

Invisible or Networked? Exploring dynamics of social capital and networking among
urban refugees in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

By

Megan Vukelic

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Political Science

Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario

© 2018, Megan Vukelic

Abstract

Policy in refugee hosting states plays a significant role in how urban refugees plot their exile strategies. However, there is often a divide between *de jure* interpretation of refugee policy as written and the *de facto* manner in which it is experienced. As such, there is significant variation in how refugees manage their social networks in exile. This thesis analyzes the social capital and livelihood procurement strategies of urban refugees in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. It will illustrate how capital and pre-exile experiences create variation in social and livelihood strategy in exile, as well as demonstrate how political factors are limited in accounting for strategy differences. Refugees demonstrate agency by navigating the structural landscape of Tanzania. While refugees are regarded as a uniform group, variation in how networks are formed, maintained and employed exists between sub-groups, conditioned by relative accumulation of capital. The unequal possession of resources and capital creates differences in access to space, creating a distinct geography of refugee space. Given the multitude of refugee groups that inhabit the city, Dar es Salaam provides a rich setting for exploring the drivers of these social nuances and exploring how refugee spaces are conditioned.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor James Milner for his unwavering patience and support throughout the experience of field work and beyond. I would also like to thank my friends and family for their endless encouragement, and Nicole for her kindness and zero tolerance approach to self-deprecating humor.

I would also like to thank Dobby, my dog, for being the light of my life and the inspiration for everything I do.



Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Appendices	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Refugee Networks.....	8
Chapter 2: Structure and Agency.....	30
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	41
Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis.....	68
Conclusion.....	104
References	110
Appendices	117

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Guide Questions.....113

Introduction

There is currently a higher number of refugees in urban spaces than has ever been recognized. This has led to a recent increase in literature and policy discussions on urban refugees and related policy change (Crisp, 2017). The phenomenon of refugees in urban spaces, however, is not new. What we have seen is that refugees have existed in urban spaces for decades. One of the most iconic works of literature on urban refugees is Lisa Malkki's *Purity and Exile* (1995) which talks about the differences between the experiences of camp dwelling refugees and urban refugees in the Kigoma region of Tanzania, particularly in what she notes to be a divisive experience of structure and agency between the two settings. In reading the existing literature on urban refugee social networks based on different case studies across Africa, we encounter three distinct refugee archetypes or paradigms.

The term archetype is used in this thesis to reflect three distinct descriptions of how social networks are arranged in existing literature. The term is used to describe lived realities of refugees and organize them into related groups, rather than suggest that the archetypes themselves define outcomes. Archetypes do not have any causal explanatory power, but rather are an organizational tool for understanding strategy.

The first archetype is that of anonymity, and is characterized by refugees choosing various strategies of invisibility to sustain their lives in urban areas. This is depicted in the work of scholars such as Malkki (1995), Landau (2018), Landau & Amit (2014) and Worby (2010). These examples are evident in case studies conducted in East and Southern Africa. The second archetype is that of minute networks based on the notion of opportunity. Evidence of such strategy is present in the work of Alexander

Betts (2017), Karen Jacobsen (2006), and is also drawn from case studies of East and Southern Africa (Sommers, 2001; Jacobsen, 2004). It embodies a notion of refugee entrepreneurs who draw on networks as a means of livelihood procurement strategy. The third archetype is that of networking. Refugees of this archetype are networked with refugees in other places, be it abroad or in the country of origin. This is distinctly different from the previous opportunity paradigm, and is based on the notion that networks are used to spread risk and share resources. (Horst, 2002; Campbell, 2006). Examples of these strategies are evident globally and suggest vast transnational refugee networks (Campbell, 2006; Campbell, 2005; Crisp et al., 2009).

As increased attention is paid to this demographic and knowledge on refugees in urban spaces increases, these archetypes do not sit comfortably together. With reports of refugee strategies varying across countries and regions of Africa and in different social, political and temporal contexts, there exists a tension between the archetypes. The question then becomes which is the dominant narrative and what is the driver of the tension between these tropes. This idea of questioning how these archetypes hold up in different contexts and the variation between them leads to two core questions that animate this thesis.

First, it asks what conditions refugee exile strategy and social network development, and the decision to be invisible or networked?

Second, it asks whether structure or agency has greater weight as a conditioning factor in the lives of urban refugees and a driving determinant of livelihood strategy. Following up on the position of Malkki (1995) who suggests that refugees' experiences of structure and agency are defined by whether they live in camps or urban areas, this

thesis will ask whether this binary experience of the dynamic exists in present day Dar es Salaam.

Finally, interrogating these two core questions leads to a third; the question of refugee space. It asks how refugee strategies reflect their experience of different spaces and what leads to variation in those experiences.

This thesis argues that traditional conceptualizations of the structure and agency dialectic do not adequately account for the refugee experience. Existing ideas of structure and agency describe a dynamic based on rigid ideas of belonging related to territoriality and Westphalian notions of borders (Bourdieu, 1984; Flint & Shelly, 1996; Bakewell, 2010; Giddens, 1979). This thesis posits an idea of structure and agency that considers a third extra-political space that is conditioned by, but exists beyond, structure.

This thesis argues that differences in strategies are conditioned by the access an individual has to particular assets and the relevance of those assets to particular situations and settings. It suggests that shifting political climates and rhetoric create and condition strategies both pre-exile and post-exile, and makes a case for how assets gained before migration effect and influence social relationships and the weight of those relationships for livelihood procurement. It advocates for an intersectional approach to viewing refugee strategy in the urban context.

Finally, it suggests that refugee spaces can be imagined as being in relationship to access and inclusion, elements which are gained through possession of certain traits and assets. Belonging to one space versus another or having access to particular arenas of interaction is relative to the assets and capital one has.

Recent literature examining refugee social strategies in exile focus on the context specific reasons particular strategies emerge the way they do within a given case study (Worby, 2010; Campbell, 2006; Landau, 2018; Sommers, 2001). While in some cases refugees have employed strategies of integration and solidarity, such as in the community of Eastleigh in Nairobi, Kenya (Campbell, 2006), others, as in the case of Zimbabwean refugees in South Africa, (Worby, 2010; Landau, 2018) employ strategies of invisibility. What has emerged is literature describing distinct social patterns in different pockets of Africa and between cultures, without a cross comparison of strategies. Sufficient attention has not been paid to what factors drive differences and lead to choices in social networking in exile. These differences can help us to understand and predict strategies of livelihood procurement in exile and better account for urban refugees. As such, this thesis aims to address this gap by first conceptualizing the relationship between contributing factors such as cultural nuance, access to capital and context and strategy as a continuum of refugee archetypes.

As will be discussed in chapter three, the methodology of this thesis draws from political science (Diefenbach, 2009; McNabb, 2015; Rodgers, 2004; Liamputtong, 2007; Browne, 2005; Denzin 2008) and anthropology (Conquergood, 1991; Evans and Handelman, 2006; O'Reilly, 2012; Harrell-Bond & Voutira, 1992; Okely 2013). These disciplines have informed the research design and levels of analysis used in this thesis. A wide selection of literature on methods for interviewing refugees and sensitive populations was considered and informed the practical aspects of the research (Rodgers, 2004; Harrell-Bond & Voutira, 1992; Liamputtong, 2007; Pernice, 1994). It draws on a variety of levels of these two disciplines, both practical and theoretical, and

offers thoughtful consideration of both. The core of this thesis is an analysis of the social strategies and methods of livelihood procurement used by refugees in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. The methodologies employed are in part semi-structured interviews and part ethnographic observation, which will be elaborated on further in this thesis. Using interviews allowed for the development of narratives from both refugees and Tanzanian nationals to provide a richer understanding of the everyday politics and lived experiences of individuals. Using ethnographic methods throughout the market allowed for observation of interactions and associations amongst nationals and refugees that might not otherwise be verbalized.

This thesis uses the term refugee as a social rather than a legal category. The most widely cited legal definition comes from the 1951 Refugee Convention, defining a refugee as a “person who owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (UNHCR, 2018). This legal definition, however, has limited explanatory power given that most refugees in Africa do not benefit from individual legal status, but – at best – have *prima facie* refugee status (Rutinwa, 2002). Instead, this thesis uses the term refugees to refer to those non-nationals who have left their country of origin due to instability or persecution and who survive in a precarious legal state as in the host country. While the lived experience of refugees intersects with other marginalized groups, such as the urban poor, and other

non-nationals with precarious legal status, and while individual social positioning pertaining to factors such as gender, ethnicity, etc. leads to differences and additional levels of precarity, this thesis argues that there is a distinct social reality experienced by those who have fled their country of origin, survive in a host country with precarious legal status, and feel unable to return to their country of origin.

This thesis is comprised of three substantive sections. The first outlines and re-examines the existing literature and frameworks that this work seeks to challenge and explain. It looks at a broad body of literature on refugee social networks in the African context, as well as refugees in relation to established theories of structure and agency. The second section provides the methodological frameworks used as well as the expectations and findings of this study. The final section provides an overview and analysis of the findings and their implications for future research.

Chapter one examines existing literature on social networks and social capital among refugees in exile across the African context. It uses key examples from Kenya (Campbell, 2006), South Africa (Landau, 2018; Worby, 2010) and Tanzania (Malkki, 1995; Sommers, 2001) to illustrate the variance in social strategy cross-culturally, as well as across time periods in order to examine the drivers of strategy difference. In addition to demonstrating that social strategies differ between refugee contexts, it reimagines these different strategies as pieces of an archetype continuum of strategies, ranging from invisible to networked, each being influenced by different factors and contexts.

Chapter two critically examines the notion that structure and agency are divisively present in refugee spaces and reimagines a framework for understanding the

dialectic that better accounts for the experiences of urban refugees. It challenges the ideas of Lisa Malkki that camps are places of structure while urban areas are places of agency, and suggests that refugee spaces can best be conceptualized as being relative to access and inclusion, rather than physical entities.

Chapter three presents the methodology chosen to undertake this research, as well as outlines challenges met in the field and what accommodations and alterations were made to the research question as a result. In addressing how this methodology serves to answer the research questions, it begins by explaining the choice of Dar es Salaam as a case study. It follows by presenting the methodologies chosen as well as the methodological considerations that were made. It also reflects on the experiences of the researcher to highlight the importance of trust and the complexities of building it, both between researcher and subject and the refugee and the community.

Chapter four outlines and analyzes the major findings of this thesis in relationship to the three major questions stated above and puts them in conversation with existing literature. It outlines the implications these findings have for existing and future academic research on refugee networks.

Chapter 1: Refugee Networks

This chapter will demonstrate the refugee archetypes that are evident in existing literature by providing an overview of a few select case studies. It will reorganize what is already understood about urban integration into an archetype continuum, a way of understanding strategies as a spectrum. By outlining the existing literature on social capital and social networks, it will provide insight into what is missing from the collective understanding of refugee social strategy and the tension that exists between the existing narratives. It will, in order, outline strategies of invisibility, minute networks, and strategies of integration. Finally, it will make sense of what organizing these strategies into a spectrum tells us about refugee social strategies and what questions we can begin to ask. Understanding these gaps provides a basis for this thesis and lays the groundwork for answering what creates variation in refugee social integration and livelihood procurement.

Urban Migration

Urban areas offer refugees economic opportunities that are not available in camps and the social freedom to carve out their own paths (Campbell, 2005 & 2006; Hovil, 2007; Jacobsen, 2006; Landau & Jacobsen, 2005; Macchiavello, n.d.; Sommers, 1999 & 2001). While camp refugees are given aid in the form of food and stipends in most contexts, this is often not sufficient to sustain their families (Horst, 2002; Macchiavello, n.d.). Urban areas are often attractive for their presumed economic offerings and promise of better opportunities (Malkki, 1995; Hovil, 2007; Jacobsen, 2006). Refugees are able to find work opportunities in urban areas through a variety of strategies that will be discussed below (Banki, 2006; Horst, 2002; Jacobsen, 2006;

Landau, 2018) however most states do not provide refugees with the right to work. This body of urban refugee work is usually within the informal sector and done in a clandestine fashion (Alexander,2002; Campbell,2006; Crisp et al. 2009, Horst, 2002; Jacobsen, 2004; Landau & Jacobsen, 2005; Sommers, 1999).

While in camps many aid organizations offer “internship” opportunities to refugees with a stipend, nationals are often reluctant from employing refugees even when there are formal channels to do so (Crisp et al, 2009; Jacobsen, 2004). Many refugees still choose the uncertainty of urban life over camps. As in any livelihood choices, refugees employ and acquire various kinds of capital in their journeys both in camps and urban life. Existing, albeit limited, literature exists describing life in urban contexts. It is estimated that 69% of refugees today are living outside of camps (UNHCR, 2017), the majority of which are in their host countries undocumented or without proper documentation. This lack of documentation makes it difficult to report accurate statistics on urban dwelling refugees and their demographics. Those who remain undocumented are at risk of being detained or deported by their host governments (Campbell, 2006; Crisp et al., 2009; Horst, 2002; Jacobsen, 2004), making getting in contact with these communities difficult.

While most host governments place significant limitations on the integrative potential of refugees, many refugees demonstrate personal agency and the ability to survive and create their own opportunities whilst navigating structural obstacles (Jacobsen, 2004). As mentioned, governments often limit the mobility of refugees, as well as the right to work and education in urban areas. In urban Tanzania, even refugees with legal status and permits to live in urban areas have reported inability to

attend local schools (Briant & Kennedy, 2004; Alexander, 2008). While there have been movements in many countries, particularly in Tanzania, to give urban refugees permits that allow them to work and move freely, little legislative work has been done to make this a reality. Without legal integration, complete local integration cannot take place under the definition Crisp gives, that local integration is based on both legal economic and social dimensions (Crisp, 2004, pg.1). Campbell states that most refugees are integrated economically, but lack integration in the remaining two pillars (2006, pg. 402). Myriad reasons exist for why states refuse to integrate refugees, including xenophobic rhetoric, a lack of resources to support population influx, and a reliance on aid provided by the international community for refugees, that would be lost if these individuals were legally integrated. While refugees manage to create lives for themselves in urban settings, they do not enjoy the same entitlements and freedoms as citizens, and they face discrimination from authorities and the public alike. Such discrimination makes finding employment all the more difficult (Jacobsen 2006; Horst, 2002). While many nationals on the African continent engage in informal work alongside refugees, it is the xenophobic discrimination that often creates challenges for securing employment opportunities. Many see refugees as an economic burden that take jobs from locals, which is a powerful scapegoating tool often used by government (Jacobsen, 2005). Despite this commonly held idea, refugees often create vibrant economic lives and in some circumstances, are able to create networks with local communities.

Establishing Archetypes

In the precarious day to day lives of refugees, social networks are often one of the most fluctuating resources (Landau 2004, Hovil, 2007). While in some situations

they are the crux of refugee strategy, in others they are infrequently called upon. The utilization of particular resources, such as financial assets, education, etc. can be dependent on legitimacy recognized but the state in the form of legal refugee status or citizenship status, therefore making them difficult or even impossible to employ (Briant and Kennedy, 2004; Campbell 2005, Campbell 2006, Bailey 2004; Alexander 2008). For example, in few circumstances are refugees able to hold formal employment or open bank accounts (Campbell, 2004). Social capital and network building is a primarily informal process, creating capital which transcends spaces of legitimacy and illegitimacy, along the border of which traditional forms of tangible capital are lost. While networks are a capital used and built by all, the context in which the refugee uses them changes how these relationships are formed and maintained, and for what purposes they are used. This section will organize existing reports of refugee networks as a continuum of the refugee archetype, across which exist a variety of different refugee strategies, contexts and related outcomes. The archetype is a snapshot of how the refugee navigates the state in their host country and social life. Organizing refugee strategy in this way highlights the disparity between reports of networking, even within the same region or geographic context. This disparity is what drives the need for understanding what conditions difference in strategy across and within contexts.

Social Capital

Capital can be broken down into five basic categories: social, which includes networks and connections, formal and informal groups, neighborhoods and kinship, etc.; physical capital, meaning tools, technology, shelter, sanitation and other tangible assets; financial capital, including savings, credit, debt and NGO remittances, natural

capital, such as land and produce, wildlife and environmental services, and human capital including education, health, knowledge and skills (Ellis, 2000). The term livelihood is a reference to these forms of capital and the access to these mediated by institutions and social relations that determine the living gained by the individual household. In ordinary circumstances, this is an aggregate of all these assets, and all are used in varying degrees of each other based on what is available to the individual or household. Structural elements mediate how resources are used and vary based on social context. Without generalizing, there are many examples in the African context where social networks are an invaluable tool for networking in the economy. While many are uneducated and unskilled, the market economy of many African states is based on familial and social connections (Lyons and Snoxell, 2005). Many individuals find work through social connections, using trust as the primary case for employability. In the cases of refugees, migrant workers are often willing or required to sacrifice some rights and assets for others, particularly when undocumented in urban areas, as a by-product of having to navigate the precarity of clandestine life. As we will encounter later in this chapter, one example of this is to cope with marginalized legal status and trading social capital, like connection to networks from pre-exile time, for human capital such as legal protection and rights to education, health, etc.

Archetype 1: Strategies of Invisibility

The first archetype is that of refugees who choose to remain “invisible” in urban areas of their host country. The quality of invisibility refers to a disengagement with both the identities of “refugee” and with the identity of the country of origin. Refugees rid themselves of their refugee identity by choosing to not claim status and the related

privileges and limitations thereof, i.e. foregoing the aid administered in camps for the freedom of living clandestinely in the city (Malkki, 1995). Malkki made the distinction between these two types of refugees by suggesting that there was a critical difference between the agency and strategies employed by camp dwelling refugees who embrace the identity of refugee in the technical and legal sense, and urban refugees who choose to leave camps and dwell in urban areas, usually undocumented and living clandestinely (1995). Malkki suggests that camp refugees identify strongly with their country of origin, and form a personal identity based on the experience of exile and the journey itself. These refugees have strong emotional connections to one another which are solidified through story telling of pre-exile life, and have little attachment to their host country (pg.3, pg. 169, 1995).

Camp refugees have their basic needs such as food and shelter provided to them by UNHCR and aid organizations, and as such, according to Malkki, demonstrate actions dictated by structure rather than individual agency. Choice in the camp setting is limited, and day to day is shaped by the structures that govern it. She contrasts this with the experience of urban dwelling refugees, who use invisibility as their primary strategy for existing undocumented in urban centres (pg. 161). These refugees leave camps for urban areas to seek out better employment opportunities and to make their own path. Malkki reports that In Kigoma, Tanzania in the 1980s when her ethnographic study was conducted, the migration of refugees to urban areas was done primarily by young Burundian men looking for better economic opportunities that were not available in camps (pg. 161).

Given their undocumented status, as refugees in Tanzania are only permitted to dwell in camps, refugees reportedly headed to urban areas alone and chose to settle anonymously and away from other refugees as this helped them to remain undetected (1995). Refugees tried to integrate seamlessly with local communities, forming new social spheres and associating themselves with the host populations. While settling in distinct enclaves is common among voluntary migrants in many countries across the globe (Jacobsen, 2006), this is not a feature of the Dar es Salaam refugee landscape, as reported by Malkki. This was due to the need to remain inconspicuous and out of sight. Settling alone and discarding previously held social ties with other refugees allowed a more seamless integration into local life and therefore a safer clandestine existence. Invisibility in this context shows that one may trade foregoing the use of social capital in order to better operationalize other strategies that may be more beneficial, in context of the political climate for refugees and policies of the time.

