to change phone numbers and block some callers but immediately provide a new number to an important friend from the past.[32] Context matters. Relationships can take on depth in one setting but need to be moderated in a context that could lead to more severe outcomes. For example, inviting an alter to your house can create multiple problems. The alter becomes more difficult to avoid. They will come to know your family. They may act against your property (Bernard; Thierry; Denis, interviews). But fully severing a relationship- stopping it rather than 'slowing it down'- is not an ideal strategy, either: "some people when they know that you do not have trust in them… in a blink they become your enemies. […] People that you don't trust- you don't need to get more closer to them. Just 'hello, hello, how are you' then drop away." (Denis, interview). Better, instead, are incremental tactics: offering only as much information as you feel comfortable with at that time, or retreating back only as far as necessary.

A precarious environment creates additional concerns that further increase the importance of determining who is and is not trustworthy. In an urban estuary, most low-cost mechanisms for replacing trust with certainty (you know their family, you know they're afraid of the repercussions of breaking your trust, you know that you can go to court, you have known them for a long time) are absent.[33]

---

[32] There are variations between participants' attitudes. Denis, for example, does not see a major issue with giving out his phone number, even though he is cautious about letting people know where he lives (though this is mostly because he sees himself as a public figure who is regularly phoned for assistance). Sébastien has no concern with giving out either his phone number or his address, but he was primarily discussing the issue in relation to his classmates, who as noted before, Sébastien has decided to create friendships with. In both cases, Denis and Sébastien feel they are benefiting from a more open communication-management strategy.

[33] Hart (1988; 189) makes a similar point about Frafra migrants in Accra's estuarial environment:

Certainty is usually provided for by the mutual knowledge that some sort of sanction- legal or social- will come into play after an agreement has been transgressed (Fukuyama, 2001; Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). Karl goes so far as to advocate that you shouldn't even trust your brother- if you're making an agreement with anyone, put it into writing. But at the same time, the cost of gathering and presenting pre-trust information is reduced by the inner city place, including its variety of public spaces and heterogeneous population*.* One person's trustworthiness can be accessed in a park, again at a mutual friend's house, and again at church (Bernard, interview). At the same church service, or in the same park, the time cost of assessing trust is reduced because of the wide range of persons (from diverse demographic backgrounds) present in the single space (Thierry, interview). Assessing and presenting trustworthiness never needs to occur in a one-on-one environment.[34] The estuary's thin social networks mean untrustworthy alters can be tactically disengaged without risking social sanction (Denis, interview). Reputation can be maintained by presenting different sides of your self in different social and geographic locations (Karl, interview). Again, person and place. Personal strategies, ultimately aimed at achieving personal ends, are intertwined with the nature of the specific place.

Generalized trust: civic good, problematic personal strategy

A lack of generalized trust is not the same as a lack of trust. No participants stated that they trust everyone in their community- however defined. Not in the neighborhood, nor in the city, not among South Africans, nor their traditional networks. But even the least trusting participants extend trust at key moments. The reality is that participants are capable of constructing trust-related mechanisms tailored to both their own goals and their own personalities. Each participant has a sense of how much social connectivity they want and need. And even for participants interested in making as many connections as possible, the wealth of alters in the inner city allows for active skepticism towards apparently untrustworthy individuals.

Generalized trust is altogether different. Generalized trust is primarily a civic concept: a good insofar as it increases social cohesion, connectivity and a sense of shared values at the communal level (Fennema & Tille, 2001; Rothstein & Stolle, 2008). Members of the civic collective then benefit from the generalized trust, but this is a secondary goal, mediated through the effect generalized trust has on the communal unit (Stolle, 2002). Trust as experienced by participants, on the other hand, is good in so far as it has utility for the actors involved. It directly translates into a beneficial trust-based relationship or interaction.

The question is, therefore, if generalized trust is absent, does it matter? Portes & Vickstrom (2011) analyze Putnam's data on generalized trust and come to the conclusion that it does not. The supposedly

---

[The Frafras] have no grounds for confidence in outcomes established by contract. Looking for some alternative form of guarantee, the migrants turn to the antithesis of modern civilization, their own customary moral institutions founded on the identities of kinship, descent, and family, reinforced […] by the certain obligations of birth and community. This option too is fallible. The institutions do not travel en bloc to Accra, and some of the important public sanctions of domestic hierarchy are missing. […] The idea of shared but separate interests cannot be expressed through a kinship idiom.

[34] *See* Dasgupta (1988), for the benefits this provides in a market environment.

positive communal-level benefits of generalized trust are often better explained by other factors and forces. My research findings extend this point to say that the absence of generalized trust does not have an effect on the secondary level of individual experience, either.

The social reality is that denizens of urban estuaries have little or no recourse to post-contractual sanction and therefore have no mechanisms for certainty in the majority of their day-to-day and long-term dealings. Broken down, they find they have no legal sanction- no state institution powerful enough or willing enough to enforce the types of 'contracts' that they are likely to enter into. They find they have no social sanction- what little sanctioning authority traditional communities retain is outweighed by the changed personalities that often accompany alters' in-migration to the inner city (Denis; Sébastien; Thierry, interviews). Especially in those moments when trust transitions into engagement and exchange, the way generalized trust would be reified in lives of estuarial individuals is counteractive and dangerous. Absent sanction and certainty, a greater need for pre-transaction, pre-engagement, information arises: preventative strategies rather than palliative responses (Dasgupta, 1988). In an urban estuary, trusting someone because of a faith in structural communal forces is a fool-hearty ignorance of the uncertainty contained therein.

