

## 26

# MIGRANTS AND THEIR CULTURAL WORLD

When things teach us about lives

*Amin Moghadam*

### Introduction

The notion of culture recurs in a variety of social and political fields. But as it is open to many interpretations, its use in the social sciences is often problematic, for example, when analysing migratory and diasporic phenomena. The appropriation of concepts such as culture, cultural diversity, and cultural integration from the social sciences by the media, politics, and the policy domain makes using them tricky in epistemologically scientific analysis – so much so that, even when tackling the cultural dimension of migrations, some academics have abandoned them in favour of less politically charged notions, more compatible with the complexity of migratory processes.

However, most researchers conducting cultural analysis of migration are together in criticising a deterministic cultural approach, under which culture is seen as an immutable package or the geographical origin of an individual or group as the only factor explaining their situation in the context of their countries of destination (Cohen and Sirkeci 2021; Cuche 2016; Dubucs 2015; Levitt 2010, 2016). But they do not throw the baby out with the bath water, so to speak. By proposing complex, dynamic definitions that reflect how individuals and groups act, bring into play a range of meanings, and engage in certain practices, analysis of the cultural dimension of migration goes well beyond a view of culture as a common denominator to describe individuals or groups.

Referring to Alexander and Smith's (2014) definition of culture, Peggy Levitt (2016, p. 144) adds:

Culture is context: the discourses, regimes and assumptions embedded in institutions, and the repertoires of meanings that are marshalled to respond to dilemmas and opportunities. It makes certain actions possible by providing the building blocks with which to enact them, and by marking them as socially appropriate, while restricting others by rendering them unacceptable...Thus culture is more likely a contingent clustering of diverse elements that is often on the move rather than a packageable, stable set of beliefs and practices rooted in a particular place.

Levitt suggests we look beyond culture as a product, not only to consider the circulation or migration of culture in the form of ideas, cultural and artistic practices, or religion, but to see migration as a cultural fact. It is no longer a matter of studying the cultural dimension of migration alone, but of considering migration as an intrinsically cultural fact, given the multiplicity of meanings it mobilises, its relevance to various social fields (economic, social, and cultural), its tendency to blur the boundaries between these fields, and its ability to operate on various geographical scales (Levitt 2010, 2016).

Taking this complexity into account, this chapter examines the notion of culture in Migration Studies by combining two distinct disciplinary perspectives: Anthropology and Cultural Geography. This inter-disciplinary approach then allows us to address another theme developed in Migration Studies, namely the materiality of migrations. As we will see below, the latter is expressed and analysed through various practices such as consumption, home-making, and housing, but also through politics of representation of collective and individual identities embedded in migrants narratives and trajectories, but also in 'biographies of objects' (Appadurai 1986).

### **A dual perspective in the study of culture in international migration**

While efforts in the social sciences to delineate culture from distinct disciplinary perspectives are converging towards a dynamic definition that avoids cultural determinism, this still varies by context and discipline. For example, in France, mistrust of a culturalist drift often leads social scientists to avoid the notion of culture as a structuring element of their research. Critics of the cultural analysis of migration point out that, by relying on cultural difference or distance, this approach leads to an essentialist vision which overlooks social constructs that evolve over time and are modified by the geographies where they are produced and underlying power relations. French geographer Hadrien Dubucs (2015) argued that the difficulty of developing a theory of migration's cultural dimension encouraged French geographers of international migration to focus on social geography and analysing power relationships through inequalities of class to avoid any culturalist leanings and potential criticisms. In contrast, academics in the 'Anglo-Saxon' world and in North America readily bring into play complex definitions of culture, placing it at the heart of their analysis of migration phenomena.