Malkki describes the group that falls under the invisibility archetype as having severed themselves from the rest of the refugee community, effectively reinventing themselves as locals and often even taking on Tanzanian names (1995, pg. 71). She reports that many did not identify themselves as refugees or with the identity of their country of origin, but rather as Tanzanians. She reports a distinctly different identity in camps, which is built on a community of refugees closely linked to their pre-exile selves. She links the strategy of invisibility to agency, or the ability of refugees to create their own paths, and suggests that camp refugees are not agents (1995). Urban refugees, according to Malkki, are effectively operating outside a structured system and according to her, do not encounter structural elements and are not bound by their expectations.

She posits that these urban refugees encounter more choice making opportunities than camp refugees and have direct control over building their lives and environments. The following chapter will examine ideas of structure and agency in the refugee context and how they affect the refugee experience. However, Malkki describes a strategy that not only involves individuals operating beyond the structures imposed on them, but one which abandons previously built social ties and cultural attachments.

The invisibility strategies of urban refugees as told by Malkki are only one sub set of the invisibility archetype as a whole. The invisibility strategies as described by Landau and Worby are taken from the context of South Africa and reflect different structural influences and rationales for remaining invisible. Malkki's accounts suggest invisibility as a form of navigating the state, and breaking with a pre-existing identity (1995). She implies that structure or its absence informs the ability to demonstrate agency. The new identity the refugee takes on is a tool of survival, as the refugee identity makes them a target of the state. For the Tanzanian refugee at the time of Malkki's research, pre-existing social ties hold little strategic benefit in urban exile. In the camp setting, these networks are obsolete as a resource as they are not required to sustain themselves, as resources are provided. In both the camp and urban areas, the structural components of the state create an environment, as far as Malkki reports, where refugees cannot utilize pre-existing social networks as part of their livelihood strategy, as it compromises their invisibility. Invisibility becomes a more valuable tool of survival because of restrictions on mobility of the refugee that prevents them from existing in urban areas.

The work of Worby (2010) describes strategies of invisibility being used in South Africa among urban refugees from Zimbabwe. However, in their manner of execution, these strategies suggest a rationale that is starkly different from the invisibility strategies described by Malkki. Worby reports that many Zimbabwean refugees cut ties from family and friends deliberately in an attempt to make their efforts at resettlement in urban Johannesburg more successful. Worby reports the narratives of refugees who disconnect themselves from connections in Zimbabwe who may place a financial or social strain on their resettlement attempt (2010). He coins the phrase “the burden of Ubuntu” to describe the feeling of being obligated to acknowledge and provide for others in need (pg. 419). While there is evidence of the power of social networks as an exile resource, Worby speaks of the burden that comes with sustaining social ties. Many respondents in Worby’s study reported being expected to financially support family members by sending remittances back home. Increase in Zimbabwean household reliance on remittances is caused by a variety of structural factors, including the close proximity of Johannesburg to the Zimbabwean border making it physically viable and convenient, the high volume of border traffic, and the collapse of the Zimbabwean economy (pg. 420).

These factors in combination created a common household need for outside income generation, and a viable means of procuring that income from family and loved ones that had migrated to Johannesburg. In these situations, social networks no longer become a resource but a burden. Many reported cutting ties with family by changing phone numbers and severing communication so as to discontinue this responsibility (pg. 421). Additionally, continuing to sustain social connections presented a social burden

when networks in Zimbabwe chose to follow and migrate to Johannesburg as well. The social concept of Ubuntu, a South African phrase meaning “humanity toward others”, suggests a social expectation to provide their newcomer relatives with a place to stay, as well as social and financial assistance (pg. 422). Respondents described this as a burden on their personal resources and a hindrance to their own development and integration into the host society (pg.426). The weight of these burdens often led individuals to disassociate themselves from their previously existing networks and pre-exile identities, sometimes going so far as to change their names in the host country. Worby reports that Zimbabweans rarely describe themselves as being in exile, and that they fully embrace a new identity in their host communities through the invisibility strategies (pg. 421). He calls this a “rescripting of identity” (pg. 425), which is similar in performance to the integrative practices of young Tanzanian men in Dar es Salaam as described by Malkki.

In “Shunning Solidarity”, Landau points out that durable solutions discussed in the international community often centre around reunification strategies with solidarity among refugees at its centre (2018). This mentality of solidarity being at the crux of solutions is evident in humanitarian efforts, as “restoration” of a previous status quo, as Landau describes it, is at its heart (2018). He suggests that in an era of urban migration, solutions for refugees might be better premised on actively evading connections and solidarity. While solidarity is strongly embedded in the normative guide, global urbanization structures may shift how asylum seekers chart life courses. This is demonstrated in refugees actively seeking opportunities outside of what is provided to them by the international community in camps by heading to urban areas despite the

precarity of clandestine existence. He suggests this shift will be to one of less site-specific durability, with a focus on resource development and accumulation, rather than settlement (pg. 2). He counters the ideas that can be found in the theories of invisibility presented by Malkki (2005), that solutions of invisibility are rooted in structural elements of the city such as pressures from police, immigration control and navigating laws for employing refugees. He suggests that while these are important factors, greater pressure may come from the extensive and often oppressive and resource demanding networks held by refugees (pg. 8). Refugees often feel required to host visiting relatives and those trying to begin a new life, hindering all parties from finding viable livelihood opportunities.

In comparing these two different accounts of invisibility strategies, it can be seen that while the outcomes look very similar in terms of host community integration and the adoption of new identities, the motivations and factors that drive them differ greatly. In the context of Tanzania, Malkki describes an invisibility driven by policies that do not allow for refugees to be mobile or work in urban areas, which prompts them to create identities that give them freedom to create their own livelihood strategies beyond what they are entitled to by the state. In Worby's account of Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa, networks are abandoned because they present burdens that are seen as outweighing the assets. This difference in what informs the choice to disconnect suggests that the social context between the two examples differs, and informs exile strategies. The theoretical differences beg the question of whether structural factors force strategies of invisibility or whether it is individual agency that drives them.

Archetype 2: Minor Network Archetype

The invisibility strategies represent one defined end of the archetype spectrum, where disengaging with the refugee label and existing identities is expressed in absolute terms and is required consistently in order to successfully settle in urban areas for those who employ it. Sommers mirrors a few of the ideas put forth by Malkki in his theory of minute networks, an archetype of urban refugees that falls somewhere in the middle of the spectrum. A midpoint between invisibility and integration, it suggests selective connectivity with curated contacts. In Sommers' study of Burundian refugees in Dar es Salaam some decades after Malkki, he comes to describe this group as "migrant refugees", meaning those who voluntarily come to urban areas (pg. 78, 2001). This is not to suggest that they are voluntarily displaced from their countries of origin, but reflects the groups of refugees who come to urban areas from camps or directly instead of going to camps by their own choice. He too describes the efforts this group of refugees puts in to remain invisible, a strategy he calls "*Kujificha*", a Swahili word meaning to hide oneself (pg. 12).

However, his analysis of *kujificha* differs from the invisibility described by Malkki in a distinct way. Malkki emphasizes that refugees separate themselves in urban areas so as not to call attention to their other-ness, based on the belief that in navigating the state alone it is easier to seamlessly integrate with the host community and therefore go undetected. Sommers goes one step further, and ascribes this invisibility to not just an effort to not stick out, but a degree of distrust for other refugees as well as host community members (pg. 6). A hesitation for developing friendships, support systems and refugee communities comes from, according to Sommers, an inability to trust that

other refugees are trustworthy and will not reveal their identity and refugee status to the larger community. This fear is also fuelled by an uncertainty of anybody being who they say they are, and the difficulty in discerning refugee from Tanzanian national. Sommers reports that learning to speak Swahili in the manner that Tanzanian nationals do and adopting local mannerisms are part of refugee integration strategy. This fear of revealing their identity to the wrong person is driven by the threat of being reported to immigration authorities or exploited if they were to be discovered as refugees. As such, there are few visible markers of who is also a refugee and who is not, which leads to a hesitancy in interacting with strangers. Despite this, he describes refugees as possessing minute networks which center on a single individual they were acquainted with prior to exile upon whom they relied heavily to maintain security and safety in Dar es Salaam (pg. 8). Refugees disclose their refugee status to these individuals, as they are also usually refugees and their relationship was formed prior to exile.

These connections act as a stepping stone to transitioning into the host community. Usually these relationships are based on opportunity, and are used to help secure employment and navigate the state safely. Aside from this acute and trusted contact, the refugees often go about their lives with the newly assumed Tanzanian identity, and integrate themselves into the local community as much as possible. Trusted networks usually form around these singular individuals and remain close knit. They are often related to church groups and communities, as described by Sommers in his experiences integrating with refugee men from Burundi at their church services (pg. 20). This archetype describes the experience of a refugee who has assumed the strategies of invisibility in the first archetype, but have developed these strategies

through the help of a social network who has helped them find, security, stability and often tangible resources like accommodation and livelihood opportunities in exile. Sommers describes a community of Burundian men who all work at the same tailoring shop (pg. 19). Among the greater neighborhood community, they are Tanzanian nationals who have moved from another region of the country, and keep this identity even at church and in other communal social settings. The strategy remains the same, however it is aided by the utilization of social capital. This archetype represents a “medium ground” between full invisibility and a renouncing of a pre-exile identity, and a full visibility in the host community and retained connection to the pre-exile culture. This archetype could be described as being one of dual identity, one that is half tied to a pre-exile self and one that is newly invented. The success of this group comes from the ability to enjoy social capital and its benefits, alongside the invisibility that allows them to navigate institutional and structural context.

The Network Archetype

The network archetype describes a refugee whose utilization of social networks and social capital forms the basis of their social lives and livelihood strategies (Jacobsen 2006; Betts et al, 2017). Rather than abandoning social networks to better navigate the state undetected, refugees who fall under the network archetype rely on social connections to procure livelihoods and navigate their host countries. Refugees of this archetype often live in communities made of refugees, particularly refugees of the same culture and country of origin (Horst, 2002; Jacobsen, 2006; Kibreab, 1996; Landau & Jacobsen, 2005; Macchiavello, n.d.). Their primary strategy becomes one of solidarity, where they hold on to their pre-exile identities as a strategy for connecting

with others of the same identity and navigating the new state together. This implies a different structural and state level context than that of the invisibility and minor network archetypes, as remaining detected by the state is not a priority or a necessity for survival. Staying connected to their pre-exile contacts proves to be an invaluable strength in the lives of refugees of this archetype. In studies conducted by Alexander Betts and Karen Jacobsen, retaining pre-exile contacts tend to be common strategies of success and employed more often, or at least prior to, connecting to and relying on the host community. While it would be problematic to generalize so broadly about refugee networks, for the purposes of this thesis the idea of a highly networked strategy will focus on this particular kind of institutional context.

Why would pre-exile connections be considered more valuable, given that they are out of place in a new social context? Betts et al. describe how institutional factors make refugee economic lives distinct from those of citizens or other groups of migrants (2017). Their positioning is distinctly different from other groups, even other marginalized groups such as the urban poor, because they lie at a cross-section of three different institutional sets; between state government and international government, between the formal and informal sectors of work, and between national and transnational economies (pg. 47). Because they often fall somewhere between these contexts, refugees also fall in a grey area unaccounted for by policies, leaving them vulnerable to abuse but also without protection of a set of national laws and governing practices. They fall outside of a traditional state-citizen relationship and are subject to different rules. While refugees are not inherently different from the host community, this different institutional context means that they face different

opportunities (pg. 47). These differences in institutional recognition manifest as obstacles to refugees procuring livelihoods in traditional ways. They lack territorial citizenships but are also subject to the exercise of sovereign authority by the host government and aid organizations.

Only a minority of refugee hosting governments provide the right to work to refugee communities, leaving them with little options other than pursuing independent sources of independent sources of income generation, typically somewhere in the informal economies (Kritikos, 2000). Their position also puts them at the cross section of two types of socio-spatial connections, those both national and transnational. Though they do not properly belong to either, they participate in both, with related constraints and opportunities resulting from their participation in each. Refugees are often well connected and develop significant social and economic transnational networks, according to Betts et al. (2017). These social networks play a primary role in refugee economic lives, particularly those pursuing lives in urban areas. Refugees move to urban areas to pursue opportunities and benefits not available to them in camps, however this comes with a unique set of challenges, such as no access to banking or credit. Having a lack of formal opportunity such as loans to begin their own business and entrepreneurial endeavors given the difficulty they often face in finding formal employment creates a need to rely on other resources. To generate their own incomes, Betts et. al. report that refugees in Kampala, Uganda use social contacts to draw finance for economic opportunities or for finding opportunities for income generating activities (2017). Betts reports that in many cases when refugees are perceived to be of economic benefit by the host community, they are openly welcomed. Refugees secure

employment by networking with pre-exile connections, but secure their place in the new community by also leveraging new contacts with locals and demonstrating their usefulness to the hosts (Horst, 2002; Jacobsen, 2006). Betts et al. report that refugees in Kampala, Uganda have set up successful entrepreneurial businesses that cause interaction between refugees and their hosts (2017). In these instances, rather than remaining invisible, refugees choose to capitalize on the opportunity of interacting with their new neighbors and form lucrative business relationships (2017). Maintaining and building strong relationships proves to be a valuable asset and strengthens the livelihood strategies and successes of these refugees.

Karen Jacobsen investigates the importance of prolonged and maintained social connection in the case of Somali refugees in Nairobi, Kenya (2005). The neighborhood of Eastleigh, Nairobi is often referred to as “Little Mogadishu” for its large Somali population, made up in large part by refugees. This neighborhood is certainly far from invisible, at it boasts Somali foods and wears, and is filled with people of the culture. Somali refugees have chosen to settle together in Kenya for generations, forming a strong and vibrant community that is anything but under the radar. However, despite their overt nature, the majority of this community has settled here illegally and are not exempt from the political struggles of being undocumented that were described as being part of the everyday of refugees in the first two archetypes we unpacked. Poor refugees are vulnerable to corruption, as Nairobi city council are among some of the most corrupt political bodies. However, their communities are sustained by the networks they create and the manner in which they transcend state boundaries. Elizabeth Campbell notes how in the Eastleigh community refugee enterprises emerge with humble beginnings

and have their roots in the informal economy (2006). Through networking and the unique position refugee networks have in transcending borders, small scale enterprises eventually stretch into elaborate trade networks. She also notes that refugees contribute to the positive growth of Kenyan businesses and economy, particularly in Eastleigh as they bring with them skills and resources that is then amplified through these connections. In this archetype, refugees capitalize on the opportunities that their particular institutional context gives them, and use their networks to create a type of transnational informal economy.

Many refugee networks extend beyond the country of origin and a single host state. In the absence of formal support services such as access to credit through banks or finding formal employment, many refugees rely on transnational networks and remittances. (Campbell, 2006, Crisp et al., 2009; Landau & Jacobsen, 2005). These transnational networks link together countries of origin with countries of asylum and countries of resettlement. In the example of Somali refugees in Nairobi, these transnational networks create links not only between refugees in Kenya and Somalia, but other parts of the African continent, Europe, and North America as well. These Somali networks have led to a substantial informal transnational economy and benefit the host community by expanding markets and importing new skills. Having these networks to support them through remittances and extending business opportunities, refugees are able to overcome social and economic limitations such as lack of employability and xenophobia (Campbell, 2006).

While the archetype of networked refugees belongs at the far right of the continuum, there is within the label itself a spectrum of strategies that correspond,

assumably, to different contexts and resources. While refugees of this type use networks as an asset and through these networks find access to community, livelihood generating opportunities and enfranchisement in the market and society (Campbell, 2006; Jacobsen, 2005; Betts et. al. 2017; Crisp et al., 2009), networks of many different kinds exist. It is how they are procured that is distinct and interesting. As noted by Jacobsen, many refugees maintain their existing familial networks through exile, retaining existing connections and using them to shape their strategies in the host country (2006). Frayne suggests that among migrants and refugees that choose to settle in urban areas, their strategies often mimic those of other urban poor in that family ties are often maintained and relied upon (2004). These connections are referred to by Lyons and Snoxell as inherited ties, and are survived by the migrant after relocation. Putnam suggests that social capital is a by-product of association, and is developed based on the context the individual is in (1995). They are related to the present time and place and are survived or newly developed based on the circumstances that exist. Lyons and Snoxell coin these as contingent marketplace ties, and suggests that social capital is developed strategically. While this remains an underexplored factor that influences social capital, studies by Lyons and Snoxell in Nairobi suggest that women rely on familial ties more often than men (1995). While the archetypes of invisibility suggest an avoidance of structure, and skirting barriers imposed on refugees, the network archetype suggests a sort of comfortability in structure, and a way of integrating within it rather than existing beyond it.

Understanding Archetypes

The section above describes three different archetypes of refugee strategies and behaviours that occur in different contexts. They represent major nodes along a spectrum of observed strategies and deployments of capital to navigate the state and secure livelihood opportunities. In making reference to differences in institutional contexts, this chapter suggests that there are structural factors put in place at the state level that drive differences in refugee strategy. The conditions created by a state and its related policies create a political terrain that the refugee must navigate. While policies in many host states in Africa are similar, there is evidence that the de facto experience of these policies looks different from context to context. The literature describes refugee strategies in different geographic contexts, suggesting variation across diverse regions of sub-Saharan Africa. This alone may suggest political differences as the driver behind varying refugee strategies. However, further examination suggests that this is not the whole picture. While policies differ from country to country, few states have lenient policies on refugee mobility and movement. Particularly, in comparing Tanzania and Kenya, two countries where the refugee populations, as discussed above, show very different strategy behaviours, both have policies that do not allow refugees to be in urban areas without a permit, and require registered refugees to remain in camps. Further, in the case of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Malkki and Sommers describe strategies that are different, albeit similar, only a few decades apart in a city where refugee flows may have shifted but policies have not.

Why, then, do groups employ different strategies in relatively similar situations? Landau suggests that social distance has become a part of contemporary city life, and

while community can lead to certain freedoms in the city, indifference can lead to others. This is not dissimilar to the concept of asset trading depending on the context that was discussed earlier in this chapter. Geschiere suggests that when rooting is not possible, such as in the case of displacement where undocumented urban dwellers do not have any formal permanent status, cities are seen as places to gain resources to accumulate for the future to create security beyond the city (1993). However, this does not fully explain why solutions of shunning and individuality have not being ubiquitous across major hosting cities in the global south. What then, creates differences in strategy implementation? How do refugees choose which social strategies to employ in exile?

This work suggests that the difference in social strategy comes from a combination of the context in which the refugee is navigating and the resources available to them. The context is what informs how and which resources and assets are used, and the assets available shape the opportunities and paths open to them. Each of these is different, suggesting that archetype determination is beyond geographic area or state policy. By filling in the archetype continuum, we can develop understanding of how refugee choice and strategy development may be seen as part of a larger discussion on networks and contemporary debates of structure and agency. How can we draw from broader understandings of structure and agency to understand what factors influence the decision to be invisible or networked? What shapes the social capital available to refugees in exile and how it is used?