When individual trust strategies are analyzed in context, survey data showing low levels of 'trust' in the inner city make greater sense. Questions framed as, "do you trust your neighbors?" or "how trustworthy are members of your community?" essentialize the decision to trust into a state of being ("I am trusting of my neighbors") rather than seeing trust as a contingent response to a belief about a particular alter. Furthermore, in the diverse and interaction-conducive inner city social space, the need to trust, generally, is reduced. Skepticism towards an uncertain partner is viable when trustworthy alternatives are likely to be found. When a goal seeking ethos connects with this cautious skepticism, there is a significant reduction in situations when any sort of trust is necessary. The ethos states, "I don't need *this* outcome" and the skepticism, "I don't need *this* alter."

Two processes occur over and over in the social lives of participants: assessing and presenting. They assess the behavior and the attributes of their alters and they present their own positive self to the outside world. Absent any guarantee that social relationships will lead to success (but aware that social capital is one of the most important resources available in an urban estuary (Van Hear, *et al*, 2009)), these acts of assessment and presentation are a mechanism for finding and indicating possibilities. But what is being searched for is not raw egotistical advantage. Rather, there is an awareness that other actors in the estuary are assessing, as well; enter the importance of reputation, and showing people 'the way you are.' When and where actors are removed from traditional social networks- freed from their embedded location based on intrinsic attributes- concomitant assessment and presentation combines with the goal seeking subjectivity and leads to one of social capital's most salient and positive social-level effects. In an open and uncertain social space, all but the most short-sighted actors can recognize the need to at least appear trustworthy, engagement-worthy, and beneficial to others. Failure to do so can mean exclusion from the benefits of social capital (i.e., the benefits of one's embedded location within a network) (Dasgupta, 1988); not the ability to belong, but the ability to negotiate access to resources (Polzer, 2008) and thus further the goal seeking project. If the social capital of a tightly

proscribed network operates on obligation (Portes, 1998), the social capital of an estuary operates on reciprocity and mutual beneficence.

Place: Goal seeking, networks of commonality, and mutual beneficence

In participants' social lives, they are neither feeling the positive benefits of Putnam's (1995) generalized trust and communal social capital, nor receiving resources from obligation-bound members of their wider traditional community (Portes, 1998). Instead, the previous section's personal strategies are used to connect with specific partners as well as create wider 'networks of commonality.' Personal strategies also communicate 'mutual beneficence.' Simone (2004), as summarized in Watts (2005; 184), "refers to this as a 'tentative cooperation,' practices in which 'potentially' something can be made out of sociabilities of various sorts." Beneficence- not only benefit realized, but a probable capacity to produce unknowable benefit in the future- gains further salience in the context of networks of commonality.[35] When both parties believe they can realize their own subjectivity only if other actors are willing to advance- collaboratively- the goal seeking praxis, mutual beneficence begins to shape the social space. It does so in absence of structural and institutional forces.

The benefit of thin ties: networks of commonality

As the role of traditional communities began to dissolve into the participants' other relationships, it became increasingly clear that they were conceiving of boundaries for new networks. What I am interested in for this analysis is that the person-to-person relationships mentioned above (that cut across boundaries of ethnicity, nationality, and migrant status) are not isolated events in my participants' lives. Rather they are part of a strategy that involves conceiving novel networks of commonality.[36] These are specifically conceived networks that not only include the participant in a beneficial embedded location, but which are bounded in a way that includes alters who might further the goal seeking process regardless of other external traits. They are primarily inclusive- they are definitions of in-groups, rather than exclusions of out-groups (Wimmer, 2009).[37] They differ from traditional networks, bounded by traits- historical, kin-based, and demographic- that are exogenous to the ability to flexibly strive for goals, generally.

Inner city social networks are often thin, shallow and dispersed (Landau, 2012).[38] Conceived networks of commonality fit this mold. Considering the nature of the estuarial social space, as a strategy these thin

---

[35] There is nothing especially profound about this distinction between benefit and beneficence. It is, for example, the essence of the colloquial understanding of 'networking' during the job seeking or entrepreneurial process.

[36] I use the word 'novel' in two senses: networks that the participant conceived after entering their new social space, and the conceiving process is ongoing.

[37] Participants include themselves within these conceived networks. The points of commonality used to shape networks are expressed through statements about people 'like me' or '… behaving the way I am behaving…'. Some interviews, like with Karl, have specific comments about trying to create or find groups held together by essential common traits. In short, participants are not exclusionarily conceiving commonalities by saying, 'those people are…'

[38] It should be noted that weak social ties are much harder to capture in quantitative methodologies than strong ties (Laurence, 2013).

networks take on a pragmatic and productive tone. Granovetter (1978) notes that 'weak' social ties are a key source of opportunity, information, and mobility. The inner city has a physical geography conducive to meeting, greeting and engaging. It has a population of other inward migrants. They are heavily reliant on social capital but have a dearth of existing social networks. The estuary has a diversity of available alters but lacks sanction mechanisms. It is an ideal site to make the imagined network real.

The estuarial space's conduciveness to networks of commonality also begins to explain the diffuseness of connections across demographic traits (including the paucity of in-group trust) captured by survey data: networks of commonality are conceived only around traits that the actor considers relevant to the goal seeking project, and these are traits that they believe reside within themselves, as well as networked alters.