Despite this wariness, there is no doubt that studies of migration and diasporas have fed into reflections on the notion of culture in a variety of disciplines, including cultural studies, where the evolution of this central notion has been closely linked to views of international migration, as evoked by Stuart Hall (1987): 'Thinking about my own sense of identity, I realise that it has always depended on the fact of being a *migrant*, of being *different* from you' (p. 44). As anthropology is fundamentally concerned with the study and understanding of culture and cultural diversity, anthropological approaches to migration often emphasise its subjective dimension. This is rooted in the discipline's history: the Chicago School could be seen as having originated the sociology and anthropology of migration, with its emphasis on the psychological dimension of migrants' living conditions and analytical focus on the individual. The first University of Chicago study on this topic, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, was published between 1918 and 1920 by William Thomas and Florian Znaniecki. It was based on the researchers' long stays in Poland, the country of emigration, and the insistence, thenceforward, on the need to take home and host country cultural frameworks into account to fully understand the migratory phenomenon and grasp the cultural transformations migrants undergo, and how they interpret and react to new living conditions

(Znaniecki and Thomas 1968). Robert Park, a founder of the Chicago School, in 1928 proposed the concept of the 'marginal man' in *Human Migration and the Marginal Man*, paying particular attention in research on immigrants in the city to the question of culture and the multiple belongings of individuals in the urban environment.

In their cultural analysis of migration, some anthropological studies lay greater emphasis on the phenomenological dimension of migration and diasporic experiences, focussing on migration and diaspora cultures as a mode of existence. In his study of the Lebanese diaspora, Ghassan Hage (2021) insists that his use of the notion of the 'diasporic condition' or culture refers to 'a reality [that] is experienced by those inhabiting it and how the experience, in turn, gives this sociocultural formation some of its distinctive characteristics' (p. 10). Through a lengthy ethnographic fieldwork of the Lebanese diaspora worldwide, Hage shows clearly that

diaspora is a way of being in the world and a way in which the world comes to be. Thus, diasporic signifies a variety of qualities and properties that pertain to both the subjects of these experiences and to the social relations/reality/world/milieu/culture/environment in which these subjects exist.

*(ibid., p. 2)*

As such, anthropology uses analysis of migratory culture as a basis for exploring the plurality of ways of being with, and even beyond, the issue of migration.

In geography, too, the use of the notion of culture has underpinned a transition from a time when migration was seen only as a response to structural forces of economics and demography and – as a result of spatial inequalities – to a new epistemology based on the analysis of culture and individual and collective perceptions and subjectivities of the migration experience. This development in 'post-population geography' is often referred to in contemporary geography as the 'Cultural Turn'. In addition, new approaches in Human Geography have enabled the multiplication of studies of space, not as a container or surface, but a product of interrelations and interactions between various scales from the global to the intimate level (Massey 2005).

Within this understanding of the space, Cultural Geography, as a sub-discipline, has made a major contribution to Migration Studies as it lies at the intersection of the analysis of cultural meanings that people invest in or attach to a specific place or to the networks that they constitute and in which they become involved, how these are materialised in space, how they are represented by those involved, and the imaginary frameworks associated with them. Its contribution has been to spatialise our perceptions of the cultural dimension of international migrations through analysis at various scales, from micro to macro, from the subjective dimension of the individual to the study of diasporic networks at urban, national, regional, and global levels. In this sense, migration is accepted as a phenomenon that is culturally produced, culturally expressed, and cultural in its effects, an event rich in meaning at various levels (Champion and Fielding 1992; McHugh 2000). Consequently, geography mobilised ethnographic, biographic, and autobiographic studies, life-histories, personal narratives, participatory methods, and other creative methods that insist on the importance of considering migration as a subjective experience and the need to understand migrants in their entire trajectory (Graham 2000).