This chapter has reviewed the core literature on refugee social networks in urban Africa and identified a need to look beyond political factors to understand what creates

this variation. The following chapter will examine how the development of these networks fit into a larger discussion of structure and agency dynamics. It will centre on a discussion of how this dialectic can be remodelled to better fit forced migration scenarios and how refugees experience structure.

Chapter 2: Structure and Agency

Differences along the archetype continuum suggest that strategies are influenced by other factors than simply the experience of exile. Nuances between choices and the opportunities available in different situations suggest that resources vary as well as the contexts which condition them. As the previous chapter suggests, policies and political context alone do not account for strategic social differences. This chapter will address these other factors by placing refugees into a larger puzzle of networks and look at how dynamics of structure and agency condition that puzzle. It will first outline some of the most fundamental theories of structure and agency and discuss their shortcomings for understanding forced migration. It will then challenge Malkki's notion that structure and agency are separately experienced and delineated by different spaces. It will then look at livelihoods literature with an emphasis on livelihood procurement in the informal African market setting, and advocate for a refocus on the importance of space.

While there are multiple types and definitions of structure, this thesis places emphasis on state structure in discussions of structure and agency. This thesis acknowledges the role and nuances of other structures, such as social structure, in the lives of both refugees and nationals in different capacities, and allows for them to have weight. However, this thesis is primarily concerned with the role of state structure or the absence of protection from the state in refugee lives. While many Tanzanians also feel an inability to turn to the state as a guarantor of their rights, there are particular dimensions and conditions that are distinct for refugees and condition their structural positioning.

Debates of structure and agency are well established in the social sciences, though still largely contested. Many theorists have tried to move away from the traditional ideas that suggest structure and agency are mutually exclusive. Theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu have put forth theories reconciling structure and agency and describing the symbiosis of their relationship (Bourdieu, 1984). Similarly, Anthony Giddens argues that structure can play a dual role, a so called “duality of structure”, where social structure is both the method and the result of social action (Giddens, 1979). In this framework, agents and structure condition each other and have “equal ontological status” (pg.219). He argues that structure has a dual nature as both the ‘medium and the outcome of the social practices they recursively organize’ (pg. 25). This idea suggests that structure shapes social practice, but is also shaped in turn by the demonstration of that practice. Hence, social structures constrain and enable actions equally. While their action may be constrained, people’s agency ensures that they have personal freedoms, and may impact and alter the structures imposed on them. (Bakewell, 2010). In recent years scholars in refugee studies have begun to highlight the need to focus on refugee created pathways and the role refugees can and do play in achieving their own solutions (Milner, 2009). However, understandings of how refugees fit into the structure-agency relationship are still largely unexplored, and is a contribution of this thesis.

The Giddens model of conceptualizing structure and agency allows for considerable weight to be placed on the ways in which refugees carve their own pathways and demonstrate agency, particularly in the action of settling in urban areas (Giddens, 1979). However, it does not account for particular realities of the refugee

experience, rendering it an unfit model for understanding relationships of structure and agency as it related to the forced migrant. Giddens' model makes note of the reflexive nature of society, pointing to how society is shaped by but also tends to shape its underlying structure. This recycling of influence is observable in daily realities of many places. Agents are shaped by structure, but then act of their own agency and with that demonstration of choice, shape structure in turn. Where this idea does not fit the refugee, experience is that it inherently assumes that those who are effected by structure are the ones creating it. Refugees are on the receiving end of structure, and are effected by structure's regulations, policies and expectations. However, they are not part of the dynamics that shape the structures that regulate them and do not receive any of the benefits of structure. Thus, this theory of dualism does not begin to adequately explain the dynamics of structure and agency as they relate to refugees. While some may argue that refugees shape structure through navigating around it, this does not necessarily relate to the dynamic Giddens describes as they have not had a hand in shaping the structure that currently governs them or is around them. As well, while refugees may be able to shape everyday living and the informal parts of the society in which they reside, their effect on shaping structure is negligible. While the presence of some refugees has led to political and policy changes in many contexts, the bulk of these changes are often driven by activism and pressure from local partners and the international community. In this way refugees are recipients of culture but do not play a hand in creating it. They are impacted by structure in how they navigate the state, but as an externality and not a part of what structure explicitly regulates.

As refugees exist extra-structurally, they are effected by structure as outsiders. Refugees exist in the negative space of government, in the political space that is created by the explicit absence of certain government provisions. As refugees that live beyond the camp are not afforded legal rights, the way in which structure effects refugees is in the absence of its recognition of them (Briant and Kennedy 2004, Alexander 2008). Refugees in this scenario are not agents if measured by the parameters of Giddens' duality, in that they do not create change to or condition the structures which regulate them. However, refugees consistently demonstrate the ability to create change and to create their own pathways. Seizing opportunities in the informal economy, making clandestine settlements in urban areas, and forming their own societies and governments are all demonstrations of power and the ability to demonstrate agency. However, this is not consistent with the definition provided by Giddens'. How, then, do we conceptualize ideas of structure and agency which encapsulate the agency of refugees as being conditioned by structure but existing beyond its scope – in this so called “negative political space”?

The theories of critical realists describe a structure and agency relationship that allows some room for discussion of the refugee experience. Archer argues against Giddens' ideas of duality, arguing that they confuse and equate structure and agency, reducing the two to each other (Bakewell, 2010). This school of thought argues that actors condition social structure through acts of agency. This conditioning eventually passes a “developmental threshold”, beyond which structures act independently of the agents which created them (pg. 1696). In this way structure has been established by agency, but continues to exist independent of it past a certain phase. Structure serves

to condition agency, but the inverse is not true. Structure is developed by agency, and once it is fully developed it provides arena in which agency can be demonstrated.

This idea of the structure and agency dynamic still has problems for forced migration as the structure in question exists beyond the refugee and does not account for the negative political space that refugees occupy. It begins to approach the refugee reality, as it describes a rigid structure that shapes the agents within it and their activities. It is not too far of a leap to assume that the structure may also condition the areas around it, in that while the structure is not necessarily created with refugees in mind, it conditions their agency as adjacent observers of structure. However, much like in the Giddens' framework, the critical realist approach assumes that the agent is one that has hand in creating the system which governs them in the first place. This theory then also suggests that the refugee is not an agent, which we see is contrary to the acts of agency that refugees demonstrate. Refugees again demonstrate the ability to make choice and demonstrate agency. Thus, a framework that fits for individuals that exist extra-structurally must be put forward to best explain the dynamic between structure and agency as it applies to the refugee. Structure and agency theories as they exist now tend to be based on a territorially motivated, Westphalian idea of the state, and do not explain the effects of structure on agency for individuals that exist in this third place of negative political space (Knafo, 2010). This begs the question of how refugees can demonstrate agency, and to what extent can they be agents of change in the Tanzanian context, and what factors condition this?

Structure and agency theories suggest that some actions are greater influenced by structure, and others by agency. Different parts of life and society are controlled by

different pieces of the dynamic. Particularly in the case of the critical realist framework, we have a society shaped by structure, within which individual agency can take shape. In the “negative political space” refugees occupy, it is important to consider which parts of everyday life that structure effects and which aspects are up to human agency. Are choices and refugee strategies informed by individual agency or structure? What conditions how capital is used?

Beyond Malkki

As discussed in the previous chapter, Malkki envisioned the structure vs agency dialectic to be a split dynamic as it applies to how refugees occupy space. While in most societies both elements are present and condition life to varying degrees, she described the legitimate refugee dwellings as being structured and the clandestine, extra-political lives of urban dwellers to be purely agency driven. While Malkki seems to have been making this distinction in relationship to political legitimacy and government recognition of camp dwellers and not urban dwellers, she does not unpack how structural factors may also influence urban refugee life. Conversely, refugees in camps have demonstrated the ability to act as agents. While their actions, capital and activity are limited by the policies imposed on them, refugees can be seen acting with agency by setting up businesses, forming their own groups and making choices of where to work and to settle. While choice may be limited, it does not necessarily follow that those who live in camps have diminished capacities as agents or do not demonstrate agency.

The situation is similar in the urban context. While refugees in urban areas make choices beyond what is available to refugees in camps, such as more varied work opportunities and a physically larger area to dwell within, their activities are not free

from constraint. Limitations are placed on them by structure, and the absence of rights afforded to them by such structure. While this is true of everyday citizens, those who are included within the structure and have a hand in creating and conditioning it, refugees and other clandestine actors face another level of precarity and constraint as they exist beyond the structure. There are no mechanisms within the structure to protect them or provide for them, and they are constantly dodging limitations imposed on them. This takes the form of government structures and policies that prevent their movement and livelihood rights, but lost social structures that separate them from the rest of the society, economically and socially. While the structural impositions in the two settings are different, they condition the options agents have and condition their choices, though in vastly different ways.

We see in the archetypes suggested in the previous chapter that there is nuance in the strategies chosen. The continuum demonstrates degrees of invisibility and a full spectrum of choices. Given the sheer variety, this suggests that different individuals not only exhibit agency in different ways, but experience space in different ways. Thus, structure and agency must not be separate binary elements present in different spaces, but elements that condition a metaphysical refugee space. The problem of discussing structure in the context of refugee studies is that it has traditionally been theorized as pertaining to a society of which its members are consenting to be a part of and are active and recognized participants. In the context of forced migrants, their choices are conditioned by a structure that they are constantly avoiding. While theories have varied on how reflexive the two components are or the exact dynamics of conditioning each, most ideas agree that its members have had some hand in shaping the structure which

governs them. This becomes a problem for forced migrants who are influenced by structure and experience the effects of dynamics of structure and agency, but exist beyond structure. To understand the positioning of refugees in the structure and agency dialectic, it is important to consider ideas that look beyond the limitations of territoriality. While Malkki suggests that choosing to exist beyond the structure of the camp is to choose agency, this disregards the limitations that structure still has on refugee life, even when existing beyond its stated parameters. Examining refugee networks allows us to examine this politically adjacent space and understand how refugees navigate the negative spaces of structure.

Urban Spaces in Africa

Livelihood literature has typically focused on livelihood as shaped by capital assets, social relationships, organizations, institutions and access (Chambers, 1987; King, 2011). While there is clear evidence demonstrating how structural and social constraints effect livelihood systems differently over space and time, little has been done to connect space and livelihood within the structure and agency debates. While present research addresses the roles of institutions in shaping livelihoods as they exist in everyday politics and livelihood systems as a whole, less attention is paid to contextual nuance created by culture and norms which shift spatially. Livelihood research has tended to over-emphasize structure (King, pg. 299). A more comprehensive view of livelihood systems, and one which would be more relevant to the refugee experience and migration research, is one that includes agency and spatial variance. The spatial variance of strategy is critical to the distinctions of the archetype continuum. This variance suggests not only the use of assets that vary physically but

how they are used and their relative significance across these spectrums. As such, including these variances into ideas of livelihoods and into how we conceptualize ideas of personal agency makes for a more robust understanding of urban refugee livelihood strategy.

Brian King (2011) has criticized livelihoods literature for its lack of emphasis on the importance of historical and contemporary geographies in livelihood theories. He argues that spatializing livelihood would allow for greater understanding in issues in livelihood studies, including diversification, intra-community differences and the structure and agency of livelihood (pg. 299). He raises several concerns that are at the heart of understanding structure and agency as it pertains to issues in forced migration, and variation of refugee livelihoods within the same host nation context.

King suggests that livelihoods literature overlooks culture (pg. 301). Capital assets are not just physical entities but also culturally shaped constructs that involve gendered, political and cultural norms. Therefore, a skill or an asset might have different relative meaning and utility spatially. This is significant in both the experience of exile and the post-exile settlement experience. During the journey of exile and the transition from one spatial context to another, the meaning of a particular hard asset may change depending on the connotation of that asset within the new context. While the individual moves spatially, the relative meaning of the asset also changes. In the experience of urban exile, an asset might mean different things in different spaces as they represent different areas of access and different opportunities.

As well as assets, individual traits, skills and identifiers such as gender may translate to different levels of access and opportunity depending on the setting. Thus,

space and spatiality not only refer to the physical experience of being in a place but also includes the different symbolism of that space and cultural nuances that are also imposed. This idea of space as being both physical space and imagined cultural space is important to explore in the refugee context particularly in how the norms of a culture and their exile strategies can juxtapose. While there are variations in the meanings of assets and strategy from place to place, this can also vary in the same place from person to person in relationship to the individual's identity and how it relates to a new space. This asks what the refugee identity means across different spaces and how the identity of national and refugee interact and diverge in the same space. An example of where this might come to light is in economy, and how refugee economies occupy the same physical spaces of nationals and other enfranchised individuals, but not the same spaces of social acceptance and access. Assets are not only means of producing life and incomes but also tools of power and agency (King, 2011). It has been argued by theorists such as McSweeney (2004) and King (2011) that livelihood theories need to change and adapt to include other dimensions of assets and livelihood building beyond the physical assets themselves. Considering livelihoods in a spatial context allows for considerations of the strategic differences in identifying the structural and social contributors that contribute to livelihood choice making.

Understanding what these factors are and how they work to produce space is integral to understanding the production of differences. This chapter has established the importance of reconsidering structure and agency for forced migration studies and suggested methods of conceptualizing how refugees experience structure. It emphasizes the importance of space in livelihood production for refugees. This focus on

refugee space sets the stage for the remainder of this thesis as it seeks to understand how refugees in Dar es Salaam experience the city. The following chapter will examine the methodologies used in this thesis. It will outline how this thesis aims to fill the gaps demonstrated in the existing literature as presented in the first two chapters.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The two preceding chapters illustrate two gaps in the literature that animate the research questions of this thesis. First, chapter one demonstrates the tension that exists between refugee archetypes in existing literature. Given the variety of strategies that exist, this thesis aims to understand what conditions such variety and how these archetypes might be reconciled. Second, chapter two investigates core theories on structure and agency and identifies a need to revisit the ideas presented by Malkki in a modern context. Through looking at the refugee relationship to structure and agency we come to a third question on refugee spaces and how we can conceive of spatiality and access. The following chapter will outline the methodologies employed in this thesis. It will first justify the choice of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania as a case study. While I cannot generalize from one case study, this explains why Tanzania provides an appropriate setting for interrogating the questions outlined above. It will then outline the methodologies employed, the ideologies considered, and the obstacles encountered in field work that ultimately led to the execution of the research. It will then discuss how these challenges led to an understanding of trust.

The Case of Tanzania

This thesis chooses the case of Dar es Salaam Tanzania as a setting to interrogate the questions of structure and agency and refugee networking strategy that motivate this thesis. In the interest of space this chapter will not provide a detailed history of refugee hosting in Tanzania, but provide a brief overview of the factors that contribute to its selection as a case study.

First, returning to the country where Malkki first made her observations of agency in urban areas presents a relevant opportunity to re-examine the structure and agency dynamic. As well, returning to Tanzania allows opportunity to reconcile the disparity between the accounts of refugee strategy of Sommers and Malkki.

Second, both de facto and de jure changes in the structural environment of Tanzania creates a particular opportunity to revisit and reexamine these narratives in a new context.

This thesis will primarily examine the case of refugees who arrived in Tanzania in the 1960s and 1970s from Burundi and Rwanda. In the decades following independence in 1962, Tanzania hosted refugees fleeing post-colonial conflict in neighboring states such as Burundi and Rwanda (Milner, 2013, pg. 4). This period was characterized by the pan-African ideals of the president at the time, Julius Nyerere, which emphasized ideas of socialism and self-reliance (Milner, 2013, pg. 5). The Arusha declaration of 1967 introduced the concept of Ujamaa, meaning family-hood in Swahili, in an effort to promote economic development and encourage settlement in underutilized areas of the country (Daley, 1992). Conceptually, it emphasized a transformation of economic and cultural attitudes with a focus on shared culture and development. Nyerere emphasized the importance of this to bring about freedom from European powers and usher in a Tanzanian identity (Kuch, 2016, pg. 470). He encouraged pan-African ideals and worked to abolish tribalism, cultivating a holistic “Tanzanian” identity through encouraging the use of Swahili over other tribal or regional languages. The declaration established farming collectives to promote self-reliance. Individuals and families were encouraged to move to the rural areas identified for land

distribution in order to populate them and make them productive (Daley, 1992). These areas were subsequently developed to produce subsistence crops as well as to create lucrative exporting opportunities (Coulson, 1982). These collectives saw the division of land into equal areas, dispersed to families including both nationals and refugee communities (Coulson, 1982). Refugees were included in this development strategy and were entitled to the same land rights as nationals, and seen as instrumental in helping to develop the rural land. During the time of Ujamaa and Nyerere, Tanzania saw open and welcoming refugee policies, as refugees were included in the national economic strategy and integral to developing the land (Kuch, 2016).

In December 1980, Tanzania saw the mass naturalization of 36,000 Rwandan refugees (Milner, pg. 4). This model was sustained by the tripartite partnership mode, a collaborative agreement between the government of Tanzania, the UNHCR and the Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service (TCRS). While Tanzania provided the land and tools for cultivation, TCRS managed the settlements and UNHCR provided financial assistance (Milner, 2013, pg. 5).

Other refugees arrived in Tanzania in the mid-1990s as a result of renewed conflict in Rwanda, Burundi and Zaire (UNHCR, 2000). Policies of this time were less hospitable to refugees amid fluctuating politics, and the Tanzanian government closed its borders with Burundi to limit the refugee flows. The exploitation and over cultivation of rural areas during the Ujamaa period led to economic collapse by 1985. In December of 1996 following the election of Benjamin Mkapa, 483,000 refugees were forcibly returned to Rwanda (Ogata, 2005).

Under Mkapa, policies shifted from pan-African beliefs to those focused on good relationships with the governments of neighboring states (Milner, 2013). This change led to the expulsion of Rwandan refugees in order to remain good trade relations between Kigali and Dar es Salaam. One of Tanzania's most prominent, contested and defied refugee policies is its mobility policy, which does not allow refugees or asylum seekers without special permission to reside or seek economic opportunities outside of camps (Kuch, 2016). This became a defining and iconic feature of Tanzania's refugee mandate beginning in 1997, when Tanzanian authorities actively returned Burundians living in urban areas to camps (Milner, 2013). This move was officially billed as a security tactic to protect Tanzanians living in border areas. This was solidified through policy in 1999 where officially refugees were not allowed to travel beyond 4km from the camp (Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, 2003). Despite these policies, Tanzania saw an influx of migration to cities following the end of Ujamaa. Despite policy discouraging and actively fighting refugee settlement in urban areas, many continued to live in settlements along the western borders of Tanzania.

Most recently, further conflict in Burundi following elections in 2015 led to the flow of over 200,000 refugees into Tanzania. A UNHCR relocation plan has seen the reopening of two retired refugee camps in the Western region to accommodate the influx. The present government, led by President John Magafuli has seen an adoption of more conservation refugee policies and anti-refugee rhetoric. In 2017 Magafuli called for the "voluntary repatriation" of Burundian refugees, stating publicly that the conflict has ended and it is safe to return.