Some networks of commonality are built around obvious attributes. Bernard, for example, knows who he should and should not go to for advice on his child's school. There is no overlap between demography and the mental boxes he places different parents into. His sole concern is whether or not he perceives them to be "good parents." Sébastien's school-based network is composed of classmates who he knows can "be of any help." He finds opportunities to help them, as well. Other networks have less strict boundaries. The most important of these reflect the goal seeking subjectivity: networks built around the idea of 'seriousness.'

Louis's cousin-in-law introduced him to a Kenyan accountant, now the only other key staff member at his small business. I asked him to explain his relationship with this cousin. He says:

> I am trying by all means to control myself- to do things right- I also find some of those things in that man. He's not a crook... he's not- he's a serious man, you know? Which means he's a trustworthy person. He did find me as such, as well. In that way we can go along, me and him.

He uses the same word, 'serious,' in describing the accountant. Louis describes himself with a synonym, 'disciplined,' on multiple occasions. As I stated above, such traits are not only applied to specific relationships. Louis is a devoted man and attributes his success to God. When asked to describe his own community, he divides it based on those who follow good "bible principles," and these individuals come from the whole range of religious affiliations.

Karl, in his goal seeking project connected to tactical local inclusion, utilizes the fact that many people mistake him for a pastor, a religious man who is "reliable" and "trustworthy." He has built a sort of protective network of South Africans around his life in Bertrams based on maintaining this reputation. He has conceived of his neighborhood as a network where the traits he is able to present to alters- "the way I dress, and maybe the way I behave"- place him in a beneficial network location. He leveraged a similarly conceived network to gather migrant leaders into a pan-migrant advocacy organization.

For transactional social capital, resources do not flow from the network itself, *per se*, but from social relationships with other network members. Portes (1998; 3-4) breaks this point down into two components: 1) the ability to make claims to resources and 2) the quality of the resource itself. This is why the attributes used to conceive networks are important. For an existing network- members of a village, for example- the alters within the network are already defined. And so too, more-or-less, are the

resources they possess. The only thing any actor can do, within that pre-existing network, is better position themselves in the eyes of their peers.

With a novel network, membership is not yet established and this allows far greater control over the resources that network relationships might make available. Participants are drawing network boundaries that allow them to make claims on network members' resources. On top of that, network members actually have resources the participants want. Up until now, I have spoken as though individuals have the power to generate a network where none existed before: to draw others into a web of their personal creation. But when I talk about conceiving networks of commonality, networks are being imagined by individuals across the social space; they connect when two persons meet and realize that not only is this man 'serious' (which is what I am looking for), but he is looking for another serious person, too (which is what I am, and how I am presenting myself to be). Convincing other alters of your membership in their conceived network requires reputation and presentation. Louis's God/success linkage indicates this idea. Reified into a network boundary, if Louis believes there is a level of ordination to his success, than it is critical that any partners similarly bring a disciplined life of bible principles to the relationship. Vice versa, Louis is able to access resources from others (such as a commitment to partnership) because of his position within the network: a serious, disciplined, and God-fearing man. As such, these networks of commonality- as I see them in my participants' lives- are inseparable from assessing and projecting mutually beneficence.

Networks of commonality have a generative effect. Individuals are projecting their positive characteristics into the public sphere, while searching for indications that others share these traits. If the rationale for conceiving a network is targeted towards a specific terminal objective, then there is no need for an expansive social network, only the connections which will lead to this targeted success. But when network creation is based on the goal seeking subjectivity, there is a high degree of pragmatism to the project: after an actor decides which traits best correlate with future successes, everything else about the conceived networks becomes radically inclusive.[39] To exclude alters for reasons that are exogenous to their perceived utility is counterproductive. Faist (2009; 179-180) refers to this approach as 'culturally indifferent organizations.' I think it goes a long way towards explaining why participants' focus on the praxis of goal seeking expands to reject traditional communities in favor of new compatriots from across ethnic, linguistic, and national lines.

Mutual beneficence: reciprocity and social capital

The generative effect of personal strategies goes beyond the creation of new inclusive networks. Social space is also affected by the principles underlying relationships: not only who is engaging with whom, but also the types of interpersonal action that fill the place on a daily basis. These actions are often acts

---

[39] And these are subjectively chosen traits. For example, taking the idea of 'seriousness,' some participants associate seriousness with a Calvanist view of godly intervention (Jean: "if God wants me to have money, I will have money"), and therefore they are looking to build networks with other Pentecostals. Others connect seriousness and discipline with an ecumenical view of religion- but would still not enter into a partnership with a non-believer (Louis, interview). Finally, there are participants with the same attitude towards seriousness and discipline, but read no divinity into those traits (Thierry, interview).

of presentation and assessment. The underlying principle is one of mutual beneficence- not bounded benefit but the possibility of expansive opportunities for success; not self-interested but based on reciprocity.

Molm, *et al* (2007; 199-200) provide an in-depth summary of understandings of reciprocity that stretch from Simmel to contemporary social capital theorists like Portes and Putnam. Reciprocity enters into relationships as a normative or moral expectation- that action to the alter's benefit will be reciprocated in the future, and vice versa- and as an act of trust- where "actors individually give benefits to each other, with no assurance of the other's reciprocity" (*ibid;* 200). While the preceding are instrumental forms of reciprocity, linked to exchange, Molm, *et al* also give reciprocity a symbolic value:

> Comprised of two elements, which we call uncertainty reduction value and expressive value. Acts of reciprocity carry uncertainty reduction value to the extent that they reduce the risk and uncertainty inherent in exchange, by providing evidence of the partner's reliability and trustworthiness. They carry expressive value to the extent that they communicate […] appreciation for benefits received, showing that the partner cares for the actor and their relationship, and demonstrating willingness to invest in its continuation. (*ibid*, 2007; 201)

Mutual beneficence also contains instrumental and symbolic value, but takes on a slightly different form from reciprocity. The difference is connected to both the goal seeking subjectivity and the absence of certainty in the estuarial space.