Finally, scholars in area studies across the world and across academic disciplines have also contributed to the study of international migration by including it in the analysis of the cultural specificities of a geographical space, often taking a *longue durée* approach. Anthropologist

Franck Mermier (2015) rightly points out that the geography of mobility and migration between cities in the Arab world such as Beirut, Dubai, or Cairo is ‘specific to the Arab space in the sense that it is based on imaginaries and hierarchies specific to this region, which are permanently subject to transformation and contestation’ (p. 183). In my own research focusing on migration between Iran and the UAE, Dubai in particular, I first tried to understand migratory and transnational dynamics in relation with historical nation-building processes in two distinct contexts that also explain the internal diversity of national communities. This required examining these issues from two fields of study: Iranian Studies and the more recent Gulf Studies. This historical research into specific cultural areas was essential for a better understanding of the different kinds of relationships individuals and groups had with their country of origin, Iran, and their host country, the Emirates, and how they are anchored in the city of Dubai, as well as their greater or lesser involvement in transnational practices (Moghadam 2021).

### Material culture and migrants

The cultural approach in both geography and anthropology has been enriched with material culture studies. For more than 25 years, we have witnessed a preoccupation with the study of material objects and materiality across social science disciplines (Cook and Tolia-Kelly 2012; Miller 2008; Tolia-Kelly 2009; Weber 2014). The latter focus on how objects and things inform us about individual and collective trajectories, the emotions and associations they elicit, and how place-making and ways of belonging are achieved through the choice or manufacture of objects and the built environment. The emotions and functionalities objects embody make them objects of study in their own right to better understand how individuals and groups engage in certain actions, mobilise repertoires of meaning, and build identities. Thus ‘object biographies’ have provided a new methodology for studying social relations, not only between humans but also between humans and non-humans (Appadurai 1986). How people make, use, exchange, and consume things, but also how these things participate in individuals’ social interactions constitute a new epistemological approach to capturing the diversity of ways of being: ‘...through active handling of the world of things, people internalise and incorporate culture, that is, social structures, ideas, norms, values and patterns of action’ (Yi-Neumann et al. 2022, p. 8).

Not surprisingly, this approach has also found some success in Migration Studies exploring how migration processes and dynamics, but also mobilities more broadly, contribute to the emergence of new living environments, including their physical dimension, and the production, circulation, exchange, and consumption of new things (Basu and Coleman 2008; Wang 2016; Werbner 2000; Yi-Neumann et al. 2022). Also dubbed ‘material culture of migration’, objects (or things) acquire in this sense their own agency to explain social phenomena related to migration and the diasporic experience. Relating the life of objects to the different sequences of migration helps us explore the links between subjects and objects to study the places where objects are used and transformed and how they relate to the intimate space of individuals and their self-identification.

The joint study of objects and lives allows us to see the migratory world in its entirety. Paul Basu and Simon Coleman (2008), in their introduction to the *Mobilities* edition titled *Migrant Worlds, Material Cultures*, explained that they

refer to “migrant worlds” rather than “migration” *per se*, in that we are not only concerned with the materiality of migration itself, but also with the material effects of

having moved, perhaps many years earlier, to a new place, and with the inter-relatedness of the movements of people and things. In addition, we want to convey the sense that a “world” – an often fragmented and fragile set of material and non-material assumptions and resources – can itself be mobile, seemingly translated from one geographical location to another, even as it is transformed in the process.

(p. 313)

‘Materiality’, as Basu and Coleman remind us, refers to ‘physical objects and worlds, but also [to] evoke more varied – multiple – forms of experience and sensation that are both embodied and constituted through the interactions of subjects and objects’ (ibid., p. 317). This may involve the emergence of new living environments, from domestic space to new architectural forms in the city or the emergence of new neighbourhoods with certain material features related to international mobilities and migrations (Blunt 2005; Savaş 2010; Walsh 2012). But this materiality can also include objects that travel with migrants or are exchanged, produced, or consumed. Think, for example, of the key role of mobile phones in irregular migration trajectories or the memorial role of photos of family and friends, or the suitcase as an object emblematic of travel, accompanying migrants and refugees on their journeys of exodus (Burrell 2008; Mertus 1997; Tuckett 2018).