As demonstrated above, each period of refugee flows into Tanzania have been characterized by their own distinct structural and political contexts. Returning to Tanzania provides a relevant setting to reinvestigate Malkki's noted observations of structure and agency from decades prior. Further, it allows us to reexamine notions of refugee strategy and the observations of researchers that have explored Tanzania and Dar es Salaam prior to evaluate how these archetypes hold up today.

The African Marketplace

The original intention of this thesis was to use the Kariakoo marketplace as a level of analysis for exploring ideas of structure and agency and social networking. Political scientists have identified the marketplace as an emerging setting for exploring social and economic dynamics and the everyday politics of communities (Molotch, 1976; Roitman, 1990; Boyte, 2010). Particularly in areas where informal economies and street level bureaucracies are at the forefront of shaping everyday life, the market place can provide a site for understanding how these structures converge and express themselves in day to day. Where clandestine activity creates life around official structures, marketplaces provide a venue for observing how these two structures converge and create daily life in a de facto sense. The market provides a snapshot of the interaction between all levels of society and insight into economic life. At this cross section is where the relationship of structure and agency can be observed. As markets function as major economic hubs, they are prime territory for observing livelihood strategy and networking patterns.

While formal markets demonstrate a particular set of relationships, particularly between the state and citizen, they are representative of deliberate and state

sanctioned activity. However, in the reality of many African cities, the pull of migrants to urban areas and entrepreneurship of the urban poor creates the development of informal markets (Vermaak, 2017). Informal markets are sites of interaction which showcase social institutions built by those within them, with complex interactions and objectives (pg. 55). Kitayama and Markus (2000) note that social adaptation is an asset among informal merchants, allowing them to integrate with others in the market (2000, pg. 123). Informal markets are an incredible glimpse into how those excluded from formal markets can adapt and influence politics and economics in their own activities. Vermaak notes that in many observed cases, particularly in Kenya, informal networks are often present among migrants, with many forming relationships and networks with other traders in the informal sector (2009). He suggests that the existence of informal networks shows a symbiosis between locals and the migrant merchants, and serves as an important survival mechanism (2017, pg. 60). The social and economic distance between refugees and the urban poor has been a long-time question in forced migration studies, with researchers such as Karen Jacobsen seeking an answer to what the difference between the two groups is in everyday politics, and if the two navigate the state in similar ways. Vermaak suggests that in the informal economy, the two groups are relatively par. Through participation in the market, actors in the informal markets gain social mobility through the connections they create (Vermaak, 2017, pg. 60). Traders use these connections to navigate fluctuations and uncertainties in daily life (Lyons & Snoxell, 2005). Informal networks shape the lives of the traders by facilitating the development of social and economic linkages. (Vermaak, 2017, pg. 62). This demonstrates that while many may be driven to work in the informal economy due to

lack of physical capital and ability to connect with formal work, the informal economy can generate connections and create social mobility among participants. Thus, migrants may find capital and empowerment through informal work. This is what draws many to market settings.

Many people migrate from rural areas to cities for the opportunity to engage in the informal and formal trade markets, depending on the capital and connections at their disposal (Vermaak, 2017). While global economic climates and the reality of many rural poor have led to an increase of the trend in informal trading, there is a reluctance on the part of national governments to recognize such and develop inclusive policies and strategies (Devas, 2001). As such, these activities, though often conspicuous, large, and dominating in many cities, remain clandestine in nature and unaccounted for. Clandestine activities are often unaccounted for by governments, however they provide a telling snapshot of the everyday politics of a region and the day-to-day experiences of the population (Boyte, 2004). The market presents a site for understanding the lived realities and externalities of African politics, where the structural facets of society (government, politics, global climate, culture) project the setting for everyday political activity and for individual agents to create daily life (Autesserre, 2014). The reality for many is a self-created and maintained space, conditioned by structure but often operating on its fringes. Policy is often present but easily navigated and inconsistently enforced in the lived experiences of many in states like Tanzania. Understanding these daily experiences can help us understand the gaps between policy and practice, and needs and reality. The market is a place where life happens in all forms. As a level of analysis, it offers us a place to explore economic life, social life, and everyday politics.

The nature of the African marketplace is that connectivity and social relationships form the basis of most trade and employment (Vermaak, 2017). Kinship and friendships are key in many livelihood strategies, with many following connections to other cities so that they make work with people they know, or work in shops for friends of friends.

The Kariakoo Market

Kariakoo market was selected as a site for analyzing refugee social networks for its positioning at the center of formal and informal economic life. What separates Kariakoo apart from other markets in Dar es Salaam and other parts of Tanzania is the expressions of informal and formal economy side by side. Within Kariakoo market exists the market stores – or “*duka*” – of the formal economy, and informal “*machinga*” who exist directly beside. This coexistence provides a unique opportunity to explore the interaction between the two economies in the context of refugee integration, as well as the relationship of structural factors and the acts of agents.

While an excellent case study for its embodiment of all the qualities outlined above, gaining access to refugee communities in Kariakoo presented unanticipated challenges. The merging of formal and informal economies so closely adds an additional layer of precarity to the refugee experience as they are constantly interacting with locals in a heavily patrolled area. As understood from conversations with locals and as is evident in Tanzanian media, anti-refugee sentiment and xenophobia has been steadily rising in Tanzania over past decades (Human Rights Watch, 1999). That being the case, refugees in this area must exercise an extra degree of caution. Refugee communities within Kariakoo, in being careful about who they disclose their identities to, did not end up being a part of this study. Initially, a community partner, TCRS, was

collaborated with to gain access to and set up interviews with refugee communities in Kariakoo. However, these communities were reluctant to meet with both the researcher or contacts at TCRS with whom they were already familiar with from previous studies and workshops. Discussions with nationals who owned formal duka in the market led to the understanding that refugees and migrants alike were not welcomed hospitably into the market. Further, many believed there were no refugees in Kariakoo at all. From this, it follows that those that are refugees in Kariakoo must be employing strategies of invisibility, which leads to a reluctance to identify themselves to an unknown researcher. Inability to reach this community led to a need to change the population of interest. The study shifted to interview refugees from different areas of Dar es Salaam that were more accessible and willing to participate. The first month of research was characterized by rejection from potential respondents in Kariakoo. This ultimately led to the pursuit of other respondents in areas outside of Kariakoo, as well as an awareness of the dynamics of trust present in the market that will be delved into further in this chapter.

Shifting my focus from the Kariakoo market to other communities allowed me to recruit respondents more easily and still answer the questions of this thesis. This experience was grounding for this work as it highlights the inability of this case study to generalize the experiences of refugees from one city, let alone refugees as whole. While I cannot generalize, and ultimately this is not a thesis about Kariakoo, the inability to penetrate the walls of invisibility reveals hints to how refugee spaces are formed, and led to a greater understanding of capital as it relates to space and inclusion. This led to the development of my third question on what conditions refugee space, as

interrogating notions of structure and agency made the importance of such abundantly clear. As such, attention was also paid to spaces of inclusion and exclusion in exile and how refugees use the capital at their disposal. In tandem with that, it explores how different capital conditions access to different spaces and different experiences of the same city.

Weighing the Methods

Gaining access to urban refugees can be difficult given the clandestine nature of their existence in the city (Duvell, 2008; Watter & Biernacki, 1989). The nature of their precarity can create boundaries for research, including retrieving reliable information, identifying refugees, and ensuring that the anonymity refugees work to create is not disrupted. With the nature of the African market being built on community and connectivity (Vermaak, 2017), privacy is an infrequently encountered commodity. In order to navigate such precarity it is important to consider the power and positioning of the researcher in relationship to that of the subject. While levels of precarity will be delved into more later in this chapter, it is important to acknowledge the role refugee precarity and vulnerability plays in developing methodology for studies in forced migration.

Studies in forced migration face many ethical dilemmas, at the foreground of which is managing the precarity and vulnerability of the population so as not to increase such through contact with the researcher. Many accept the research ethics litmus test of David Turton, who suggests that research into the suffering of others is only justifiable if the intention of the research is to alleviate that suffering (Turton, 1996, pg. 96). Many prominent scholars in the field feel as though this problem in forced migration studies is

rectified with a return to more “scientific” research and quantitative data (Jacobsen & Landau 2003; Lieberman, 1994; Castles 2003). Scholars such as Jacobsen and Landau in their work “The Dual Imperative” advocate for a move away from small scale qualitative studies, arguing that this research is based on poor design and yields small, unrepresentative samples (2003, pg. 190). Scholars of this view suggest that migration studies should follow in the research fashion of hard sciences, producing data sets that are drawn from statistically representative samples in order to produce generalizable results representative of a larger populace, and not over representative of or over dependent on the nuances of local cultural life (Jacobsen & Landau 2003; Lieberman 1994; Castles 2003).

On the opposite side of the spectrum are scholars in favor of producing strong refugee narrative and focus less on generalizable data production (Whitaker 2002; Vincent & Sorenson 2001; Savolainen, 1994; Raggin, 1992; Czarniawska, 2004). While these narratives may not always offer clear answers to a specific question, these scholars argue that narratives provide insight into areas of life that are traditionally difficult to access. Christina Kazak-Clark in her book *Recounting Migration* provides political narratives of Congolese young people in Uganda (2011). While she looks at the individual experiences of youth to illustrate various political situations and choice making activities of refugees, a demonstration of the small-scale narrative producing projects feared by many scholars, Clark-Kazak is careful to situate the narratives within an intergenerational political context (2011), understanding these narratives not in isolation but as they relate to other social and political factors. Understanding current events as part of the historical political context they are situated in rather than laboratory

like circumstances for objective information is key to understanding the factors that lead to refugee conditions, and ultimately give insight into how they can be solved. To ignore the political climate of each issue is to hinder the ability to alleviate the suffering of the vulnerable, as objective observations cannot be treated without understanding of the context. In *Hanging out with Forced Migrants*, Graeme Rodgers further illuminates the importance of situating research and results within a context by noting in a critique of Landau and Jacobsen's ideas that the neutrality of a true scientist creates problematic social and physical distance between the researcher and the subject, positioning them in an abstract social context and creates the illusion of distinctly different social worlds. He furthers that this distance ignores the linkages between knowledge and power (2004, pg. 49).

While acknowledging that small scale projects sometimes do not lead to specific answers that are applicable to all situations, Rodgers points out that participatory and narrative engaging methods can be methodologically sound and give the truest insight into the everyday nature of interactions and processes (pg. 48). While it may not generate specific, "question-answering" information, he argues that this may not be a fatal flaw. He suggests that the quantitative method approach to gathering information as championed by Landau and Jacobsen assumes that the academic community already knows the relevant questions to ask and thus leads to scientific knowledge that leads to better and more ethical policy decisions (p. 48). Qualitative methods can be useful in uncovering understanding of issues and leading researchers to relevant questions. This also reduces the critical distance between researcher and respondent by illuminating the assumption that academia knows the problems that need to be

solved. This opens up space for problematizing issues in forced migration, rather than ascribing problems to a situation without adequately understanding the political origins of a problem or unintentionally obscuring them. The fashion of “hanging out” with refugees that Rodgers describes, meaning immersing the researcher in the context they are working to understand in order to gain understanding rather than being necessarily focused on a particular data set, can open channels for narratives without claiming the definitively represent them (pg. 49). He argues that sustaining this humanism and understanding of the social and political context and social world is essential to informing ethical and accountable policy decisions (pg. 49).

One of the concerns for small scale qualitative projects that comes out of the work *Dual Imperative* is that these projects overemphasize local cultural life (2003). However, as is positioned by Clark-Kazak and Rodgers, understanding cultural nuance is essential to planning for productive and ethical decision making. What is evident from literature on refugee social networks is that there is a significant degree of cultural nuance and disparity, with social strategy and livelihood development varying significantly not only geographically but temporally and across social dynamics as well. While the refugee archetype continuum is not complete and requires significant work and research to be filled in, it shows that while refugees have experiences that connect them, the circumstances they are faced with and the contexts that contain them are not ubiquitous and ungeneralizable. This suggests that, while time consuming and tedious, small scale projects examining the nuances of multiple contexts and cross comparing them to understand social nuances and the conditions that lead to particular networks occurring or not occurring in various areas could be the key to understanding and

finding solutions to refugee plight. This method problematizes refugee issues more than it offers concrete conclusions, however the insights garnered from these queries may be the best bet for authentic and ethical policy directives in the future. This study chooses to explore refugee experiences in Dar es Salaam in order to understand which urban strategies are being used and which factors have caused variation in refugee strategies over time. This study chose to approach interviews with a general guideline for looking to understand how networks and social capital change and are employed in exile, and what factors shape them. This allowed for the respondents to shape the outcome of the project and was intended to allow the most important and most pertinent issues to the population to be uncovered and explored.

The Methods

This study is based on semi structured interviews conducted in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania between October 16, 2017 and December 10, 2017. While Kariakoo was initially intended to be the area for recruitment, this changed over the course of the study as indicated above. Of the 23 interviews collected, 12 were of Tanzanian nationals who owned small business or worked as *machinga* in both the Kariakoo and Ilala neighborhoods. The remaining 11 were with refugees of varying backgrounds and lengths of time living in Tanzania, however they were primarily of Burundian and Congolese origin. While some had just arrived to Tanzania, some had been living in Dar es Salaam for decades. Of the refugees interviewed, none were presently engaged in work in Kariakoo, but approximately half had begun their time in Dar es Salaam working in Kariakoo or had had some experience in the market. The first few interviews were arranged by partners at TCRS who had prior relationships with the respondents as

developed through other programs offered by TCRS. Following these interviews, the researcher was connected to other respondents through the initial few using a snowball method. While the researcher was familiar with basic Swahili, a staff member at TCRS worked with the researcher as both a liaison to connect with respondents and an interpreter. The interviews were primarily conducted by the researcher with the assistance of the interpreter, particularly for understanding colloquial language and cultural nuance. The initial guide planned for interviewing refugees in the market included questions on what brought individuals to Kariakoo and how they navigated interactions with local business owners and authorities that patrol the market areas. While these questions ultimately changed to reflect the geography of the respondents, it was still able to gain insight into what factors conditioned where individuals work and what connections led them to their current places of employment. The focus remained on livelihood strategies and social connectivity, however it grew through insights gained through personal narrative. Because some groups were more accessible than others, the process of recruitment ultimately shaped the scope of the research and led to asking deeply relevant questions of space and access. These narratives shaped the study and made it a more reflexive and relevant work, rather than letting the questions shape the narratives. A desire to explore narratives informed the choice to use semi-structured interviews.

In addition to the interviews conducted, ethnographic methods were borrowed from literature on livelihoods in Southern Africa to understand social connectivity and the everyday life and politics of the market (Rutherford, 2008; Dolan & Johnstone-Louis, 2011). The researcher visited the market almost daily at various times of day in an effort

to understand the everyday happenings of the market and the connections and relationships that sustain it.

As discussed later in this thesis, this study acknowledges the positioning of the researcher and the related reactivity of the respondents. What follows is a discussion of trust and the quest to find “reliable narratives”. However, while this thesis cannot delve into what creates a reliable narrative or the importance of such to research, it acknowledges that having trust does not necessarily equate truth. Respondents were particularly keen to mention the need to “hustle”, for example, in discussions of livelihood procurement. This is an example of how, but not always or necessarily, the dynamic between researcher and respondent can lead to performance. While this research aims to come as close to uncovering the lived experiences of the individuals it studies, it acknowledges that finding a veracity of narratives is unrealistic. However, it believes that the narratives themselves can offer insight into the everyday politics of refugees regardless of performance.

Trust Building

The above discusses how the inability to access respondents in Kariakoo changed the site of the research. While the same questions were still able to be asked and answered, the scope shifted from being acutely asking questions about the specific relationships in Kariakoo, to gaining insight into snapshots of refugee experience across urban Dar es Salaam more generally. While it is difficult to generalize, the inability to access Kariakoo gives us information on the importance of trust in relationship building with refugees, as well as points us to questions of space and accessibility.

Throughout the data collection process, it was most difficult to gain access to respondents who were women and respondents who were employed in the Kariakoo area. While access to individuals employed in the market was impeded, many respondents were former residents or employees of the market. Information was obtained on why those individuals moved, and what the difficulties of working in the market are. Through discussions with respondents on their strategies and why they choose the areas they do, the question shifted from how do refugees network in the market, to an arguably more important question of how do certain spaces call for the use of certain resources and why, and how do these exclusionary or inclusionary processes shape the geography of social networking among refugees in Dar es Salaam. While trust building and lack of trust was vital in who interviews were available with and where they were not, it was just as apparent that trust between refugees and the community and refugees themselves was as important to establishing network connections and livelihood opportunities.

Trust building was integral to making connections that would lead to fruitful interviews with reliable content. Significant delays in beginning the data collection process occurred as a result of the investment necessary in developing relationships with respondents. Upon arriving in Tanzania and establishing a plan to recruit respondents with partners at TCRS, connections with refugees working in Kariakoo were made and contacted. Many respondents were hesitant and non-committal to the invitation to engage with the researcher, despite being offered compensation for their time and having previous experience engaging with representatives of TCRS in the past. To make respondents more comfortable with engaging with the researcher on

sensitive issues and their personal experiences, refugees were invited to join focus groups with other members of their communities in order to make the setting more familiar. This did not yield the desired outcome, as many still declined the invitation. Initially many potential recruits that had expressed some interest, were either non-committal or cancelled. Many made plans to be interviewed and would cancel or reschedule multiple times before eventually being uncontactable. While many did not give reasons for why they were disinterested or why they had cancelled, a few openly questioned the research and the researcher. Some were skeptical of why the researcher wanted to know information on their journey and were nervous to answer any questions on their experiences with the authorities, immigration, their status, or even to be identified to the researcher as a refugee, regardless of whether or not they were introduced to the researcher by a trusted acquaintance. Others questioned what outcomes the research would bring and whether their participation would bring them any benefit in the form of tangible social results or policy change.

Trust in the researcher was only developed in curated and controlled circumstances that were preferable to the respondent. As a result, where these climates were not achievable, access to particular respondents was not available. Respondents recruited in Kariakoo were the majority of those who were noncommittal or cancelled. As will be demonstrated in the following chapter, refugees in other areas of Dar es Salaam tended to build their livelihoods independently and engage with local refugee organizations when they feel inclined. Contrastingly, refugee behaviours among those engaged in livelihood activities in the Kariakoo market tended to be community centric. The partners at TCRS stated that many group leaders of communities located in the

market prevented individuals from participating in interviews and focus groups in order to protect the community from gaining attention from others in the market. To these groups, their ability to assimilate and integrate is their greatest asset. For many, being interviewed beyond their places of work is not possible as it hinders their income generating capabilities.

One of the externalities of navigating trust in refugee interviews is the reliability of the information obtained. It was discovered through the interview process that refugees may often give an answer that is not completely true, and as the interview moves on and trust develops, the answer changes. During the interviews, a number of respondents reported that they came to Dar es Salaam alone, or knew no one before they arrived. They often would later reveal that they did have family living in Dar es Salaam either with them or nearby. Often these mis-reported details were related to the networks that individuals used in coming to Dar es Salaam or other information related to relationships, family or social connections. The most common changes in responses were that individuals would report living alone or not being engaged with community resources or community groups. Individuals would often begin by giving short answers, such as saying they didn't have any family left in their countries of origin or that they knew no one in their neighborhood in Dar. As the interview wore on and they became more comfortable with the researcher and the questions, the answers would often change and they would go on to add connections they have in Dar or mention family they have here living with them or family they are in contact with back home.