Mutual beneficence is a trait of relationships. It has both a kinetic and potential energy**.** The kinetic value is, simply, realized when a mutually beneficent relationship leads to mutual benefit. The value of beneficence also lies in a potentiality that, in the context of the goal seeking subjectivity, is instrumental. As I discussed in the analysis of 'Person,' under the goal seeking subjectivity actors seek (or are impeded from seeking) no particular outcome above all others. In a relationship, then, the most instrumentally valuable resource is a disposition, or a way of being: the potential to help achieve a range of goals in the future. The beneficence is instrumental because it satisfies the personal migrant subjectivity; makes meaning of migrant-ness by creating a potential for opportunity, success, or reduced risk. The value embedded in the relationship becomes mutual when the alter is searching for the same.

Molm, *et al* (*ibid*) focus on reciprocity's symbolic ability to indicate trustworthiness. Sébastien captures this in stating, "I realize in life, it's better to try your best, to make people to trust you. Because, you might need them at any time. And, when they trust you, they will be able to trust you. So, I try my best, to be trustworthy to as many people that I can." The movement from proving trustworthiness, to being trusted, to not needing to prove trustworthiness is conscious on Sébastien's behalf, as is the importance of mutuality. Sébastien is well aware that his future success is dependent upon his relationships (the man he was specifically referring to has become a major donor in his life), and he knows future, socially-mediated, opportunities are dependent on the depth and breadth of the relationships he is able to create- the connection between 'needing at any time' and enacting trustworthiness to as many people as possible.

Unlike reciprocity, beneficence also symbolically indicates successfulness. Like Molm, *et al* (*ibid)*, I would argue that symbolic value is communicated by prior action: successfulness evidenced by success

achieved. But it is also communicated in presentation and reputation. Sébastien's presentation of self is his student-ness, and the enactment of trustworthiness when given the chance. For other participants it is displaying 'seriousness,' religiosity, or far vaguer ideas like "the way I am living" (Bernard, interview). Denis utilizes this symbolic value of beneficence while creating a youth soccer academy. Louis uses it when instigating a savings group at work.

Symbolic value through presentation- both of trustworthiness and successfulness- gains salience in the precarity of the urban estuary. Simone (2004; 422) describes a reliance "on the constant activation of a sense of mutual cooperation and interdependency" among inner city migrants, and that "these ties are often more apparent than real—especially as a complex mixture of dependence and autonomy is at work in relations among compatriots." Watts (2005) compares Simone's view to idealizing the lawlessness of the American Wild West. But in participants I see an earnest, willing, well-meaning, and pragmatic push for partnership. The man in Thierry's taxi would have gained selfish material benefit from stealing Thierry's phone. But by presenting himself as a trustworthy man worth creating a relationship with, he can draw instead on the greater, but potential, benefits of a new relationship.

Beneficence's combined instrumental and symbolic value is never capable of fully indicating future outcomes within the estuarial space. That sort of certainty is further undercut by the inability to know if a social connection is truly cooperative rather than self-serving (Dasgupta, 1988), and the inability to know the true resources available to the alter: the combination of which indicates the potential benefit of the relationship. I agree with Simone's point that there is a constant activation in the social space. Mutual beneficence- as a perceived component of relationships- obliges actors to remain conscious of indicating their own capacity for possibilities, opportunities, commitment, and success, while going about judging those same traits in others. They are negotiating a claim to retain membership in the commonly conceived network while confirming that they continue to include the alter in this network, as well.

I mentioned skepticism above, implying that actors are aware of whether a particular alter is actually necessary to their goal seeking project- that actors may be looking for ways to opt out of rather than remain engaged with existing relationships. But this skepticism is enacted only in cases of apparent untrustworthiness. Over the course of the interviews, participants repeatedly describe "giving second chances" (Denis, interview), systems of "probation" (Louis, interview), situating without cutting off (Bernard, interview), searching for mutually acceptable terms by which to transact (Karl; Sébastien, interviews), or a willingness to collaborate from positions of uncertainty (Thierry, interview). Negotiating mutual beneficence must be thought about in the context of a fundamental need to make meaning via positive action. As Polzer (2008) notes about local refugee integration, in the face of such a need, all resources are leveraged towards presenting, assessing and negotiating. But it is a negotiation with an alter who is commonly open to and desperately craving the idea of beneficence, as well.

Goal seeking and generation in the social space

Over the preceding analysis I present the goal seeking subjectivity's expansion into social strategies, and then into social network creation. I have also attempted to include examples of how this scaling up is a product of, and helps to shape, the estuarial social space. To return to the early pages of this paper,

Landau (2012; Madhavan & Landau, 2011) sees challenging structural abscesses: no thick bonds or general trust, even within traditional communities; weak institutions and no host capable of facilitating symbolic and instrumental inclusivity; poverty and precarity. But the inner city is vibrant and fluid, as well. It is Denis's space of "struggle and survive," but just as importantly- most importantly- it is a place where one *can* actively struggle, can survive, and can make meaning in the doing so.