This migrant material world also illuminates the strategies of distinction and differentiation deployed by migrants within their groups of belonging in relation to the host and home societies, with distinct modalities of materialisation and on different geographical scales, from the domestic space to the neighbourhood and the city. It has, therefore, many manifestations. It is expressed, for example, through the products consumed by migrants and how they consume them, in themselves indicators of modes of belonging to a new environment, of social, family, and intergenerational links (Silhouette-Dercourt and Möhring 2018). Where, what, and how products are consumed are rich in meaning for individual or group strategies and may become vectors of social positioning vis-à-vis others and society at large. Laure Assaf’s (2020) study of young Arab migrants’ sociability in Abu Dhabi shows how consuming *Karak* – a drink made of black tea, sweet milk, and cardamom – is associated with their strategies of appropriation of the interstitial spaces of the city and helps them build some sense of belonging in an environment where access to citizenship is almost impossible. Through consumption patterns, associated imaginaries, and alternative urban practices, Assaf examines the behaviour and strategies of belonging of young migrants in an exclusionary context:

In so doing, they construct a specific version of the Emirati capital – an Abu Dhabi for which belonging does not depend on the nationality on one’s passport, but on the intimate knowledge of the city and familiarity with its diverse inhabitants.

(ibid., p. 839)

Such approaches allow us to formulate migration issues both within and beyond Migration Studies. In a medical anthropology study of the psychological trauma and disorders of Iranians who grew up during the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s, Orkideh Behrouzan (2016) asks her interlocutors in Iran and the diaspora to talk about the consumer goods and day-to-day items that marked their daily lives in those years: *Darugar* shampoo bottles (the emblematic national brand), illegal Betamax video players, *Khersi* chewing gum, cartoon characters etc. The memory of these objects, their frequent use and representation in social networks recalled wartime camaraderie in a context of economic hardship and international sanctions,

constituting a generational memory that links those in the country of origin with the diaspora. In the memory of these objects and their reminiscence, Behrouzan sees ‘culturally generative venues for the compulsive return of the 1980s...In them, I look for recursive processes of remembering or forgetting that produce new cultural contexts and generational identities’ (ibid., p. 6).

Given their power to generate emotions and memories, objects have often contributed to diasporic art and design and how the diaspora represents the experience of migration and exile; they may even feature in their host countries’ heritage projects, in some cases in immigration or settlers’ museums or urban history museums. The Musée National de l’Histoire de l’Immigration in Paris offers an interesting example. Opened in 2007 after a complex institutional gestation, it is founded around the idea that the museum, as mediator, should enable cultural expressions in the broad sense to become the collective heritage of all. It has a space called the Donations Gallery, which brings together objects given by individuals whose lives were directly or indirectly marked by migration. Displaying the objects alongside the migration narratives of donors and their families contributes to the museum’s ambition to ‘build links with civil society’ (Flicoteaux 2018). Gifts are governed by agreements between donors and the museum under which the former may withdraw their objects should they so wish: a trowel, a sewing machine, a soccer table, a violin, a suitcase, a teapot, a stateless person’s papers, but also things once belonging to the famous or particular groups, such ‘chevalier de l’Ordre des arts et des lettres’ medal or the flag of the Union of Jewish volunteers and veterans of 1939–1945. Displaying these different objects and their transnational narratives, which often link several cities and national contexts, sheds light on emblematic figures from world and French history. The museum thus participates in a form of institutionalisation of migration’s material culture, highlighting individual and family migratory memories, while exhibiting them in the public space of a museum links them to France’s national heritage.

By this shift from the intimate to the public space, from family heritage to national heritage, it confers a certain aura, but also and above all legitimises these cultures. This is certainly a recognition of the importance of migratory phenomena and their capacity to transform (or *migrantize*) dominant material cultures. But one may also wonder whether it is not also a form of distancing and compartmentalisation of migratory issues (in a museum dedicated to these issues).