In *Learning How to Ask* (1986), Briggs discusses the role of the interview in social science research. He touches on how the manner in which a question is asked

can inform how it is answered. He discusses how interviews can create bias based on phrasing and the environment the interviewer creates. This speaks to how the relationship between the researcher and the respondent and the manner in which that relationship is approached can affect the responses, as was experienced in this research. Raheem, et al (2016) further contribute to the conversation by discussing how power and the experience of “insider” and “outsider” characteristics effect dynamics of trust and influence answers in interviews. This relationship was evident in the research as narratives from refugees changed to reveal more personal information about themselves as they became more relationship with “the other”. Addressing these power dynamics in qualitative research can help establish earlier in the research process what a “reliable” narrative is.

The above demonstrates the importance of trust building in connecting with respondents as well as developing reliable narratives. Many are wary of who they disclose their status to because of fear of being discovered or facing repercussions. This fear is driven by common public rhetoric among Tanzanian nationals that tends to be misinformed about refugee statistics and facts. In interviewing Tanzanian nationals who worked or owned businesses in the Kariakoo market, caution was taken to protect the anonymity of refugees while still trying to gain insight into how nationals perceive refugee engagement with the market. Through these interviews it became clear that most nationals believe that there are no refugees in Dar es Salaam and that the refugee population is contained in the Kigoma region. Many were able to identify communities of foreigners that live in the city, with many citing particular shops and businesses owned by Chinese shop owners, and a particular building owned and occupied by Chinese

shops and dwellings. Congolese business people were also well known to the locals, many referencing Congolese auto parts sales people and *machinga*. However, none of the locals that were interviewed believed refugees resided in Dar es Salaam and none had ever knowingly encountered refugees in their own lives. However, there are abundant communities of refugees of multiple different countries of origin existing in Kariakoo and engaging in livelihood generating activities, as reported by respondents of the study and local partners. Thus, this demonstrates not only the presence and implementation of livelihood strategies, but also how these strategies work to shield these groups from the larger community. There is evidence in the literature of refugees using various strategies to protect themselves from both the host community and other refugees. Worby details how refugees distance themselves from family and friends to avoid having to send remittances and support others (2010), while others hide their refugee status from hosts to prevent exploitation (Sommers 2001; Horst). In interviews, most nationals expressed distaste for informal activity in the market and foreign competition of any kind. As mentioned in previous chapters, part of Magafuli's election promises were to allow *machinga* to exist and operate freely in the market without paying the taxes that owners of formal *maduka* do. Under former leader president Kikwete, *machinga* were relegated to specifically zoned areas such as the famous Machinga Complex in Ilala where *machinga* operate under a lower tax system, *machinga* in Magafuli's Tanzania are able to display goods purchased from wholesalers and other market shops on tables outside formal duka. While these changes to *machinga* regulations were made in order to gain political support from the largest group of voters in the country, the urban poor, sentiment toward these people has grown sour

from those that control the formal economy in the area. As most refugees working in Kariakoo are employed as *machinga* in the informal economy, they experience this lack of social trust in two ways; in a blatant sense as *duka* owners have a distaste for *machinga* in general, and in a way that doesn't allow them to be free in their own identities as it is repressed by distaste by locals in general. It is because of these dynamics caused by political influence and misinformation that has led to anti-refugee action and therefore lack of trust between refugee and citizen.

Trust and the Refugee Woman

Existing literature on urban refugees has historically tended to focus on the experiences of men. Looking back to studies that provide the basis for our understanding of refugee archetypes, the works of Malkki (1995), Worby (2010), Landau (2006), etc., these works tend to suggest that most refugees choosing to settle in urban areas are young men. While these studies may be products of the time period they are conducted in where much of the migration to cities was done by young men who possessed the resources and social mobility to do so, continuing to focus on this particular demographic leaves a large piece of the archetype puzzle in shadow. Buscher and Heller report that while in many refugee contexts livelihoods can offer protection, in many cases this is the opposite for women. In the case of Malaysia, they report that having a job increases the vulnerability of women and their chance of violence, arrest or extortion (2010). This highlights not only the difference in experience between refugee men and women in some circumstances, but also the need for narratives of refugee women to emerge to further illuminate such differences. Including female voices can

help us to produce more intersectional work and better understand differences in developing exile strategy

One of the hopes of this study was to expand the narrative to include the experiences of refugee women and focus on the experiences of women migrating to Dar es Salaam, in order to be able to contrast it with the existing literature referenced previously. However, the goal to highlight the narratives of refugee women is one that this research falls short of. What this study can offer, however, is some understanding on why women are missing from the narrative and offer proposals from engaging with this underrepresented demographic of refugees in the future.

The experience of the refugee woman can illuminate how the westernized notion of the “refugee community” misrepresents it as a homogenous community with equal and congruent needs. While gender as a conditioning factor in the migration experience is being paid more attention in academic analysis as of late (UNHCR, 2015), little work has been done on gender on the theme of social networks in exile. An anticipated obstacle in gaining access to women was the additional layer of social precarity they face in comparison to other refugees. While it would be problematic to generalize, there was evidence in this study of many refugees in Tanzania finding themselves struggling with dynamics of trust and navigating authority that will be discussed in the following chapter. These dynamics are largely external; between the refugee community and the state or the larger community. However, women face these as well as dynamics of trust and distrust between themselves and their own communities (UNHCR, 2015). Initial efforts to establish focus groups included attempts to establish women only focus groups so that they may feel able to speak freely. However, this was not able to be

carried out as intended. Many women were not allowed to participate by their husbands or by male community leaders. In the case of an interview where a couple were interviewed together, the wife contributed very little to the conversation. When asked a question directly, she often said very little or the question was answered by her husband. Initially this was taken to be reflective of general distrust of the researcher, but upon further discussion with local partners and humanitarian organizations it is clear that thinking of refugees as a homogenous group where trust dynamics are even across a group is incorrect. While this study aimed to explore how nuances in culture and capital can account for strategic differences, the variances in trust dynamics illuminate how social factors such as gender create differences in strategy as well. In the case of refugee women, there is often a mistrust with their own communities. As such, many of the issues refugee women face often go unreported and undocumented because the lack of communal trust represses these narratives (UNHCR, 2015). In an interview with Asylum Access, an organization that provides free legal aid to refugees in various stages of exile, they report that many women choose not to report instances of rape and abuse due to lack of trust in their communities and in organizations that reporting their experiences will not make their situation worse. Many women fear being abandoned by their husbands if they acknowledge past abuse, or that they will not be protected by their communities. Keeping these traumas to themselves is part of the survival strategy in urban areas of these refugee women. This fear stems from a fear of losing the social protection provided to them by their husbands, families and refugee communities. For many women, because of their social positioning and relative lack of rights compared to

men, particularly in the refugee context, social capital and being connected to a family is one of the largest assets they can possess (UNHCR, 2015).

Trust and Methodology

A significant factor in why trust building has and continues to be an issue in narrative retrieval among precariously positioned populations is methodology. Methodology that is poorly equipped to navigate issues of trust will not yield reliable narratives nor a selection of narratives that adequately portrays all subgroups. While refugee scholars such as Landau and Jacobsen call for a return to a more quantitative and scientific approach to refugee studies and criticize the small scale qualitative approach to refugee research on the basis that it does not sample a reliable and generalizable cross-section of individuals (2003), the distinct needs of different subgroups need to be taken into consideration and thus adapted for so that reliable narratives may be achieved. While Landau and Jacobsen highlight the fact that focused and small projects do not produce narratives that are general or indicative of the nuances of a larger population, they can be useful for filling in gaps in the archetype continuum. Rather than imagining projects that can wholly encompass and uncover an entire group, small scale projects can be designed to meet the needs regarding trust and otherwise so that they can successfully uncover otherwise inaccessible narratives. Small scale and dedicated projects to understand the specific experiences of refugee women may be beneficial to understanding a group that is missing from many areas of refugee literature and fill in this gap in a way that is empowering to the community. The University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa has been instrumental in pioneering methods that overcome issues of trust and empower migrants and refugee

women to share their stories. The Move project developed by Jo Vearey and Elsa Oliveira empowers refugee women to share their journeys into exile and the obstacles they have experienced in settling in South Africa (2017). This participatory method was a tool developed to overcome barriers in trust and fear of having their experiences known. While such participatory methods may not be appropriate in all contexts, the success of the projects in extracting narratives and information about refugee women speaks to the need to create trust between the researcher and the subject and the value in going beyond traditional quantitative research methods in doing so.

The above discusses developing trust with the respondent as key to conducting ethical and productive research with refugees. It falls then on the researcher to do two things:

1. develop a safe space to protect the respondent
2. develop a manner of communicating which brings out the most reliable narrative.

This study offers two suggestions for strategies which proved helpful during the interview phase of this research. First, developing partnerships with local partners who may have experience with these groups can help establish trust. Using TCRS as a gateway to these individuals led to success among some respondents. Using a partner with some familiarity of local culture and customs can help navigate the trust building terrain. Secondly, using one-on-one interviews allowed for trust to develop naturally through the course of conversation. By engaging in conversation, rather than a focus group or survey, a more organic bond is formed and trust can be built naturally. This builds further case for narrative based research, as it accounts for and includes strategy to build trust within the research relationship.

This chapter outlines the methodologies used in this thesis. In doing so it justifies the choice of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania as a case study, as well as makes a case for narrative based small scale research for the purposes of producing detailed, nuanced accounts of everyday politics. It also addresses the challenges of using the Kariakoo marketplace as a level of analysis to discuss trust relationships in the refugee experience, and how these relationships shaped the research. The following chapter will look at the findings of this thesis and analyze them in the context of the questions posed in the earlier chapters. It will put these findings in conversation with existing literature, and make recommendations for future studies.

Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the livelihood strategies of urban refugees and their experience of structure and agency. In response to this, it asks three main questions:

1. What conditions differences in livelihood strategies among urban refugees?
2. How do refugees in Dar es Salaam experience structure and agency dynamics in urban areas and how does this compare to the observations of Malkki?
3. How can we conceptualize refugee spaces?

In response to the methods outlined in the previous chapter, this chapter will look at the findings of this thesis. It will outline the major findings in relation to the questions posed, and provide a discussion of the meaning of these findings in relationship to the literature.

Social Networks

Many scholars site changing political climates within a refugee hosting nation as the cause for changing refugee policy (Milner, 2009; Crisp 2017). As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Tanzania's refugee policies have shifted with changes in the nations politics. By that measure, changing political context was anticipated to be correlated with differing strategy across both contexts and across time. However, through conducting field work, it was evident that strategies were not uniform across the city and that significant variation existed even within the same urban and political climate, and among individuals who have come to Tanzania around the same time. Thus, politics does not account for the entirety of why refugee social strategies differ in Tanzania. For example, Kenya has similar policies towards urban refugees as

Tanzania, however as stated earlier, Kenyan refugees employ strategies of invisibility much less frequently. Visible ethnic enclaves of refugees such as the Somali neighborhood of Eastleigh are able to exist in Kenya, open groups of undocumented Somali refugees, while this is not the case in Tanzania. Turning to the everyday politics of refugees can give answer to what happens de jure versus de facto. While policies between the two nations are similar on paper, this may not translate into the same opinions and daily expressions of power and policy.

Existing literature on urban social networks out of Tanzania show that urban refugees in past contexts have employed strategies of invisibility to varying degrees. Malkki reports invisibility strategies that include complete disassociation from pre-exile identities among refugees in Kigoma (1995), while Sommers describes Burundian refugees in Dar es Salaam employing strategies of opportunity based on minute networks (2001). Drawing from these works, it was anticipated that strategies of invisibility would be the primary strategy found in Dar es Salaam. As strategy was assumed to correlate with changing politics, it was anticipated that invisibility would have increased since the previous studies as refugee policies have tightened in Tanzania.

Respondents were asked about their social connections and associations in Dar es Salaam. Questions were centred around the nature of the networks they presently had in Dar es Salaam, where they were formed, and about connections they may have with their country of origin. They were asked about their current connections and if they had used connections to aid them in their journey of exile. Many expressed that they were in contact with relatives or friends from their home countries, both in Dar es

Salaam and those that were still in the country of origin or in another place of relocation. For those that were no longer in contact with friends or relatives, many expressed the desire to be or wished that they could be but extenuating circumstances prevented their interaction. A commonly cited reason for disconnection with a loved one was that the phone numbers they had had before coming to Dar es Salaam were no longer in service, and they had no other means of connection. Many who responded this way also noted that because of this disruption in communication, they were unsure of the status of their loved ones. One respondent who worked for a Congolese hair salon in the Kijitonyama neighborhood of Dar es Salaam stated that he had been separated from his wife and children during the journey of exile. He came to Dar es Salaam with the hopes of finding them here, and spent the better part of five years searching for them in the city. He tried connecting with other refugee communities and finding old connections but these efforts proved fruitless. Eventually searching for his family could not be his primary activity, and he needed to generate income. He sought out a cousin he had found in Dar es Salaam through his search for his family and came to work for him at the salon.

Of those who were connected with family in their country of origin, many reported that the communications were few and far between. While some were able to reach their families on old phone numbers or keeping connected through WhatsApp, lack of financial capital on both sides of the communication hindered their ability to speak frequently. One boy who had recently arrived in Tanzania from the Congo said he could only communicate with his family sporadically using a friend's WhatsApp account on

their mobile phone, and only when the family they were contacting had been able to purchase phone credits.

A variety of patterns emerged regarding networks within Tanzania and into exile, two in particular dominating most of the narratives. When asked if they travelled to Dar es Salaam alone or with company, many reported that they had travelled alone. Of those that had travelled by themselves, some reported knowing someone who had come to Dar es Salaam previously or had direct family working in the city. Others reported not knowing anyone but had heard of Dar es Salaam in other ways. One respondent spoke of how other people he had met in the Kigoma region prior to travelling to Dar es Salaam had mentioned wanting to travel to Dar es Salaam because of the opportunities to find work. Others had similar stories of hearing other people's plans to make the journey to Dar es Salaam, and later decided to do so themselves. Those who travelled alone had a variety of stories of how they got connected with their current place of employment. What was consistent throughout the diverse narratives was the involvement of referrals from people they connected with along the way. Many spoke of connecting with someone they knew from before, and then finding work through that person. Rarely were they working directly with that individual but were connected to other networks of employment through them. Many who did not have existing connections in Dar es Salaam followed similar methods of livelihood procurement.

Some reported making connections along the way that led them to where they work now. In the case of one Congolese man who arrived in Dar es Salaam from Kigoma where he first stopped on his journey, he found his current place of work, a

Congolese hair salon, through a string of connections. When he first arrived in Dar es Salaam he headed for the Kariakoo market because that is where he believed most of the major job opportunities were to be found. After struggling to find work he was referred to someone who owned a salon in the Mikocheni area. He worked in Mikocheni for some time but found that he was often being apprehended by government officials, immigration officers and the ministry of home affairs. Making a change, he was referred by clients to a salon in Kijitonyama where he currently works.

Among the strategies used by those travelling alone or with a partner, and those who had contacts versus those who did not, the strategies remained quite similar. The majority of respondents used connections of some kind, either existing or forged through networking in situ, to connect them to places of employment or people who could help them find work. Many reported the need to build trust and some sort of a relationship among themselves and their contact before they could be referred. While some had existing contacts, they did not need to create, this did not seem to play to give an obvious advantage. Having pre-exile networks active in Dar es Salaam, to any degree, did not seem to lead to more fruitful job prospects than those who had arrived in Dar es salaam not knowing anyone. Pre-exile networks were not necessarily less precarious than those crafted in the marketplace or in the city. However, certain groups faced different challenges with securing networks in the cities than others. These differences tended to be related to ethnicity and country of origin more than level of connectedness or the existence of pre-formed pre-exile networks. Burundian respondents tended to be less connected socially to other Burundians or other nationals both economically or socially.

Two narratives in particular demonstrate this reality. One Burundian couple in the Mikocheni neighborhood has been in Dar es Salaam for five years after coming from the refugee camps in Kigoma. After relocating to Dar es Salaam following security concerns in the camp, the family had no contacts in the city and were required to make their own way. Using aid that they had acquired from UNHCR after preliminary registration in the camps, they began their own business selling small goods and refreshments from a cart in Mikocheni. They did not use connections to begin their business, and were reliant on the endowment of aid from UNHCR and other organizations such as Asylum Access. When asked if they had friends in Dar who knew of their status, they said that they hid their status from even their closest Tanzanian friends. In one anecdote, they spoke of how they had to pull their youngest child from school on three separate occasions and send him to schools in different areas as they had come close to being discovered by others in the community. Once their aid had been depleted they found it challenging to continue their business and had to work even harder to maintain it, including working longer hours and moving to an area with cheaper rent to reduce their costs.

Another story by a Burundian refugee tells a similar story of disconnectedness. This young man was living alone in Dar es salaam and working as a self-employed hawker in the Kariakoo area. He would purchase items wholesale or from shops and re-sell them in different areas. When asked if he had any contacts or friends in Dar es Salaam he said he did not, and that he had not worked to establish any sort of economic or social connections other than the ones created by circumstance such as neighborhoods or individuals who provided him with services and goods. He said that

he preferred to “hustle for himself” and create a life that was independent, rather than reliant on others in exile.

Congolese refugees, however, described a different experience. Even those who had arrived in Dar es Salaam with no connections created networks, predominantly with other Congolese people. A young man now working at a salon in Kijitonyama referenced arriving in Kariakoo with another young man he had met in transit. Neither had any connections in Dar es Salaam. The pair tried to network with individuals in Kariakoo unsuccessfully until they were referred to *Mtaa Congo*, a street populated by predominantly Congolese merchants or individuals selling Congolese goods. There they were referred to the salon he is presently working at in Kijitonyama by someone they met through this woman. The owner was only able to hire one, and referred the other to another salon in Mikocheni. Others reported that in the absence of contacts they began approaching salons they assumed to be Congolese. Through the narratives of many, it was stated that Congolese individuals have a reputation of being excellent hair dressers and many own salons in the areas of Kijitonyama and Mikocheni.

Many Congolese who did not have connections prior to arriving attempted to find other Congolese or showed up at salons they believed to be owned by Congolese. Ethnic connections and networking among Congolese people tended to be stronger than other ethnicities of refugees. Congolese people tended to be more reliant on ethnic organizations as well. Of all the Congolese respondents, nearly all of them reported some degree of involvement or contact with a Congolese refugee association of some sort. Many reported experiences of relying on community networks in situations where their tumultuous legal status caused them problems with immigration officers. One man

reported a situation his community was facing at the time of the interview. A Congolese member of the community had been thrown in jail for a second time by immigration officers and was unable to pay the bail that had been posted for him. The community had gathered to try and put together the money needed. Congolese people on the whole were more likely to be engaged with community organizations of Congolese refugees and church organizations than humanitarian organizations such as REDES, Asylum Access and TCRS.