The inner city is a character in this analysis. Economic precarity coupled with needing to display beneficence in order to access resources from other (and mostly migrant) goal seeking alters, amplifies goal seeking as a subjectivity. The diversity and density of the population, the wealth of public space, the absence of sanction and certainty make trust and relationship-building strategies both more critical and less costly. All of these factors are heightened because inward migration is given an objective meaning through pre-migration influences.

The goal seeking subjectivity, social strategies, networks of commonality, and mutual beneficence are also shaping the inner city. They are not the only forces doing so. Previously, I mentioned the role of police and municipal officials in reducing crime. But as Fela notes, their ability to do so was contingent upon a concurrent set of actions and mentalities amongst the population. Karl and Denis discuss the 2008 xenophobic violence, when the collaboration of authorities helped prevent attacks in Yeoville. But, their work complimented the preexisting capacity for collective protection of a stratified migrant population. Economic opportunity may persuade denizens to tolerate adverse living conditions. Yet, participants remain in the space when real, rather than potential, economic activity is unavailable (Bernard; Thierry; Jean, interviews). My sense is that the strategies and networks arising from the praxis of goal seeking are also having an impact on the social space independent of other external factors. A desire for socially-embedded possibilities disincentives acts of petty crime, small distrusts, and unfounded antagonisms. For all the colloquial worries of migrants entering into a place, siphoning off public resources, refusing to connect to the extant population, and initiating crime, the preference for reciprocity over finite material gain does not end at the boundary of a supposed migrant community. When allowed room for full expression, mutual beneficence's positive social outcomes run through purposive networks that can, and should, be comprised of non-migrants, too. Again, for the goal seeking migrant, as long as an alter presents possibilities and is willing to recognize beneficence in return, there is no place for exclusivity.

I believe the above findings help to understand why urban estuaries are a viable choice for migrants- not to remain close to some traditional community, with easy access to relationships of obligation (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993), nor because of exclusion from some host body, where better opportunities may lie (Phillimore, 2011). Both ideas focus too strongly on an ethos of 'belonging,' and not strongly enough on a generative program that contrasts 'goal seeking' with 'wasting time.' Focusing on this goal seeking migrant subjectivity- intrinsically connected to a personal praxis of striving, strategizing, connecting, seeking goals, reducing risks, making meaning of inward migration- illuminates how urban estuaries are not only precarious and uncertain, but also containers of an essential social fluidity. Strategizing and network-conceiving can compensate for precarity and uncertainty. The fluidity is essential to effective goal seeking praxes, when "access to social networks and mobility" are your "most important assets" (Van Hear, *et al*, 2009; 28). Turning again to the structures missing from the estuarial space, denizens'

strategies, networks, and subjectivities do reinforce the structures' continued absence. The strategies are a response to the forces that are missing, but it is not their (logical, intended, or expected) outcome to reintroduce strong ties, traditional community cohesion, permanence, institutional influence, or generalized trust into the place of inward migration. And this is fine.

V. Conclusion

The objective of this paper has been use the micro-level interaction between person and place to show how an individual subjectivity, a personal meaning-making project, can affect both strategies for social interaction and the place itself.

That task has involved construction and destruction. The causes and expressions of the goal seeking migrant subjectivity were introduced, but at the expense of migrant integration as belonging. Strategies of social capital, trust, networks of commonality, and mutual beneficence were provided as examples of how the goal seeking subjectivity is reified and then scaled up to shape the place of inward migration. But doing so meant rejecting the utility of the host/migrant dichotomy and bonding and bridging capital to describe the interaction between migrant and social space; generalized trust was rejected as an illogical attitude when embedded in the assessment of an unknown alter. But the construction and destruction converge. My interview participants do not need that which is missing from urban estuaries. They get by. They strive. They find ways to succeed.

But can the subjectivity underlying this project really be thought of as based upon personal migrant-ness? I would like to close by looking at two final quotations from the interviews. Karl and Fela are the oldest participants in the study. They have lived in Johannesburg for long enough that most nuanced data capture techniques would consider them 'locals,' their inward migration project complete. Their attitudes capture not only the difference between a long-term resident and a new arrival, but also between a true non-migrator and the latent sense of migrant-ness that the two men still retain.

Karl was explaining to me that he is not interested in further movement within the city. While he dismisses the classic idea of local integration, and believes even migrants who "start settling down" in South Africa will still move within the country to "wherever you feel you can get business done," he personally will no longer "move from one place to another, just for the sake of moving." Karl has settled down in the truest sense. There is little chance he will ever move out of Bertrams- a far quieter suburb than the chaotic social streets of Yeoville and Hillbrow. Yet his understanding of the migrant sensibility has not been lost. He has much advice for his migrant brethren: to not live isolated from South African neighbors, to apply for proper permits when opening a business, to learn Zulu and yet build protective connections with other traditional migrant communities. But he never scolds, or dismisses, or looks down on individuals who are willing to latch on to opportunities and connections that require mobility. He understands that in the life of individual movers there is something more fundamental than stable habitus. He is the personification of 'staying put' as a migration decision, in that he does not expect of his neighbors and networks that they will choose to stay put as well.

Fela, too, makes a key comment that straddles the space between belonging and migratory goal seeking. He explains that recent bylaw changes in Johannesburg have increased property ownership among migrants. He says:

African migrants, they come from a society that believes ownership of a property is […] 'indigenization' into that society. And the intention- why most of them came here- is not only for economic advancement. […] They want to be part of the New Democracy. [… Those who] came with resources enjoy this- enjoy investing and belonging- "Can we own a piece of land here?"- the ability to assess your stay.