(ibid., p. 103)<sup>1</sup>

Lastly, an important material manifestation of migratory trajectories is embodied in housing and home-making practices, including the architectural forms that emerge from transnational practices. Numerous research projects in Cultural Geography, Anthropology, and cultural studies have focussed on the interplay of home-making and housing issues, fostering new dialogues with other disciplines such as architecture, even if the latter’s interest in migration issues came rather late (Blunt 2005; Boccagni 2014; Levin 2012, 2015; Lozanovska 2019; Savaş 2010; Tolia-Kelly 2004). What is interesting about the house as an architectural form is precisely how it highlights links between the interior and exterior of living spaces, between domestic habitat and public spaces, between domesticity and displacement. As part of my ongoing study of Iranian migrant home-ownership experiences in Toronto, one migrant proudly told me that he bought a house in a ‘White Canadian’ suburb. When we entered his home, he showed me a large traditional painting he had brought with him from Iran and the Louis XV-style furniture common in some wealthy circles in Iran, transported to Canada by a specialist carrier to recreate the same atmosphere as in his Tehran flat. On the

one hand, this interior provided the setting for an almost exclusively Iranian social life, while on the other, access to property in a neighbourhood perceived as ‘White Canadian’ evoked a sense of integration into Canadian society. In this case, analysis may focus on economic, social, and emotional considerations at the individual level or regarding intra-community relations, alongside the aesthetic and material features of these furnishings that led to the decision to transport them from Tehran to Toronto. But it can go further and change the scale by emphasising the repercussions of such practices on the creation of new logistics circuits, involving numerous intermediary actors making shipping from Iran to Canada possible despite difficulties caused by international sanctions. Finally, these individual and collective choices and the global circuits resulting from them also have repercussions at the city level since not only have some companies now specialised in this intercontinental transport, but ‘Iranian-style’ furniture shops have become one of the hallmarks of the so-called Iranian neighbourhood of Richmond Hill in Toronto’s northern suburbs.

Seen in this way, the house becomes a ‘transcultural construct’ insofar as ‘when migrants inhabit, adapt, purchase or construct houses, questions are raised about who has access to defining value and meaning, and how the symbolic and cultural narratives of taste and aesthetics are formed’ (Lozanovska 2019, p. 2).

Housing strategies in the country of origin and in the cities or other places of settlement also shed light on the different stages of the migratory process, often intersecting with other spheres of life, such as children’s education, retirement strategies, or gender roles. In some contexts where migration (both emigration and immigration) plays a major role in socio-spatial dynamics, the question of migrant housing and related architectural forms becomes essential to understanding the emergence of new urban aesthetics, the organisation of streets, and *in fine* the production of space. Mirjana Lozanovska’s (2019) study of migration from southern Europe (Italy, Greece, former Yugoslavia) to countries such as Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, the US, Canada, or Australia explores the distinct modalities of housing in both home and host country. Her research focusses on migrant houses in the village of Zavjol in Northern Macedonia, the place of emigration, and Melbourne in Australia, the city of immigration. She makes a careful analysis of the materialities and architectural forms linked to these moves, highlighting the different social and cultural aspects of the constructions: ‘The theory resides in the studies of the migrant housing, and how the houses mediate, stage and negotiate connections and distances, and communities during the settlement process of migration’ (*ibid.*, p. 1).

Lozanovska’s methodology is in itself innovative as it draws on extensive architectural documentation, including drawings, plans and elevations, photographs, and diagrams of the dwellings in both country of origin and host city, in addition to more classical methods of ethnographic research. Furthermore, through a form of connected ethnography that takes architectural form as its primary object of research, the author relates and narrates the processes of post-war Australian nation-building and the migratory flows it generated to Melbourne, juxtaposing them with emigration from Zavoj and its decline as a place of habitation after 1945.