Two reasons were commonly cited for a lack of engagement with humanitarian groups. A few stated that they did not have a knowledge of who these groups were when asked if they had engagement with groups like Asylum Access. This often came up during discussions of legal trouble, and Asylum Access was suggested as a resource. All of the respondents who were offered the resource of asylum access stated that they would likely not reach out to them as they feared the repercussion of seeking help beyond the Congolese community. Those who had heard of Asylum Access responded in the same fashion, feeling as though aid organizations put them at greater risk. Conversely, the inverse pattern was true in the case of Burundian respondents. Many of the Burundians interviewed were heavily reliant on aid organizations, but more reluctant to engage with community groups or Burundian refugee associations. Of the Burundians interviewed, using aid obtained through REDES or Unhcr was a common method of procuring their own businesses and livelihoods. Many used the services of TCRS and Asylum Access such as trauma counselling and legal aid. Others had relied on the connections of TCRS to connect them with businesses willing to invest in and employ refugees. One man from Burundi told the story of how he had begun his journey

in the camps and was told of REDESO by another person he had met there. Upon arriving in Dar es Salaam, he got in touch with REDESO and then was connected to TCRS and asylum access. TCRS' partnership with collectives in the area led him to work on the farm where he is currently employed.

A common theme among individuals who had existing networks in Dar prior to arrival was a desire to be independent. While there was some reliance in terms of a temporary place to stay or connections to potential employment, many reported knowing someone in Dar, even closely related family, but having little regular interaction with them. A common theme was a desire to “hustle for one’s self”. This came across in the majority of refugee narratives in many different forms and was a common reason for choosing to be disconnected from previous social networks. Many sited this as a reason for choosing to come to Dar es Salaam by themselves instead of with their families. This was a common answer particularly among young men, who referenced independence as being a major motivator for them. When asked why they chose not to work for brothers or cousins or other acquaintances, many stated a need to carve out their own space and not be reliant on the goodwill of others. Many also stated that others did not have the resources to sustain and support them, and that they recognized the need to support themselves even with a network.

This recognition of the need to “hustle” and independence in procuring strategies that was distinct from their established networks was evident across cross-cultural contexts and fairly ubiquitous to all the refugees interviewed, whether expressed in those terms or differently. What varied cross-culturally was the manner in which the

need to hustle manifested itself, as is evident in the ways that Burundian and Congolese strategies differ mentioned above.

This idea of “hustling” was present in how Tanzanian nationals conducted their day to day economic lives as well. Many of the *machinga* that were interviewed in Kariakoo who were Tanzanian nationals or foreigners with status stated that their primary interactions were with the people they bought or sold goods to, and chose to have little to no other business interaction. Many stated that they worked alone, and chose to do so over collaborating with others. Many also used the phrasing of “hustling for themselves” instead of forming collaborative business connections. Many reported, much like refugee respondents had, that they chose to work independent from even family and friends and be independent in their undertakings. This was distinctly different from those who owned shops, who strongly relied on connections and familial relationships.

None of the respondents reported spending more than a few months in the refugee camp prior to journeying to Dar, with approximately half spending no time in the Kigoma region or in the camps at all. All of the respondents that did stop in Kigoma or in the camps eventually moved on to Dar es Salaam and did not spend any notable amount of time there. All of the respondents reported having no intention of spending a significant amount of time in the camps and intended to move to Dar or other areas. One of the major reasons for going to the camps at all was curiosity. Many said that they had heard of the camps from relatives who had already made the journey into exile and were curious as to what was there. They had heard that opportunities were available to them that they wanted to see. Word of mouth was also cited as a factor

detering them from going to the camps from those who had spent no time in the camp setting or surrounding areas. Many reported that they had heard of the atrocities and hardships of camp life from friends and family who had made the journey while they were still in their countries of origin planning their routes into exile. Most reported hearing that conditions were dangerous and unsuitable to live in, and that freedom was restricted. The same people heard reports of economic opportunity elsewhere, particularly in Dar es Salaam and South Africa. These reports came both from individuals who had fled their countries of origin as refugees in search of asylum, but also from general ideas of economic hubs and opportunity that had been present in public opinion and rhetoric prior to exile. The desire to journey had been shaped by pre-exile beliefs as much as ideas shaped by the experience of exile. Another frequently cited reason for going to the camps was reconnecting with family or other contacts. Many knew friends, family or third-party contacts that's had previously gone to camps that they were planning to connect with there. Of the respondents who cited connecting with others, all planned to continue on to another destination once meeting up with the other person and re-establishing ties. Others, such as the Congolese man mentioned above, had initially gone to the camps to try and find family or friends they had been separated from and lost track of. In case this case, he had been disconnected from his family during the war in Congo and had no knowledge of where his wife and children had gone. He had heard that many people had gone to Kigoma to the refugee camps, so he decided to try and find them there. When this proved unsuccessful, he continued to Dar es Salaam. A few respondents, particularly of Congolese descent, stated that they had chosen to go to Kigoma because it was presented as one of the only options

to escape the Congo. A young boy who had recently fled the Congo stated that when the war initially broke out, he did not have the opportunity to leave and instead moved to live with his Aunt in another village. He reported that later, when additional violence had broken out in the community, a group of young men were loading boats to cross the lake into Tanzania headed for Kigoma, and he was given the opportunity to escape. Once he arrived in Kigoma, he connected with other people that he had known prior to exile and decided to come to Tanzania. In all cases, camps were expressed to be a temporary solution.

Two major findings related to the social connectivity of urban refugees in Dar es Salaam were found. First, it was found that possessing pre-exile networks and contacts was not crucial to developing a lasting strategy for livelihood procurement. It was assumed prior that given the undocumented and therefore clandestine nature of refugees in Dar es Salaam, that refugees would rely on strategies similar to the observations of Malkki and Sommers that suggest invisibility and minute networks respectively. Anticipated strategies included invisibility and blending into the host nation while maintaining pre-exile networks. However, it was found that while social capital, was demonstrably important in connecting individuals to opportunities, having existing connections or the absence of pre-formed networks was not an integral factor in how refugees chose their strategies. The development of social capital or relying on social capital played a shockingly small role in decision making. Respondents frequently reported making connections throughout the course of a search for a job, much of which were situational or formed through using other forms of capital such as skills acquired prior to exile. Many employed what Putnam describes as being marketplace based

situational connections, that are developed for utility in a particular context (Putnam, 1995). This tendency for refugees to rely on utility based connections rather than relying on existing connections points to a distinction between the traditional African marketplace model and the economic space refugees occupy. While the African marketplace tends to operate based on familiarity and kinship, employing friends and relatives and trade based on social networks, the refugee economy in the Dar es salaam context is based more on strategic connections rather than kinship. Refugee livelihood strategies seemed to follow similar patterns regardless of being previously well connected or not.

Regardless of pre-existing connections or lack thereof, respondents seemed to choose who they associated with based on seizing opportunities for livelihood and income generation rather than social association. As mentioned in the previous chapter, refugees were most often not predisposed to connecting with other refugees, nationals, or previous connections, but rather had networked themselves in whichever way allowed them to find livelihood generating opportunities. Connections were formed strategically so that one may find work and independence, rather than relying on a particular group as part of that strategy. Connections were used in most cases as means to an end rather than an end themselves. Choices for who they connected with seemed to be dictated by capital and asset and what opportunities could be reasonably secured rather than desiring association with a group in particular. Overall, Congolese respondents chose pathways that led to greater connection with other Congolese people than Burundians. Most of the Congolese respondents were employed by Congolese people and tended to associate with other Congolese community groups,

while this was less encountered in the case of Burundian people. What was different between these groups that contributed to different associations was the assets they had. Burundians in general were more reliant on aid, and therefore had more financial and physical capital. Congolese people overall had arrived with more skills, often in the hairstyling profession. While these are two different types of capital, both groups employed the assets they had which led to particular associations. In the absence of social capital, social connections were built using the capital at their disposal. In the case of the Congolese, this led to further connection among the community and strong Congolese association, as many had arrived with the similar skill and ended up working in the same sector. This allowed the barrier to trust to become reduced, as the same cultural group was concentrated together.

In the Burundian experience, there was less willingness to communicate their status as they feared retribution by others. In this way, the existence or absence of certain capital is what shapes social connectivity. Having pre-existing social networks in Dar es Salaam and being connected to pre-exile networks had little to do with shaping in exile associations. While these networks were sometimes jumping off points for finding other livelihood connections and opportunities, they followed the same trajectory as other individuals with the same capital. For example, Congolese individuals who had pre-exile networks in Dar versus those who did not often ended up in similar livelihood situations, working at salons. Having pre-exile networks was not considered more of an asset than not having them. As well, it did not seem that any sort of perceived barriers were preventing them from utilizing those networks, rather individuals did not seem to view these networks as particularly useful. There were no reports of fearing to be

associated with their existing contacts, but rather it was more often stated that they were unable to work with their relative or friend due to lack of resources or opportunity. It may follow from this that social capital procured before exile does not carry much weight in terms of being an important asset. As well, forming a distinct group to associate with did not seem to be a significant concern to the respondents, either.

Secondly, refugee strategies were not homogenous and a singular “refugee strategy” in Dar es Salaam could not be identified. Rather, multiple strategies were evident based on a variety of factors dependent on the experiences of the individual both pre-and post-exile. The experience of refugees was not observed to be the same for all urban dwellers in Dar es Salaam and therefore simply being a refugee and clandestine was not enough to explain strategy.

A greater factor that described variation was the existence of other capital. In general, the African informal economy is ruled by relationships of kinship and connectivity, social capital being the greatest asset for income generation. However, it is evident that in the context of Tanzania, refugees are largely excluded from this method of procurement. This exclusion is promoted by xenophobic and anti-refugee sentiment, as well as distaste for the informal economy in general. Where some may have extensive networks formed prior to exile, these connections do not translate the same way as that of nationals. While Tanzanians engaging in informal work, such as machinga and other hawkers, are able to use the same familial networking channels to find opportunities much like those, these are less effective in refugee circumstances. Given the precarity of their situations and the scarcity of opportunities, connections are not enough to secure livelihood. While the Tanzanian economy, both formal and

informal, is built on connectivity, refugees trade in their skills and relative usefulness. In the Tanzanian context, there is not the same kinship built on mutual refugee identity. This is in part due to wariness of disclosing refugee identity, preventing such connecting from developing and growing. Particularly, however, because refugees need to “hustle” relatively more than other individuals in the same arena, including the urban poor, due to their lack of status creating an additional level of precarity, connections and relationships look more like transactions than acts of familiarity. Refugees who had skills that made them marketable in the refugee economy were able to create connections based on the applicability of the skills they had. This dynamic worked similarly in situations where individuals had pre-exile connections in Dar and in situations where the individual had no pre-existing connections. In each scenario, it was the marketability of the skill the individual had that became the greatest asset, regardless of connectivity. Results in finding pathways to employment opportunities took similar shapes for individuals with a marketable skill. In the context of the study, the skill most often encountered was hair dressing among Congolese men. Among those who did not have employable skills that could connect them to livelihood opportunities or existing business, self-employment was the most frequently cited solution. In these situations where a lack of skill led to independent ventures, networks were relatively non-existent. Because the networking is merely a method of acquiring opportunity rather than the opportunity itself, for those self-employed networking was not a necessity or an asset. This suggests that in this context networks are assets insofar as that they connect individuals with skills and assets to places to apply them. Whether these networks are formed prior to exile or in the context of exile, the function similarly in

terms of finding employment applicable to the individual's skill set. However, given that the existence of social networks prior to exile is not a requirement in order to find work and livelihood procurement is based more on the skill itself than having a trusted network, social networks function less as capital and more as a tool in the refugee economy of Tanzania.

The refugee archetype continuum is concerned with how different refugee assets, attributes and experiences lead correlate with different strategies and how the convergence of these three elements in different expressions and proportions lead to different outcomes. Understanding this becomes clearer when we understand how different nuances are shaped. The above demonstrates that the country of origin not only delineates differences between refugees but that ethnic origin plays a role in refugee strategy, insofar as that it is part of the matrix of qualities that shape refugee strategy. While all refugees are entitled the same legal rights and subject to the same policies within a given context and country, the matrix of assets and resources at their disposal to navigate this landscape differ from case to case. While ethnic origin is an example demonstrable from the data obtained in this study, it is not the only variable in strategy formation. Attention must be called to the various factors beyond political situation that frame how an individual or group of individuals may approach their livelihoods and integration strategies in exile. The knowledge that different subgroups of refugees encounter differences and have different assets and strategies suggests that the term of "refugee" cannot be used to generally describe refugees, as to do so is to prescribe a set of needs and abilities.

The findings of this study demonstrate that different groups of refugees that fall within different archetypes experience the city differently and create different livelihood strategies based on what is available to them. We see through cross comparing how Burundian and Congolese individuals navigate the state and earn their livelihoods that there are dividing factors that contribute to the differing strategies. From this we learn that politics and policy are not the only nor the most influential factor in determining social and livelihood strategy. While a definite factor in influencing the lives of refugees, and the realest in the sense of what refugees themselves identify in being challenges and obstacles in their everyday lives, politics only explain so much as to what conditions refugee strategy. This study demonstrates that part of what creates nuance in strategy is the conditioning that occurs prior to exile, such as skills and opinions. Politics create an arena for these different factors to play out in, resulting in different outcomes and expressions of strategy. Contemporary refugee discourse has tended to compare refugee experiences and realities from country to country, putting an emphasis on the variations between country refugee policy and the experiences creates by changes politics and government. While there is significant cross-country variation that is relevant and important to understanding refugee life, this study finds that emphasis should be refocused on what shapes the differences between refugees within the same nation. While work presently being done has put emphasis on cross-comparing refugee contexts, more can be done to compare the experiences of different groups and sub-groups within a nation to better understand refugee strategy nuance.

These findings on the social networks of refugees speak to the literature in three main ways. Firstly, the trend in social network literature from Tanzania suggested that

strategies of invisibility would prevail in Dar es Salaam (Malkki, 1995; Sommers, 2001), however the reality appears to be much more nuanced and diverse than one singular strategy. Diverse strategies were apparent in different areas of Dar es Salaam, ranging from invisible to networked. While the existing literature describes instances of these types in a multitude of contexts, little exists on how archetypes can overlap, as the majority of examples tend to focus on a singular strategy per group (Malkki 1995; Sommers 2001; Worby 2010; Jacobsen 2006; Campbell 2006; Landau 2018). While the above shows that refugees within a context can display different strategies, it also demonstrates that archetypes are not isolated and can overlap. For example, it was discovered through field work that some refugees may choose to employ strategies of invisibility from in their day to day lives by choosing to disassociate themselves from other refugees and assume a local identity, while still being plugged into transnational refugee networks abroad. The example of the couple from Burundi in Mikocheni illustrates that these strategies can exist together, as they chose to live invisibly in Dar es Salaam but still rely heavily on remittances from friends in North America.

The findings of this paper suggest the need for an intersectional approach to understanding refugee strategy and capital. What is evident in looking at the different archetypes and strategies of refugees is that different conditioning factors lead to different strategic outcomes. This study includes gender, capital, culture and geography as factors that influence difference in exile strategy. Feminist theorists discuss how being at the intersection of different systems of oppressions leads to differences between individuals as well as particular sets of identities (McCall, 2005; Valentine 2008). Massey (2005) discusses how these identities are relational and are constantly

being co-produced within a given space. Studies on refugee networks tend to look at the label of refugee as an evenly experienced identity (Worby 2010; Landau 2018; Jacobsen 2006). While these studies often highlight features of being marginalized in the refugee experience, such as poverty, the need to “hustle”, and the reluctance of hosts to employ refugees (Worby, 2010; Landau, 2016).

Some work has been done by humanitarian organizations to highlight particular vulnerabilities, such as the experience of refugee women (UNHCR, 2015). However, more can be done to account for the unique positioning of individual groups of refugees even within the same context. Including more intersectional approaches to looking at refugee networks can lead to more nuanced understandings of these complex livelihood strategies. Feminists such as Judith Butler (1990) call for understanding individuals as aggregates of the unique positions and social structures they are a part of. West and Fenstermaker suggest a Venn diagram style framework of understanding the intersection of the multiple identified to better understand how power structures are organized around these intersecting elements (1995). Future work in refugee network analysis could benefit from including such intersectional approaches to combat the trap of falling into the labelling of a singular refugee identity.

Structure and Agency

As discussed in chapter two, the notion of structure and agency as being binary does not properly account for the refugee experience. Refugees in both camps and urban areas demonstrate agency and are conditioned by structural factors. Tanzania in particular has had evidence of refugees demonstrating agency by leaving camps for urban areas since the first cohort of refugees arrived from Burundi in 1972 (Malkki,

1995). Prohibitive policies in urban areas that restrict refugees from having mobility and the ability to work are only some of the examples of structural factors that refugees have to face. Therefore, it can be assumed that both structure and agency are present in the lives of urban refugees. Changing politics of Tanzania and the relative responses of refugees suggest that both exist in varying degrees and condition each other. However, the variation in refugee strategies suggest that not all experience structural factors equally. This understanding that the relative weight of policies may be experienced differently by some was developed through the experience of being denied access to the Kariakoo dwelling group of refugees. The evidence that some need to employ strategies of invisibility greater than others suggests that levels of precarity vary across the city.

In using the “hanging out” method in tandem with the semi-structured interviews, many of the respondents were interested in the work of the researcher and engaged in conversation regarding the nature of the research. Many were curious as to why the researcher was interested in their daily interactions and networking strategies. This opened up greater conversations on the conditions of clandestine life and what factors effected daily choice making and well-being. Many of the respondents stated their one wish was to have greater mobility and freedom to find work. These two changes were sited repeatedly as being essential to relieving anxiety over being clandestine. The overall consensus of the group was that having some sort of permit that allowed them to navigate the city freely and earn an income in an official way would greatly increase their quality of life.

Respondents were asked whether they interacted more with foreigners or with Tanzanian nationals in their day to day lives. Many engaged in conversations on what conditioned their interactions. Two patterns arose from the responses. The first was that most respondents did not answer either way that they had more national and refugee friends. Most respondents stated that they preferred to keep to themselves and were more focused on work and “hustling” than making social connections. Those who did note social connections did not make any distinction between national or refugee relationships, but rather noted that they had formed these relationships through either humanitarian organization, church groups, or through connections. Second, in discussing these social connections, it appears as though refugee social connections tend to be more focused on strategic connecting rather than choosing a particular group to associate with socially. Whether one interacted more with refugees or nationals, these questions seemed unnatural for most refugees to answer as they chose their connections based on finding work or other assets. For almost all respondents, the groups they interacted with most seemed based more on opportunity than on social ties and identification. Respondents answered often that they were not sure of the status of the people they knew, as they had not asked. Often respondents would say “I am not sure, I just work with them”, suggesting an emphasis on relationships for practical reasons rather than deliberate seeking out of a community.

Malkki’s analysis of urban and camp dwelling refugees suggests a separation of structure and agency. She suggests that refugee spaces are a function of either structure or agency which characterize the opportunities available to the inhabitants. This thesis looks at the Tanzanian context to offer evidence to the contrary, and

suggests that political influence is not the dominant factor at play for refugee action in Dar es Salaam.