I find the final line to be telling. Even in the context of ownership for the purpose of "indigenization," Fela still sees a reference back to inward migrant-ness. The act of purchasing property, of becoming part of South Africa as a polity in the broadest sense, is not an evaluation of life, or financial success, but of "your stay." The next migratory act remains just below the surface. It remains just below the surface in how Fela understands the motivations of his successful migrant peers. Again, the people he is interacting with, the people who make up the social space he moves through and has built a life in relationship to. The thread of this understanding winds backwards to the way Bernard will move homes and then go months without seeing an intimate neighbor or friend, or Jean will not see his old roommate for years. Bernard sees the acquaintance on the street. They say hello. They assess and present, and remember why it is important to stay in networked connection. They pass along new phone numbers. They keep the potential for communication open. Jean and the roommate call. They say hello. They understand one another, as migrants, and that their relationship will never be, need never be, built upon the stability of contact one enjoys with a neighbor of 25 years.

At times in this paper I have taken an antagonistic view towards the discourse of migrant belonging. But might it not be a reflection of the subjective local-ness of the supposed host? Shorn of the willingness to geographically chase opportunity; living a life rooted in a particular place with habits and desires and needs located therein; lacking Karl's personal empathy for the decision to uproot and move on again; lacking Fela's view that even the most grounded act only reflects your 'stay'- might we all not have a deep psychological desire to belong to the place that we find our lives inextricably linked to? Migration from this vantage is the loss of a partner or employee, the rotating neighbors next door, the opening and shuttering of storefronts filled with different languages and musics and smells, the fundamental inability to rely upon the simplest and lowest cost mechanisms of building thick relationships, certainty and trust. From this vantage, might it not appear that life would be better for everyone if someone was able to reconstruct a society where everyone could just be included and belong?

In an urban estuary, no. It is not a place of stability. There is no clear and ordained slot for migrants to integrate into. Its fluidity is opportunity. Opportunity attracts persons willing to sacrifice stability. Fluidity increases. And the main thrust of this paper is that this is not a problematic condition. It is a space of negotiation (Polzer, 2008), where the ideal negotiation position is the presentation of future benefit to those around you. To get by in the inner city, you must be the sort of person willing to negotiate. The ideal person to negotiate with- it does not matter who they are, or what they look like, or where they are from- recognizes your benefit, as you recognize theirs. To get by in the inner city you must be the sort of person willing to assess, and present, and generate the place you live in. There is an inherent openness to this project. There is promise and possibility.

Bibliography

Adepoju, Aderanti. "Internal and international migration within Africa" in P. Kok, D. Gelderblom, J. Oucho, and J. van Zyl (Eds.) *Migration in South and Southern Africa.* Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council, 26-46 (2006).

Adler, Paul S., and Seok-Woo Kwon. "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept." *Academy of Management Review* 27.1 (2002): 17-40.

Ager, Alastair, and Alison Strang. *Indicators of Integration: Final Report*. Home Office Development and Practice Report 28. London: Home Office (2004).

Ager, Alastair, and Alison Strang. "Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21.2 (2008): 166-191.

Andrews, Molly. Shelly Day Sclater, Corinne Squire, and Amal Treacher. "Introduction." In, *The uses of Narrative*. New Brunswick: Transaction (2004).

Bakewell, Oliver. "Research Beyond the Categories: The Importance of Policy Irrelevant Research into Forced Migration." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21.4 (2008): 432-453.

Bakewell, Oliver. "Conceptualising Displacement and Migration: Processes, Conditions, and Categories." *The Migration-Displacement Nexus: Patterns, Processes, and Policies.* Oxford: Berghahn Books (2011): 14-28.

Black, Richard. "Fifty Years of Refugee Studies: From Theory to Policy." *International Migration Review* 35.1 (2001): 57-78.

Blommaert, Jan, and Ben Rampton. *Language and superdiversity*. MPIMMG, 2012.

Böhning, Wolf Rüdiger, and R. Zegers de Beijl. *The Integration of Migrant Workers in the Labour Market: Policies and Their Impact*. Employment Department, International Labour Office (1995).

Bottero, Wendy, and Sarah Irwin. "Locating difference: class,'race' and gender, and the shaping of social inequalities." *The Sociological Review* 51.4 (2003): 463-483.

Castles, Stephen. "Towards a Sociology of Forced Migration and Social Transformation." *Sociology* 37.1 (2003): 13-34.

Cheong, Pauline Hope, Rosalind Edwards, Harry Goulbourne, and John Solomos. "Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review." *Critical Social Policy* 27.1 (2007): 24-49.

Coleman, James S. "Social capital in the creation of human capital." *American Journal of Sociology* (1988): S95-S120.

Dasgupta, Partha. "Trust as a commodity." In Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell (1988): 49-72

De Wit, Thom Duyvené, and Ruud Koopmans. "The Integration of Ethnic Minorities into Political Culture: The Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain Compared." *Acta Politica* 40.1 (2005): 50-73.

Dunn, Robert G. "Self, Identity, and Difference: Mead and the Poststructuralists." *Sociological Quarterly* (1997): 687-705.

Duponchel, Marguerite. "Who's the alien? Xenophobia in post-apartheid South Africa." WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/003 (2013).