### **Concluding remarks**

By emphasising both material culture and spatiality, we set up an inter-disciplinary dialogue in the study of migration to which Anthropology and Cultural Geography have made important contributions. The main advantage is that this enables us to focus once more on practices and lived experiences, on the importance of localities and their history, and the plurality of ways of living and being, and investigate their universal and specific nature. In this

way, it also makes it possible to question identity beyond identity-based discourses that tend to homogenise heterogeneous situations, often through an authoritarian type of pedagogy that underlies benevolent political categorisations seeking to ‘manage’ migration or cultural diversity. It thus represents a shift from ‘identity-talk’ to ‘object-talk’, to better understand the complexity of migrants’ lives (Frykman 2016, p. 54). When people use certain things, they objectify their social relations ‘providing a kind of commentary on their social existence’ (Jackson 2000).

Making objects talk along with the migrants (and non-migrants) who carry, live in, exchange, make, or exhibit them allows us to ask phenomenological questions about the construction of self – always in relation to others – about the emotions and associations they evoke and the economic and social considerations involved. For behind the material culture of migrations, whether we are looking at things or spaces, there is also a political economy supporting their production: the multitude of networks of players and economic circuits feeding into them. It is perhaps through this interplay between the political economy of circulations and the material culture of migration that new research perspectives on culture and migration will emerge.

### Note

- 1 Translated from French into English by the author.

### References

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Smith, Philip (2014) The Strong Program. In: *Handbook of Cultural Sociology*. London: Routledge. DOI:10.4324/9780203891377.ch1.
- Appadurai, Arjun, ed. (1986) *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Assaf, Laure (2020) Abu Dhabi Is My Sweet Home. *City*, 24(5–6), pp. 830–841.
- Basu, Paul and Coleman, Simon (2008) Introduction: Migrant Worlds, Material Cultures’. *Mobilities*, 3(3), pp. 313–330.
- Behrouzan, Orkideh (2016) *Prozak Diaries: Psychiatry and Generational Memory in Iran*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Blunt, Alison (2005) Cultural Geography: Cultural Geographies of Home. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(4), pp. 505–515.
- Boccagni, Paolo (2014) What’s in a (Migrant) House? Changing Domestic Spaces, the Negotiation of Belonging and Home-Making in Ecuadorian Migration. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 31(3), pp. 277–293.
- Burrell, Kathy (2008) Materialising the Border: Spaces of Mobility and Material Culture in Migration from Post-Socialist Poland. *Mobilities*, 3(3), pp. 353–373.
- Champion, Tony and Fielding, Tony (1992) *Migration Processes and Patterns*, Vol. 1. Place of publication not identified: Belhaven.
- Cohen, Jeffrey H. and Sirkeci, Ibrahim (2021) *Handbook of Culture and Migration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Cook, Ian and Tolia-Kelly, Divya P. (2012) *Material Geographies*. In: Hicks, Dan and Beaudry, Mary C. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199218714.013.0003.
- Cuche, Denys (2016) IX/Migrations internationales et transformations culturelles. *Reperes*, 5e éd, pp. 141–156.
- Dubucs, Hadrien (2015) Quelle Place Pour Le ‘culturel’ En Géographie Des Migrations Internationales? *Géographie et Cultures*, no. 93–94 (April), pp. 325–346. DOI:10.4000/gc.4032.
- Flicoteaux, Muriel (2018) Vers de nouvelles formes d’institutionnalisation des cultures matérielles immigrées ? *Hommes & migrations. Revue française de référence sur les dynamiques migratoires*, no. 1320 (January), pp. 97–103. DOI:10.4000/hommesmigrations.4060.