Malkki's analysis of urban dwelling refugees suggests a refugee experience dictated by space and the structures that govern them or lack thereof. In Malkki's depiction, these spaces are fixed and have no interaction with one another or other spaces. This may have been representative of a time where the refugee situation was new and two represented binary choices; being within the designated structure for refugees or choosing to live beyond it. It also reflects a pre-technology world where communication tools were not nearly as abundant. As connectivity has increased, refugee spaces have become increasingly more reflexive and permeable. While the world Malkki observed may have reflected two binary and distinctly different groups of people – those choosing structure and remaining connected to their origins, and those choosing clandestinely and living beyond – changing circumstances and migration patterns that are decidedly less linear have led to overlapping refugee spaces. Communication has allowed information about camps to spread not only to urban areas but back to countries of origin, conditioning how people making choices choose their exile paths. Refugee spaces may now be thought of less as distinct physical areas but as levels of privilege and permission to be accepted in certain areas and opportunities, conditioned by capital.

Malkki's depiction of camps as being spaces of structure and urban areas as being of agency is as mentioned in previous chapters, indicative of political climate of the time. The findings of this study show that refugee spaces are much less divisive in terms of the actions available within them. In fact, as discussed, spaces defy

boundaries. The spaces and areas refugees are able to interact within and privy to are conditioned by their assets and capital. While Malkki describes camps as arenas of structure and urban areas as not, political structures and settings condition the landscapes of both areas. Political factors are best described as providing the arena other factors interact in.

This study initially assumed that how social connections are used and their relative value for livelihood and strategy generation is based on the political conditioning of the context. Regardless of the social assets accumulated by the individual prior to exile, the political context conditions how these assets are used. This narrative is true to an extent, as the political context generates a climate that the refugee must navigate, which includes choosing how assets are deployed. However, in the instance of refugee respondents that had been in Tanzania for an extended period of time and have seen the effects of political change on refugee rhetoric, none reported a change in their strategies for livelihood generation. While many reported changing locations and jobs due to external factors, none reported differences in social association due to politics, or for reasons that could be reasonably associated with political change. While many noticed changes in immigration patrol or reported negative interactions with authorities over their status, not reported changing their social connections due to such. Thus, there must be other factors that contribute to social patterns of association and strategy development rather than political nuance. Refugee livelihood strategies seemed to follow similar patterns regardless of being previously well connected or not.

However, comparing Malkki's observations to today suggests much about information flows between refugee spaces. These flows are driven by the movement of

refugees to and from spaces, rather than in just one direction as may have been observed previously. At the time of Malkki's research, spaces had greater social separation between them, which may have led to a binary understanding. With fewer urban refugees and less communication technology, the two groups, camp and urban, had little interaction. While this may give the appearance of singular elemental factors, this does not mean that even at the time structure and agency were separate. Now that movement between the two is more common and more apparent, it is easier to see the expressions of structure and acts of agency in both spaces.

Refugee Space and Access

Initially this study expected that strategies might be dispersed throughout the city in a concentric zone model type fashion, radiating outward from Kariakoo. At the centre, in the Kariakoo marketplace, it was expected that strategies of invisibility might be the most used given the high concentration of nationals and interactions with authorities are frequent. Because the possibility of being exposed is higher, the need to be invisible is great. It would follow that as you move away from Kariakoo and level of interaction with "others" decreases, so does the need for invisibility strategy. However, the struggles of access led the researcher to ask what was conditioning the ability of some to be in Kariakoo and other to choose to be in other areas. What is the linkage between space and strategy and what conditions the refugee geography of Dar es Salaam? This thesis suggests that capital and resource conditions an individual's relative access to areas of the city and their inclusion in those areas activities. This geography of inclusion is what conditions the spatiality of the refugee experience in Dar es Salaam.

Respondents were asked about what conditioned their choices to settle and work in certain areas rather than others. Given the inability to access respondents in Kariakoo, the scope of this project changed from how refugees navigate working and living in Kariakoo and what strategies they employ, to what conditions the choice to live in particular areas over others and what sets of personal criteria lead to each choice. Instead of asking “How do you navigate Kariakoo and what strategies do you use?” this project instead aimed to ask, “How did you choose to settle where you are and why not Kariakoo, given the perceived opportunities there?”.

Respondents were asked how they came to work where they currently do and how to choose to come and settle in this area. Answers were largely circumstantial, and did not seem to follow any pre-meditated strategy. Many of the answers followed patterns of “this is where I was able to find work” or “I had previously lived in one area, but did not feel safe and relocated here”. Many reported first attempting to find work in Kariakoo and being unable to do so, or first working in Kariakoo and then relocating. Of the few that did have previous experience Kariakoo, there was a consistent opinion that forming connections and building relationships in the marketplace was more difficult, with multiple layers of social life to navigate. Two young boys, mentioned earlier, began their experience in Dar es Salaam in Kariakoo. Trying to find work, they approached various people to look for opportunities. Hearing their accents and the way they spoke Swahili, many identified them immediately as foreigners and refused to help them or speak to them. They began to think of going elsewhere as they had not been successful in finding work or accommodation, and began to worry that they might be reported to the authorities. Eventually they found a woman willing to speak to them. They noted that

it took a significant amount of conversation to build trust on both sides with this woman. While they were hesitant to disclose where they were from and that they were refugees looking for work, she was hesitant to help them without knowing about them first. She eventually referred them to the street densely populated with Congolese in Kariakoo, where they then found connections to work in other neighborhoods. They did not remain in Kariakoo because the opportunities were not there and the competition to generate income amongst the Congolese was intense.

Many respondents noted moving to certain areas or following certain livelihood opportunities if they already had experience or expertise in a particular area. For example, many of the Congolese respondents noted moving to a particular area they had not initially identified as an area of potential interest because that is where they found job prospects. In this manner, certain forms of capital conditioned moves in certain areas. Most stated that they chose to be in a certain area because of work and not because they had chosen that area for other reasons.

When asked if they had received negative attention from immigration officers or every felt fearful in their daily lives being undocumented, many of the respondents mentioned stories of having to relocate themselves within Dar es Salaam in order to remain anonymous. Some stated they relocated because in particular areas they were known to national officials and were often being apprehended by immigration authorities. One man stated that he moved neighborhoods and places of employment because he was continuously being detained. He stated that sometimes he would be taken into custody by immigration, held until he paid his fine, and then once he was released would be re-arrested outside the courthouse again. Many cited moving to

areas that are more discrete and in areas that are closer to people they have become acquainted with and trust. A common theme that arose was people moving once their identities became compromised or were at a risk. From the example of the Burundian family mentioned earlier, the family was forced to relocate neighborhoods several times as they were concealing their identities as refugees and felt that they were becoming close to being discovered by people at their children's school. Another man mentioned that in a previous neighborhood he lived in, he was cautious of disclosing his status or getting too close to people in the neighborhood as they might detect his foreign status from his accent. He said that often when people realized he was a refugee, they would ask him for money and threaten him with going to the police. If he was unable to give them what they asked of him, they would turn him into the police.

In looking for a solution to Malkki's binary vision of structure and agency, this thesis asks how we can understand refugee's experience of urban space. The findings of this research suggest that refugee's experience of space can be thought of as relative inclusivity and the access one has to particular areas. This access is a function of the assets one has that gives them access to certain spaces as opposed to others. How individuals are able to use the assets they have says a lot about the way they navigate the city and the opportunities available to them. As demonstrated above, having a skill versus not conditions the opportunities available to you, and in pursuing those opportunities conditions the relationships and spaces you occupy both social and spatially. Refugees that had assets they could use to connect themselves had access to entire social world. For example, the individuals that had found work because of their skills in hairstyling had found a community through this skill that they would not have

plugged into otherwise. Through these connections they were able to find accommodation, refugee associations, etc. While connecting socially was not a primary objective, it was an externality. Meanwhile, as mentioned prior in situations where connection building was not necessary, in the case of self-employment, that social association does not get the opportunity to form. Having capital allows access to social spaces, and informs and develops the social capital. Access to space is further conditioned by the political context of the moment, including public rhetoric

While these refugees have cultural differences, which could suggest different assets and attitudes for exile strategies cultivated prior to the journey of exile, this is assumed to not be the cause for differing social spaces and social strategies. All of the refugees interviewed suggested a desire to “hustle for themselves”, suggesting a desire to create their own path independently. Then differing cultural attitudes alone do not account for the variation in social association and networking. The assets individuals possess allow them access to different social spaces and different physical spaces. In this way, refugees experience of the city is in part conditioned pre-exile, but this is not limited to social assets and social networking. In fact, what comes from this study is a knowledge that within a skills-valued based context such as Dar, where refugees occupy a sub-economy that is not directly congruent to that of the regular informal economy but occupies an economic space adjacent to it, is that social relationships are largely situational and can be built in exile. The greatest distinction between refugees was not whether they had previously devised social networks or the social strategies they were using, but there was a clear distinction between the strategies used by different cultures. Congolese refugees used strategies that were centered around the

skills they had brought into exile. Refugees from Burundi centered their strategies around aid and independent business ventures. There were also cultural variants between the groups on how they perceived humanitarian organizations. While determining why these attitudes were the way they were was not within the scope or mission of this study, the fact that these variations were delineated by cultural identification and not by network endowment suggests two things about resource and asset development. Firstly, it suggests that physical and skills based capital are largely developed prior to exile and skills that one forms back home will form the basis of their livelihood strategies in exile. Refugees in this context are likely to pursue the same methods of employment they had back home, particularly if these are skills based. While some of the respondents from the Congo mentioned that they were learning hairdressing skills in the present in Dar es Salaam, this choice was conditioned by cultural trends toward hairdressing in the Congo. While the reason behind it is unclear, it was evident that while Congolese refugees in Dar es Salaam have created an identity for themselves as hairdressers by which other Congolese people and other refugees and Tanzanians alike identify them by, the Burundian population did not have a specific brand in the same way. While many Burundian refugees were entrepreneurs, this was less related to a previously cultivated predisposition to entrepreneurship and salesmanship, but rather a means of independently earning an income. This suggests that situations between the two countries of origin are such that condition different skills and thus different livelihood strategies. This illuminates that not only are strategies conditioned, at least in part, by the experiences prior to exile and the assets acquired prior to the journey, but also that individuals build networks around their skills rather

than the other way around. Attitudes toward aid were also conditioned prior to exile. Resources are acquired different creating different strategies. This distinction could be based on changing and differing politics in host nations, affecting the strategic landscape as much as internal politics in the hosting nation. Much in the way that host national policies and politics play a role in conditioning the barriers refugees have to livelihood opportunities and play a role in the need to “hustle” or be clandestine or any of the myriad refugee traits associated with the Tanzanian experience, the politics of the sending nation shapes their experience as well.

Where pre-exile networks and the existence of social assets developed in the country of origin did play a role and caused strategy variation was in information and plan development. Many respondents stated their choices and plans going into exile were conditioned by information they received by others who had already left or people they knew in Dar es salaam already. These relationships were integral. Passing along information more than they were in establishing linkages and connections to livelihood opportunities. This passing of information informed people of the opportunities available to them and conditioned the choices they made in terms of moving to urban areas and how they would procure their livelihoods. The choice to come to urban areas was most frequently conditioned by the ideas that urban areas like Dar es Salaam are the centers of economic life. Many reported that their initial intention was to travel to South Africa, but either did not make the journey or were unable to make it into the country and returned to Dar. When asked why they thought to go to South Africa first, all respondents who intended to make that journey stated that they had heard about it from people who had gone previously and associated South Africa with wealth and

opportunity. None of the respondents had previously been to South Africa or had any stable contact with the individuals they knew there, and in many cases the person they had known was no longer there. Despite not having firm connections, the trade back to the country of origin of information conditioned the choice to come to urban centers. Those who decided to enter camps first or contrarily actively chose to avoid camps stated that they did so because they had heard either negative or positive things that influenced their decisions. Though the information was often opposing and resulted in different outcomes and strategies of movement, it was the process of knowledge transference from exile to countries of origin that creates a network of discourse that informs refugee choice. Thus, the decisions made in exile in choosing where to settle is both conditioned by the experience and previous knowledge.

The collective of assets, attitudes, networks and information refugees enter exile with condition their archetype. While archetypes correlate with different strategies, they also determine how one navigates the city and its various spaces. While politics creates the arena in which refugees engage in every day experiences, their archetype determines their relative privileges and the spaces they engage in and have access to. This is evident in the case of this study, where access to refugees in the Kariakoo district was difficult to obtain. In failing to gain access to refugees living and working in the Kariakoo area, it was evident that refugees of this sort have different strategies than those who were able to be interviewed, presumably greater focused on anonymity and strategies of invisibility. This difference is assumed from the relative ease at which individuals from other areas were able to be contacted and interviewed, Additionally, of those refugees who were interviewed, many reported initially trying to find work in

Kariakoo but not being successful. Many stated that they found integrating themselves difficult and gaining trust of other individuals to find work a daunting task. One of the greatest references reasons for not remaining In Kariakoo was being connected to job opportunities elsewhere that were outside of the Kariakoo area. For Congolese refugees in particular, many sited finding hairdressing opportunities elsewhere within the city, through contacts initially made in Kariakoo.

While this study was unsuccessful in recruiting respondents in Kariakoo, inferences can be made based on what we know about other refugees and the nature of archetypes and state navigation in Dar es Salaam. As mentioned, given their unwillingness to participate compared to the willingness of other refugees, refugees in Kariakoo are assumed to use strategies of invisibility, making them less willing to engage with strangers or those that pose a potential threat to their anonymity in the heterogeneous market setting. While it seems as though these groups demonstrate strategies which segregate them, the minimal interaction with these groups in trying to set up interviews suggests that they have established tight-knit and insular communities. In attempting to set up meetings with these individuals through the help of partners in situ, it was leaders of communities in Kariakoo that declined the invitation or were the key communicators in setting up meetings (none of which ultimately came to fruition). This suggests that while they choose anonymity with outside groups and within the areas they live, or I other times anonymity in relationship with the larger Tanzanian community, there seems to be a tight knit dependence and authority structure within the Kariakoo communities. Whether these communities comprise of refugees or are community groups led by churches, other institutions, or simply neighbors, their strategy

seems to be markedly different than those of the refugees interviewed who live and work in other areas of the city. While it is not clear what these communities look like, what appears to be evident is a distinctly different archetype from what has been reported in other cases, comprising a strategy that is simultaneously anonymous and network based, engaging both archetypes of invisibility and social networking. This demonstrates further that other strategies are at play in different contexts, and myriad archetypes exist in different contexts. Variations exist both between places and within places. It also proves and further demonstrates that archetypes are conditioned by assets. In the discussions had with refugees during this study, it shows as discussed earlier that refugees are drawn to follow particular paths and engage in particular genres of work and particular physical areas of the city based on the assets they had to work with and are able to work with, given the politics of the city. Assets effect the archetypes ability to navigate physical space, social space, livelihoods and everyday life. It must follow, then, that the strategies of those in Kariakoo are conditioned, structured and influenced in the same ways and by the same factors; their assets.

It must further follow then that the assets of those refugees in Kariakoo differ from those elsewhere. While understanding the strategies of refugees engaged in Kariakoo was beyond the reasonable abilities and capabilities of this study, this demonstrates that different strategies exist within the same setting and same political arena, further suggesting that assets are what condition strategy choice and execution. It also demonstrates that assets allow access to different physical spaces and opportunities. While it remains unknown what assets of the Kariakoo refugee population

set them apart from others, it is clear that these allow them access to an elite are others do not have the capital to engage in.

The above discusses social capital as being conditioned by other assets. While social networks and connections can be means for finding livelihood opportunities, the findings of this study suggest that within this context, other assets such as skills and capital conditioned the ways in which social networks were formed and used. While having social connections were vital in many cases, their development and use was groomed by the existence of other capital. In other words, other assets formed the independent variable which conditioned social networks, the dependent variable. However, it is important to consider that the ability of one asset or form of capital to condition another may be reflexive, or the variables may switch depending on the situation or “political arena”. As earlier suggested, context and political arena have the ability to condition not only policy and public opinion, but the choices refugees make in navigating the state. As urban refugees create strategies that circumvent policy, as in the case of Tanzania where refugees are not allowed beyond camps, the political climate conditions what these strategies look like. While the above suggests that we cross reference contexts within a nation to understand internal archetypes, within this cross referencing and analyzing, it is useful to look at what variables are the defining factor that condition the others.

Valentine (2005) discusses how the concepts of space and identity are intertwined and condition one another. She states that space is not just a location but a place where individual “trajectories”, or aggregates of individual pasts, assets, and potentials, meet and give meaning to the environment. Always fluctuating, Massey

(2005) images individual identities as “trajectorial relationships”. Interaction conditioning space is evident in the refugee spaces of Dar es Salaam. As the above findings demonstrate, the relative positioning, or “trajectories” to borrow Massey’s word, of refugees in Dar es Salaam shapes the spaces they have access to as well as the distribution of space as a common experience. While it is different to generalize and unlikely that the spatial terrain of Dar es Salaam exactly mimics that of all other urban refugee hosting cities in Africa, it is likely that these same spatial conditioning dynamics exist. This is in direct tension with the ideas of Malkki (1995) that particular spaces can be conditioned by a singular element, but rather highlights that spaces are arenas where these elements are in constant conversation with one another.

Conclusion

This thesis puts focus on understanding the experiences of urban refugees in exile. In acknowledging literature that suggests starkly different social and livelihood strategies, this work aims to better understand the conditioning process. In doing so, it addresses three major questions. First it looked at how notions of structure and agency can be reconfigured to better account for the refugee experience. It challenges the ideas of Malkki that camp and urban refugee spaces are each dominated by structure and agency respectfully, and therefore create different choices and realities. It then asked how, given this challenge, can refugee spaces be imagined? It aimed to understand how refugees experience urban life and what can be a better answer to refugee's depiction of binary refugee spaces. Third, it asks what factors condition refugee exile strategy and the development of social networks and livelihood procurement. Given the variation of social strategy in the African context, it asks what creates such difference and how they can be understood.

Review of Questions and Arguments

This study asked how refugees fit into the structure and agency dialectic and how it can be envisioned to better account for forced migration. While scholars such as Malkki have claimed that refugee camps are spaces of structure and urban areas are spaces where agency can be expressed, this study shows that both elements are intertwined in both spaces. While camps have more direct forms of structure, individuals still express agency through their own ventures and choice making. In urban areas, being clandestine does not mean refugees are free from the barriers of structure, as they still impose barriers to navigate.

This thesis also asked how we can reimagine refugee spaces, given that agency and structure are not binary. This study found that particular areas such as Kariakoo were more difficult to access both for the researcher and for the refugee. Possessing certain assets or capital gave some refugees access to certain spaces and not to others. Thus, spaces can better be understood as arenas of access when considering the geography of the city. It suggests that in the Tanzanian context, the identity of refugee is not one that is evenly or ubiquitously experienced. It attributes this unequal experience of the city to relative access and inclusion of particular spaces, which is conditioned by relative access to resources and capital.