Fábos, Anita, and Gaim Kibreab. "Urban Refugees: Introduction." *Refuge: Canada's Periodical on Refugees* 24.1 (2007): 1-19.

Faist, Thomas. "Diversity–a new mode of incorporation?." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32.1 (2009): 171-190.

Fennema, Meindert, and Jean Tillie. "Civic community, political participation and political trust of ethnic groups." *Connections* 24.1 (2001): 26-41.

Franzosi, Roberto. "Narrative analysis-or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative." *Annual Review of Sociology* (1998): 517-554.

Fukuyama, Francis. "Social capital, civil society and development" *Third World Quarterly* 22.1 (2001): 7-20.

Gambetta, Diego. "Can we Trust?" In Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell (1988): 213-237.

Gieryn, Thomas F. "A space for place in sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* (2000): 463-496.

Granovetter, Mark S. "The strength of weak ties." American Journal of Sociology (1973): 1360-1380.

Hart, Keith. "Kinship, Contract, and Trust- The Economic Organization of Migrants in an African City Slum." In Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell (1988): 176-193.

Harrison, Philip, Khangelani Moyo, and Yan Yang. "Strategy and Tactics: Chinese Immigrants and Diasporic Spaces in Johannesburg, South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 38.4 (2012): 899-925.

Hathaway, James C. "Forced Migration Studies: Could we Agree Just to 'Date'?." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20.3 (2007): 349-369.

Hawthorn, Geoffrey. "Three Ironies of Trust." In Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell (1988): 111-126.

Itzigsohn, José, and Silvia Giorguli Saucedo. "Immigrant Incorporation and Sociocultural Transnationalism." *International Migration Review* 36.3 (2002): 766-798

Jacobs, Dirk, and Jean Tillie. "Introduction: Social Capital and Political Integration of Migrants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30.3 (2004): 419-427.

Jacobsen, Karen. *The Forgotten Solution: Local Integration for Refugees in Developing Countries*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2001).

Janjuha-Jivraj, Shaheena. "The Sustainability of Social Capital within Ethnic Networks." *Journal of Business Ethics* 47.1 (2003): 31-43.

Jinnah, Zaheera. "Making Home in a Hostile Land: Understanding Somali Identity, Integration, Livelihood and Risks in Johannesburg." *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 1.1 (2010).

Johnson, R. Burke, and Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie. "Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come." *Educational Researcher* 33.7 (2004): 14-26.

Korac, Maja. "Integration and How We Facilitate It: A Comparative Study of the Settlement Experiences of Refugees in Italy and the Netherlands." *Sociology* 37.1 (2003): 51-68.

Landau, Loren B. "Transplants and Transients: Idioms of Belonging and Dislocation in Inner-City Johannesburg." *African Studies Review* 49.2 (2006): 125-145.

Landau, Loren B. "Passage, Profit, Protection, and the Challenge of Participation: Building and Belonging in African Cities." *Urban Forum* 21.3 (2010): 315-329.

Landau, Loren B. "Hospitality without Hosts: Mobility and Communities in Africa's Urban Estuaries." (2012).

Landau, Loren B., and Iriann Freemantle. "Tactical cosmopolitanism and idioms of belonging: Insertion and self-exclusion in Johannesburg." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36.3 (2010): 375-390.

Landau, Loren B., and Tamlyn Monson. "Displacement, estrangement and sovereignty: Reconfiguring state power in urban South Africa." *Government and Opposition* 43.2 (2008): 315-336.

Laurence, James. ""Hunkering Down or Hunkering Away?" The Effect of Community Ethnic Diversity on Residents' Social Networks." *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties* 23.3 (2013): 255-278.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell (1991).

Levi, Margaret. "A state of trust." *Trust and Governance* 1 (1998): 77-101.

Luhmann, Niklas. "Familiarity, Confidence, Trust- Problems and Alternatives." In Gambetta (ed.) *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations.* New York: Basil Blackwell (1988): 94-107.

Madhavan, Sangeetha, and Loren B. Landau. "Bridges to Nowhere: Hosts, Migrants, and the Chimera of Social Capital in Three African Cities." *Population and development review* 37.3 (2011): 473-497.

Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* (1993): 431-466.

Mbembé, Achille, and Sarah Nuttall. "Writing the world from an African metropolis." *Public Culture* 16.3 (2004): 347-372.

Misago, Jean Pierre, Tamlyn Monson, Tara Polzer and Loren Landau. "May 2008 Violence Against Foreign Nationals in South Africa: Understanding Causes and Evaluating Responses." Johannesburg: Forced Migration Studies Programme (FMSP), University of the Witwatersrand (2010).

Molm, Linda D., David R. Schaefer, and Jessica L. Collett. "The value of reciprocity." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70.2 (2007): 199-217.

Morgan, David L. "Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1.1 (2007): 48-76.

Moroşanu, Laura. "'We all eat the same bread': the roots and limits of cosmopolitan bridging ties developed by Romanians in London." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* ahead-of-print (2012): 1-22.

Morris, Alan. "Race relations and racism in a racially diverse inner city neighbourhood: A case study of Hillbrow, Johannesburg." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 25.4 (1999): 667-694.

Nuttall, Sarah, and Achille Mbembé. "A blasé attitude: a response to Michael Watts." *Public Culture* 17.1 (2005): 193-202.

Park, Robert E. "Human migration and the marginal man." *American Journal of Sociology* (1928): 881-893.