### *Migrants and their cultural world*

- Frykman, Maja Povrzanović (2016) Conceptualising Continuity: A Material Culture Perspective on Transnational Social Fields. *Ethnologia Fennica*, 43, pp. 43–56.
- Graham, Elspeth (2000) What Kind of Theory for What Kind of Population Geography? *International Journal of Population Geography*, 6(4), pp. 257–272.
- Hage, Ghassan (2021) *The Diasporic Condition: Ethnographic Explorations of the Lebanese in the World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, Stuart (1987) Minimal Selves. In: Appignanesi, Lisa (ed.), *Identity: The Real Me*. London: ICA Documents, pp. 44–46.
- Jackson, Peter (2000) Rematerializing Social and Cultural Geography. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1(1), pp. 9–14.
- Levin, Iris (2012) Chinese Migrants in Melbourne and Their House Choices. *Australian Geographer*, 43(3), pp. 303–320.
- Levin, Iris (2015) *Migration, Settlement, and the Concepts of House and Home*. New York: Routledge. DOI:10.4324/9781315866802.
- Levitt, Peggy (2010) Taking Culture Seriously: The Unexplored Nexus between Migration, Incorporation and Development. *Revue Européenne Des Migrations Internationales*, 26(2), pp. 139–153.
- Levitt, Peggy (2016) Global Culture in Motion. In: Robertson, R. and Buhari-Gulmez, D. (eds.), *Global Culture: Consciousness and Connectivity*. London: Routledge, pp. 143–160.
- Lozanovska, Mirjana (2019) *Migrant Housing: Architecture, Dwelling, Migration*. Routledge Research in Architecture. New York: Routledge.
- Massey, Doreen B. (2005) *For Space*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- McHugh, Kevin E. (2000) Inside, Outside, Upside down, Backward, Forward, Round and Round: A Case for Ethnographic Studies in Migration. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(1), pp. 71–89.
- Mermier, Franck (2015) *Récits de Villes: D'Aden à Beyrouth: Essai*. Sindbad. Paris: Actes Sud.
- Mertus, Julie, ed. (1997) *The Suitcase: Refugee Voices from Bosnia and Croatia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Miller, Daniel (2008) *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moghadam, Amin (2021) Iranian Migrations to Dubai: Constraints and Autonomy of a Segmented Diaspora. Working Paper No. 2021/3. Toronto: Ryerson University, CERC in Migration and Integration.
- Park, Robert E. (1928) Human Migration and the Marginal Man. *American Journal of Sociology*, 33(6), pp. 881–893.
- Savaş, Özlem (2010) The Collective Turkish Home in Vienna: Aesthetic Narratives of Migration and Belonging. *Home Cultures*, 7(November), pp. 313–340. DOI:10.2752/175174210X12785760502252.
- Silhouette-Dercourt, Virginie and Möhring, Maren (2018) La migration au prisme de la consommation. *Hommes & migrations. Revue française de référence sur les dynamiques migratoires*, 1320(January), pp. 6–11. DOI:10.4000/hommesmigrations.4038.
- Tolia-Kelly, Divya (2004) Locating Processes of Identification: Studying the Precipitates of Remembrance through Artefacts in the British Asian Home. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(3), pp. 314–329.
- Tolia-Kelly, Divya (2009) Material Culture. In: Kitchen, Rob and Thrift, Nigel (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 500–504.
- Tuckett, Anna (2018) *Rules, Paper, Status: Migrants and Precarious Bureaucracy in Contemporary Italy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Walsh, Katie (2012) Emotion and Migration: British Transnationals in Dubai. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 30(1), pp. 43–59.
- Wang, Cangbai (2016) Introduction: The 'Material Turn' in Migration Studies. *Modern Languages Open*, September. DOI:10.3828/mlo.v0i0.88.
- Weber, Serge (2014) Le retour au matériel en géographie. *Géographie et cultures*, no. 91–92 (October), pp. 5–22.
- Werbner, Pnina (2000) Introduction: The Materiality of Diaspora – Between Aesthetic and 'Real' Politics. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 9(1), pp. 5–20.
- Yi-Neumann, Friedemann, Lauser, A., Fuhse, A. and Bräunlein, P.J., eds. (2022) *Material Culture and (Forced) Migration. Materializing the Transient*. London: UCL Press.
- Znaniecki, Florian and Thomas, William I. (1968) The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. *The Polish Review*, 13(2), pp. 14–27.