Further, this thesis suggests that capital conditions strategy as well as space, and the variance in strategy within Dar es Salaam can be attributed to the employment of different capital in different spaces. While refugee subgroups are subject to the same structural limitations, capital and culture conditioned pre-exile shapes strategies of both socialization and livelihood procurement in distinctly different ways. It is interesting to note that there is not one distinct “Tanzanian” refugee strategy, and that to identify refugee strategy in relation to the host nation is to suggest that the structures of that nation are the sole conditioning factor. In fact, the case of Tanzania suggests

Implications

This thesis and its findings have implications not only for forced migration studies but in real world application and solution development. There are two main implications this study identifies. First, the evidence suggests refugees as a group do not create strategies uniformly even in within the same contextual conditions. This has implications for understanding forced migration in Africa and for how we conceptualize refugees

generally. There is a tendency to view refugees in terms of their legal definition, which is determined by meeting a set of criteria related to their exile. That identity does not consider the distinct cultural and contextual nuances of each distinct subgroup. This work shows that refugees of different cultural groups, while all navigating the same structural and policy barriers in Tanzania, make distinctly different choices based on culturally derived differences and assets. Literature on protracted refugee situations in Africa tends to focus on the impact of post-colonial conflict on refugee flows. While important, this work suggests that emphasis should be refocused on how differences formed in the countries of origin lead to variation in exile strategy. This variance in refugees' experience of the cities they inhabit both spatially and socially indicates a need to rethink how we identify refugees and the weight we place on the legal definition, particularly in the case of urban refugees who exist beyond the legally mandated context for which the definition is derived. In identifying that the experiences of refugees within a given place are not always equal, it suggests that while environment and setting in the host country conditions refugee lives and provides arena for demonstrating agency, experiences and capital development prior to exile are also formative. Politics, therefore, can only explain part of refugee strategy formation; the arena. While scholars such as Milner (2009) demonstrate that changes in refugee policy can be best understood in relationship to political change and influence, it is necessary to further explain what in pre-exile experience drives the variance in strategy that exists even within the same environment. As well, this thesis points to the importance of understanding refugees as distinct sub groups with individual interests and assets, rather than a homogenous whole. In relation to the pursuit of durable solutions,

understanding groups' distinct needs and strategies can be crucial to creating sustainable policy.

Second, this thesis makes recommendations for conducting research with refugees that is ethical and factual. It illuminates trust building as not only necessary for ensuring the well-being of the population being interacted with, but also for the development of sustainable and accurate research projects. It suggests that the formation of trust is integral to achieving data that is true when working with undocumented populations who already experience precarity within the state. As demonstrated in chapter five, the absence of trust can lead to inaccurate information and false narratives, or being denied access to an entire group. Incorporating methods for gaining trust and developing relationships with respondents is key to gaining accurate reflections of the context.

Areas of future research

Further developing the archetype continuum skeleton drawn out in this thesis can provide more complex understanding of the linkages between capital and livelihood strategy for urban refugees. Future research can add to the archetype continuum by continuing to collect narratives of strategy development from across the African context and map out what factors lead to such strategy implementation. While forced migration research has, of late, begun to recognize the value of listening to narratives of exile and tracing the dissemination of information and choice making, future efforts can add further dimension by becoming more reflexive. As stated in the substantive sections of this thesis, the findings of this research suggest that information flows not only lead from camps and country of origin to the urban areas, but that information often makes its way

back to these places, conditioning the choice making of future migrants and refugees. Research that examines how shared information as an asset is shared and conditioned can be complimentary to this work on social networks and refugee spaces. Having an understanding of how information and either access to it or lack thereof conditions choice making and movement can further enrich the continuum. This work also makes case for reconceptualising the structure and agency dialectic in a way that moves beyond the limits of using structure synonymous with territory and reimagining it with a third “extra-political” space. Including the extra political, that which is conditioned by structure but does not necessarily have hand in creating it or research benefit from it, makes move toward understanding a more transient, border-bending reality where those who act within a state and are recipients of state action are not actually who the structure aims to serve. There is existing, albeit limited, literature that also images spaces of activity beyond the binary of structure and agency. De Boer imagines liminal spaces as ideas of cultural identity and belonging that transcend and exist between concrete spaces and boundaries (2014, pg.487). Lee also conceptualizes a third space of citizenship (2010). He imagines a Foucauldian idea of *bio-power*, an informal governance of human welfare by the populace (pg. 66). Landau and Amit report on how occupants of the extra-political space demonstrate power and organization (2014). Further exploration of what this space looks like as it relates to refugee association, livelihoods and day to day experiences is essential to not only understanding how refugees make choice but understanding the development of a clandestine refugee social structure within a structure that does not serve them.

While some forced migration scholars call for a movement away from small scale narrative based research in favor of more generalizable quantitative work, this thesis demonstrates the value in conducting research with small scale sampling methods. Through the establishment of the archetype continuum it is clear that there is no generalizable model of refugee strategy. However, through the accumulation of small scale research we can gain greater understanding of the strategies of individual cultures and cross reference them. As demonstrated, protracted situations in Africa cannot be generalized, and do not fit a singular cohesive strategy model. As this thesis demonstrates, even within a single nation the strategies of different refugee sub-groups differ based on a host of factors including those conditions occurring prior to and post exile.

References

- Alexander, A. (2008). Without refuge: Chinese refugees in india and malaysia. *Forced Migration Review*, (30), 36-37.
- Bakewell, O. (2010). Some reflections on structure and agency in migration theory. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1689-1708. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2010.489382
- Banki, S. (2006). Burmese refugees in tokyo: Livelihoods in the urban environment. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(3), 328-344. doi:10.1093/jrs/fel015
- Boer, R. D. (2015). Liminal space in protracted exile: The meaning of place in Congolese refugees' narratives of Home and Belonging in Kampala. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 28(4), 486-504. doi:10.1093/jrs/feu047
- Boyte, H. C. (2010). *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Briant, N. (2004). An investigation of the perceived needs and priorities held by african refugees in an urban setting in a first country of asylum. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 17(4), 437-459. doi:10.1093/jrs/17.4.437
- Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, A., & University of Cardiff. (2006). *Contested space: Street trading, public space, and livelihoods in developing cities*. Rugby, UK: ITDG Pub.
- Browne, K. (2005). Snowball sampling: using social networks to research non-heterosexual women. *International journal of social research methodology*, 8(1), 47-60.
- Buscher, D., & Heller, L. (2010). Desperate lives: urban refugee women in Malaysia and Egypt. *Forced Migration Review*, (34), 20.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the sub-version of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, E. H. (2006). Urban refugees in Nairobi: Problems of protection, mechanisms of survival, and possibilities for integration. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(3), 396-413. doi:10.1093/jrs/fel011
- Castles, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of forced migration and social transformation. *sociology*, 37(1), 13-34.

Clark-Kazak, C. R. (2011). *Recounting migration: Political narratives of Congolese young people in Uganda*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. *Communications monographs*, 58(2), 179-194.

Coulson, A. (1982). *Tanzania: A political economy*. New York;Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press.

Crisp, J. (1999) 'Policy Challenges of the New Diasporas: Migrant Networks and Their Impact on Asylum Flows and Regimes', UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, New Issues in Refugee Research Working Paper No. 7, www.unhcr.ch.

Crisp, J. (2004) 'The Local Integration and Local Settlement of Refugees: a Conceptual and Historical Analysis', UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, New Issues in Refugee Research Working Paper No. 102, (www.unhcr.ch).

Crisp, J. (2017). Finding space for protection: An inside account of the evolution of UNHCR's urban refugee policy. *Refugee*, 33(1), 87.

Crisp, J., Janz, J. Riera, J., and Samy, S. (2009). *Surviving in the City – A review of UNHCR's operation for Iraqi refugees in urban areas of Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria*. UUNHCR. Policy Development and Evaluation Service.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. Sage.

Daley, P. (1992), "The Politics of the Refugee Crisis in Tanzania", in Horace Campbell and Howard Stein (eds.), *Tanzania and the IMF: The Dynamics of Liberalization*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Diefenbach, T. (2009). Are case studies more than sophisticated storytelling?: Methodological problems of qualitative empirical research mainly based on semi-structured interviews. *Quality & Quantity*, 43(6), 875.

Denzin, N. K. (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (Vol. 3). Sage.

Devas, N. (Ed.) (2001) *Urban governance and poverty*. School of Public Policy, University of Birmingham, June.

Düvell, F. (2008). Clandestine migration in Europe. *Social Science Information*, 47(4), 479-497.

Dolan, C., & Johnstone-Louis, M. (2011). Re-siting corporate responsibility: The making of south africa's avon entrepreneurs. *Focaal*, 2011(60), 21-33.
doi:10.3167/fcl.2011.600103

Ellis, F. (2000). *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. Oxford university press.

Evens, T. T., & Handelman, D. (Eds.). (2006). *The Manchester School: practice and ethnographic praxis in anthropology*. Berghahn Books.

Flint, C., & Shelley, F. M. (1996). Structure, agency, and context: The contributions of geography to world-systems analysis. *Sociological Inquiry*, 66(4), 496-508.

Frayne, B. (2004) Migration and urban survival strategies in Windhoek, Namibia, *Geoforum*, 35, pp. 489–505.

Gaynor, T. (2015). UNHCR concerned at reports of sexual violence against refugee women and children. UNHCR. Accessed June 19, 2019. <http://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2015>

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Geschiere, P. (1993). Chiefs and colonial rule in Cameroon: Inventing chieftaincy, French and British style. *Africa*, 63(2), 151-175. doi:10.2307/1160839

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. London: Macmillan Press

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (2003), Ministry of Home Affairs “The National Refugee Policy”, Dar es Salaam, September, 7.

Harrell-Bond, B. E., & Voutira, E. (1992). Anthropology and the Study of Refugees. *Anthropology today*, 8(4), 6-10.

Horst, C. (2002). Vital links in social security: Somali refugees in the Dadaab camps, Kenya. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 21(1 and 2), 242-259.

Hovil, L. (2010). *Naturalisation of Burundian refugees in Tanzania: A new home?* Pambazuka News. <https://www.pambazuka.org/human-security/naturalisation-burundian-refugees-tanzania-new-home>

Jacobsen, K., & Landau, L. B. (2003). The dual imperative in refugee research: Some methodological and ethical considerations in social science research on forced migration. *Disasters*, 27(3), 185-206. doi:10.1111/1467-7717.00228

Jacobsen, K. (2005). *The economic life of refugees*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc.

- Jacobsen, K., & Landau, L. (2005). Recommendations for urban refugee policy. *Forced Migration Review*, (23), 52-52.
- Kibreab, G. (1996). Eritrean and ethiopian urban refugees in khartoum: What the eye refuses to see. *African Studies Review*, 39(3), 131-178. doi:10.2307/524946
- Kritikos, G. (2000). State policy and urban employment of refugees: The greek case (1923-30). *European Review of History: Revue Europeenne d'Histoire*, 7(2), 189-206. doi:10.1080/713666751
- King, B. (2011). Spatializing livelihoods: Resource access and livelihood spaces in south Africa. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 36(2), 297-313.
- Kitayama, S. & Markus, H.R. 2000. The Pursuit of Happiness and the Realization of Sympathy: Cultural Patterns of Self, Social Relations and Well-Being. pp 113–162 In E. Diener and E. M. Suh. (eds). *Culture and Subjective Well-Being*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- Knafo, S. (2010). Critical approaches and the legacy of the agent/structure debate in international relations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(3), 493-516.
- Kuch, A. (2016). Naturalization of burundian refugees in Tanzania: The debates on local integration and the meaning of citizenship revisited. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, , few024. doi:10.1093/jrs/few024
- Landau, L. B., & Amit, R. (2014). Wither policy? southern african perspectives on understanding law, 'refugee' policy and protection. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 27(4), 534-552. doi:10.1093/jrs/feu005
- Landau, L. B. (2006). Protection and dignity in johannesburg: Shortcomings of south africa's urban refugee policy. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19(3), 308-327. doi:10.1093/jrs/fel012
- Landau, L. (2019). Shunning Solidarity: Durable Solutions in a Fluid Era. Bradley, M., Milner, J., and Peruniak, B. (eds.), *Refugees' Roles in Resolving Displacement and Building Peace: Beyond Beneficiaries*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lee, C. T. (2010). Bare life, interstices, and the third space of citizenship. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 38(1/2), 57-81. doi:10.1353/wsq.0.0224
- Liamputtong, P. (2007). *Researching the vulnerable: A guide to sensitive research methods*. Sage.
- Lieberson, S. (1994) More on the Uneasy Case for Using Mill-Type Methods in Small-N Comparative Studies. *Social Forces* 72(4): 1225–37

- Lyons, M., & Snoxell, S. (2005). Creating urban social capital: Some evidence from informal traders in Nairobi. *Urban Studies*, 42(7), 1077-1097. doi:10.1080/00420980500120865
- Macchiavello, M. (n.d.). "Livelihoods Strategies of Urban Refugees in Kampala." *Forced Migration Review* 20.
- Malkki, L. H. (1995). *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology among hutu refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Massey, D., 2005. *For space*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Autesserre, S. (2014). *Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention*. Cambridge University Press.
- McCall, L. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30:1771–1802.
- McNabb, D. E. (2015). *Research methods for political science: Quantitative and qualitative methods*. Routledge.
- McSweeney, K. (2004). The dugout canoe trade in Central America's Mosquitia: approaching rural livelihoods through systems of exchange. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* (94) 638–61
- Milner, J. (2009). *Refugees, the state and the politics of asylum in Africa*. Basingstoke, England; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milner, J. (2013) 'Two steps forward, one step back: understanding the shifting politics of refugee policy in Tanzania', UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Development Unit, *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 255, www.unhcr.ch.
- Molotch, H. (1976). The city as a growth machine: Toward a political economy of place. *American journal of sociology*, 82(2), 309-332.
- Okely, J. (2013). *Anthropological practice: Fieldwork and the ethnographic method*. Berg.
- Oliveira, E., & Vearey, J. (2017). Beyond the single story: Creative research approaches with migrant sex workers in South Africa. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, 6(2), 317-321. doi:10.1332/204674317X14937364476877
- Omata, N., Kaplan, J. D., Bloom, L., Betts, A., & Oxford University Press. (2016). *Refugee economies: Forced displacement and development* (First ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Reilly, K. (2012). *Ethnographic methods*. Routledge.

Ogata, S. N. (2005). *The turbulent decade: Confronting the refugee crises of the 1990s* (1st ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.

Pernice, R. (1994). Methodological issues in research with refugees and immigrants. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25(3), 207.

Putnam, R.D. (1995) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital, *Journal of Democracy*,

Råheim, M., Magnussen, L. H., Sekse, R. J. T., Lunde, Å., Jacobsen, T., & Blystad, A. (2016). Researcher–researched relationship in qualitative research: Shifts in positions and researcher vulnerability. *International journal of qualitative studies on health and well-being*, 11(1), 30996.

Ragin, C. (1992) 'Casing' and the Process of Social Inquiry. In C.C. Ragin and H. Becker (eds.) *What Is A Case: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rodgers, G. (2004). Hanging out with forced migrants: methodological and ethical challenges. *Forced migration review*, (21), 48-49.

Rutherford, B. (2008). An unsettled belonging: Zimbabwean farm workers in limpopo province, south africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 26(4), 401-415. doi:10.1080/02589000802481973

Rutinwa, B. (1996). The Tanzanian government's response to the Rwandan emergency. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 9(3), 291-302. doi:10.1093/jrs/9.3.291

Rutinwa, B. (2002) 'Prima facie status and refugee protection', UNHCR Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit, New Issues in Refugee Research, Working Paper No. 69, www.unhcr.ch.

Savolainen, J. (1994) The Rationality of Drawing Big Conclusions Based on Small Samples: In Defense of Mill's Methods. *Social Forces* 72: 1217–223.

Sommers, M. (2001). *Fear in Bongoland: Burundi refugees in urban Tanzania* (Vol. 8). Berghahn Books.

Sommers, M. (1999). Urbanisation and its discontents: Urban refugees in tanzania. *Forced Migration Review*, (4), 22-24.

Tanzania -- in the name of security: Forced round-ups of refugees in tanzania. (1999). ().Human Rights Watch.

Turton, D. (1996). Migrants and refugees: a Mursi case study. *In Search of cool ground: war, flight and homecoming in Northeast Africa*, James Currey Press: London, 96-110.

United National High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Protection. Accessed May 2018. <http://www.unhcr.org/protection.html>

UNHCR (2000), *The State of the World's Refugees: Fifty Years of Humanitarian Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 312.

Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 59(1), 10-21. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00587.x

Vermaak, J. (2017). Social development and informal markets: Lessons from thohoyandou market, south africa. *Development in Practice*, 27(1), 53-63. doi:10.1080/09614524.2017.1258038

Vermaak, J. (2009). Reassessing the concept of 'social capital': Considering resources for satisfying the needs of rural communities. *Development Southern Africa*, 26(3), 399-412. doi:10.1080/03768350903086770

Watters, J. K., & Biernacki, P. (1989). Targeted sampling: options for the study of hidden populations. *Social problems*, 36(4), 416-430.

West, C., and S. Fenstermaker. 1995. Doing difference. *Gender and Society* 9:8–37.

Whitaker, B.E. (2002) Refugees in Western Tanzania: The Distribution of Burdens and Benefits Among Local Hosts. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 15(4): 339–58.

Zolberg, A., Suhrke, A., and Aguayo, S. (1989). *Escape from Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 45-9.

Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Question Guide

Interview Guide for Refugees

1. What do you do in the market? What do you sell?
2. Who owns your shop/stall?
3. How do you know each other?
 - a. How were you introduced?
 - b. Did you know this person before coming to Dar es Salaam?
4. Who would you say you interact with the most in the market?
 - a. How were you introduced?
 - b. Describe some important interactions/people
5. How did you come to work in Kariakoo?
6. What led you to pursue work in Kariakoo as opposed to elsewhere?
7. How long have you been working in Kariakoo?
8. What prompted you to come to Dar es Salaam?
9. Did you arrive alone or with company? If so, with who?
10. Did you have pre-existing contacts in Dar es Salaam when you first arrive?
11. When did you first arrive?
12. Where did you register upon arrival?
13. Where are you from originally?
14. Did you stay anywhere in between?
 - a. If so, for how long?
 - b. Did you make any connections or relationships in this place/these places?
15. Who are you still in contact with from your country of origin?
 - a. How often do you communicate?
 - b. Are these individuals in Dar es Salaam or in your country of origin?
16. In Dar es Salaam, are you engaged with any refugee networks?
17. Is your current social network mostly other migrants or Tanzanian nationals?
18. Briefly describe an average day in the market
 - a. Who do you interact with?
 - b. Does working in the market present any challenges in your every day life?
If so, describe as much as you feel comfortable

Interview Guide for Tanzanian Nationals

1. What do you do in the market? What do you sell?
2. Who owns your shop/stall?
3. How do you know each other?
 - a. How were you introduced?
 - b. Did you know this person before coming to Dar es Salaam?
4. Who would you say you interact with the most in the market?

- a. Are these people Tanzanians?
5. How did you come to work in Kariakoo?
6. What led you to pursue work in Kariakoo as opposed to elsewhere?
7. How long have you been working in Kariakoo?
8. Do you work mostly with Tanzanians?
9. What is the dominant culture you interact with other than Tanzanian?
10. Do migrants work for you/with you?
 - a. Why or why not?
11. In what areas of work are most migrants employed?
12. How do most migrants become established in the market?
13. Briefly describe an average day in the market
 - a. Who do you interact with?
 - b. Does working in the market present any challenges in your every day life?
If so, describe as much as you feel comfortable