Phillimore, Jenny. "Refugees, Acculturation Strategies, Stress and Integration." *Journal of Social Policy* 40.3 (2011): 575-593.

Polzer, Tara. "Negotiating Rights: The Politics of Local Integration." ACMS Working Papers #41 (2008a).

Ponterotto, Joseph G. "Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52.2 (2005): 126-136.

Portes, Alejandro. "Immigration theory for a new century: Some problems and opportunities." *International Migration Review* (1997a): 799-825.

Portes, Alejandro. *Globalization from below: the rise of transnational communities*. UK Economic and Social Research Council Transnational Communities Programme. Working Paper Series WPTC-98-01. (1997b).

Portes, Alejandro. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." In Lesser (ed)*. Knowledge and Social Capital.* Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann (1998): 43-67.

Portes, Alejandro, and Julia Sensenbrenner. "Embeddedness and immigration: Notes on the social determinants of economic action." *American Journal of Sociology* (1993): 1320-1350.

Portes, Alejandro, and Erik Vickstrom. "Diversity, social capital, and cohesion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37 (2011): 461-479.

Portes, Alejandro, Cristina Escobar, and Renelinda Arana. "Bridging the Gap: Transnational and Ethnic Organizations in the Political Incorporation of Immigrants in the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31.6 (2008): 1056-1090.

Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital." *Journal of Democracy* 6.1 (1995): 65-78.

Putnam, Robert D. "E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture." *Scandinavian political studies* 30.2 (2007): 137-174.

Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick, and Thomas J. Espenshade. "Immigrant Incorporation and Political Participation in the United States." *International Migration Review* 35.3 (2001): 870-909.

Rothstein, Bo, and Dietlind Stolle. "The state and social capital: An institutional theory of generalized trust." *Comparative Politics* (2008): 441-459.

Schiller, Nina Glick, Boris Nieswand, Günther Schlee, Ayşe Çağlar, Evangelos Karagiannis, Tsypylma Darieva, Lale Yalçın-Heckmann, and László Fosztó. "Pathways of Migrant Incorporation in Germany." *Transit* 1.1 (2004): 31-52.

Siisiainen, Martti. "Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu vs. Putnam." *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 40.2 (2003): 183-204.

Simmel, Georg. "The stranger." *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* (1950): 402-408.

Simone, Abdou Maliq. "People as infrastructure: intersecting fragments in Johannesburg." *Public Culture* 16.3 (2004): 407-429.

Simone, AbdouMaliq. "The Urbanity of Movement Dynamic Frontiers in Contemporary Africa." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31.4 (2011): 379-391.

Smart, Alan. "Unruly places: Urban governance and the persistence of illegality in Hong Kong's urban squatter areas." *American Anthropologist* 103.1 (2001): 30-44.

Smith, Charles P. "Content analysis and narrative analysis." *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology* (2000): 313-335.

Stolle, Dietlind. "Trusting Strangers-The Concept of Generalized Trust in Perspective." *OZP-INSTITUT FUR STAATS UND POLITIKWISSENSCHAFT-* 31.4 (2002): 397-412.

Stolle, Dietlind, and Marc Hooghe. "Conflicting Approaches to the Study of Social Capital." *Ethical Perspectives* 10.1 (2005): 22-45.

Strang, Alison, and Alastair Ager. "Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23.4 (2010): 589-607.

Turton, David. *Conceptualising Forced Migration*. Refugee Studies Centre (2003).

Uslaner, Eric M. "Trust, Diversity, and Segregation in the United States and the United Kingdom." *Comparative Sociology* 10.2 (2011): 221-247.

Valenta, Marko, and Nihad Bunar. "State Assisted Integration: Refugee Integration Policies in Scandinavian Welfare States: The Swedish and Norwegian Experience." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23.4 (2010): 463-483.

Van Hear, Nicholas, Rebecca Brubaker, and Thais Bessa. "Managing Mobility for Human Development: The Growing Salience of Mixed Migration." New York: United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report Office (2009).

Vertovec, Steven. "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22.2 (1999): 447-462.

Vertovec, Steven. "Super-Diversity and its Implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30.6 (2007): 1024-1054.

Watts, Michael. "Baudelaire over Berea, Simmel over Sandton?" *Public Culture* 17.1 (2005): 181-192.

Wessendorf, Susanne. "Commonplace diversity and the 'ethos of mixing': perceptions of difference in a London neighbourhood." *Identities* 20.4 (2013): 407-422.

Willems, Roos. "Coping with Displacement: Social Networking Among Urban Refugees in an East African Context". In I. Ohta & Y.D. Gebre (Eds). *Displacement Risks in Africa: Refugees, Resettlers and Their Host Populations*. Australia: Trans Pacific Press (2005): 53-77.

Williamson, Oliver E. "Calculativeness, Trust, and Economic Organization." *Journal of Law and Economics* 36.1 (1993): 453-86.

Wimmer, Andreas. "Herder's Heritage and the Boundary-Making Approach: Studying Ethnicity in Immigrant Societies." *Sociological Theory* 27.3 (2009): 244-270.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. "Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences." *Global Networks* 2.4 (2002): 301-334.

Woolcock, Michael. "The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes." *Canadian Journal of Policy Research* 2.1 (2001): 11-17.

Zhou, Min. "Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation." *International Migration Review* (1997): 975-1008.

Zulu, Melekias. *Gaining an understanding of Umnyama from the Zionist churches: a case study of Zimbabwean migrants in Johannesburg, South Africa*. Masters Dissertation (2012).