

Temporary migrants as an uneasy presence in immigrant societies: Reflections on ambivalence in Australia

International Journal of
Comparative Sociology
1–19

© The Author(s) 2019

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0020715219835891

journals.sagepub.com/home/cos



Claudia Tazreiter 

University of New South Wales, Australia

Abstract

This article explores the status of temporariness in international migration. The focus is on the impact of temporary status on migrants' actions, behavior, and emotional responses to the daily circumstances in negotiating everyday life. Ambivalence is evaluated as an explanatory category that allows particular insight into strategies of resistance used by temporary migrants as they navigate a host society besides maintaining connections with home. Original data obtained from in-depth interviews with Indonesian migrant workers and students undertaking temporary migration projects in Australia is discussed. The case study explored in this article identifies some of the core problems temporary migrants face as encapsulated by a deficit of rights and protections that, at the same time, are expected by members of liberal states. Temporary status turns migrants into nomadic global laborers. The article argues that actions and responses that appear to be ambivalent are far from irrational, hasty, or disloyal. Rather, migrants' decision-making in response to the uncertain and shifting economic and sociocultural environments that they enter often comprises subtle calibrations and switching actions, observable as ambivalence, in adjusting to the unanticipated demands of a new society.

Keywords

Ambivalence, belonging, citizenship, rights, temporary migration

Introduction¹

This article mounts an argument that temporary migration poses unique challenges to migrants and to host societies due to the particular vulnerabilities that flow from temporary status. Though host societies are impacted by the presence of temporary migrants, it is the migrants who bear the considerable burden of the vulnerabilities that result due to temporariness. The challenges of temporary migration emerge through, and are conditioned by, the present era of fast paced global change within predominantly neoliberal economic systems of values and exchange which attribute success or failure primarily to the individual (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2006; Harvey, 2005). In recent years, many countries with large, regulated immigration programs have favored temporary over permanent immigration. This is also the case in Australia, where a shift in priorities toward temporary visas for employment

Corresponding author:

Claudia Tazreiter, University of New South Wales, High Street, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.

Email: c.tazreiter@unsw.edu.au

and study is evident over the last two decades. This shift provides opportunities for skilled and unskilled workers to enter Australia's employment market and for international students, particularly from the Asian region, to pursue higher education and temporary work (Castles, 2016; Koleth, 2017; Mares, 2016; Mayes, 2017; Robertson, 2014; Tazreiter et al., 2016; Vosko et al., 2014).

Temporary migration is not a new phenomenon within the field of migration studies as circular migration and return migration also marked previous eras of human mobility. Nevertheless, temporariness has unique characteristics in the contemporary period. This is, at least partly, a result of the exclusionary character of citizenship status and migrant integration, still favoring permanence and stasis over the unpredictable circulations of temporary status, as is explained in more detail later. Temporary employment arrangements for foreign workers are also an important feature of the precarious global labor landscape, impacting migrants as well as the domestic workforce in countries that host temporary migrants and in sending countries (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2006; Ness, 2011; Sassen, 2014). With this background in mind, the present article will focus particularly on the social context within which temporary migrants negotiate and make sense of everyday life in their temporary home, rather than on state regulation and control. A case study of temporary workers and students entering Australia is explored in the article, mindful of the international context where "temporariness" prevails as a feature of contemporary global migration. The article contributes to sociological studies that recognize migration as one key aspect of social transformation (Castles, 2010; Glick Schiller and Salazar, 2013). The article argues that a double effect is evident from the phenomenon of global "temporariness." First, this is manifested in exploitation as workers and students cannot often access minimal rights and protections (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2006; Ness, 2011; Shachar, 2009; Standing, 2011). Second, citizens and permanent residents are "free riders" on the economic, social, and cultural contributions that temporary migrants make to host societies, without having access to adequate and reciprocal rights (Rubio-Marin, 2000).

The article draws on the scholarship that conceptualizes the rights and presence of marginalized temporary migrants, or "mobile labor" (Castles, 2016; Dauvergne, 2016; Hennebry et al., 2018; Koleth, 2017; Mares, 2016, 2017; Robertson, 2014, 2016; Robertson and Runganaikaloo, 2013; Wise, 2016; Wright, 2014). In many other countries, the proportion of such "mobile labor" is significant. In Australia, some eleven percent of the workforce is temporary "mobile labor" (Berg and Farbenblum, 2018). Here, the contribution to knowledge is two-fold. First, to bring to the fore the hidden and invisible self-understanding of migrants' life and labor, constructed through, and often in resistance to, the temporal and spatial impositions of temporary visa status. Second, the article contributes to the theorization of affect and ambivalence as sociocultural manifestations of temporariness in the lives of migrants.

These concepts are assessed through a case study of qualitative interviews with temporary Indonesian migrants moving in and out of Australia. The article asks whether the evident disconnect of policy, public discourse, and social attitudes toward temporary migrants on the one hand with the lived experience of temporary entrants in immigration countries such as Australia on the other means that a dissonance is likely in the narratives told by temporary migrants. That is, is it not rational for ambivalence to prevail in the lives of temporary migrants if their self-understanding, actions, and decision-making are misunderstood in the perceptions of others (citizens and permanent residents)?

Background

A number of often interrelated factors result in the increased prevalence of temporary rather than permanent migration, including less permanent work; increasingly transnational family, friendship, and wider social and political networks; and the demand for a highly mobile, yet dispensable

workforce in neoliberal, globally connected economies. Indeed, globalized economies are highly adaptive to international forces with consequences for human mobility: “Individual success or failure is interpreted in terms of entrepreneurial virtues or personal failings ... rather than being attributed to any systemic property” (Harvey, 2005: 65–66). Moreover, unlike the flow of capital, human mobility is subject to continuous cycles of regulation and re-regulation of borders and bodies. These processes are manifested profoundly in the uneven flows of authorized or unauthorized, planned or spontaneous migrants across nation-state borders (Castles, 2011; Cresswell, 2010; Dauvergne and Marsden, 2014; Sassen, 2006).

In the field of migration studies, migrant transnationalism has emerged as an important area of theorization. Migrant transnationalism elaborates the new social spaces and cross-border communities emerging through new patterns of mobility and enables more nuanced understanding of the social, economic, and political ties that are nurtured across time, space, and territory as migrants not only have loyalties and ties to more than one nation-state, but often live with flexible work, education, and family arrangements. These arrangements are both proactively planned by some migrants and responses to new policy and economic arrangements on the other (Faist, 2015; Portes et al. 1999; Vertovec et al., 2003). New migration patterns including temporary and circular migration are part of this field of inquiry. The recent surge in neo-nationalist, turbo-nationalist, and anti-immigrant political rhetoric in many parts of the world, including Australia, rests on a conflation of national security issues and economic issues with the arrival and presence of migrants. To be sure, this is a notable contradiction and important contextual issue for this article. The contradiction rests on the tensions between the exclusionary policies and rhetoric in liberal societies directed at vulnerable migrants such as those who are temporary, while simultaneously espousing a liberal egalitarianism (Walzer, 1983: 58) that eschews turning fellow humans into second-class members of a society. This tension is embedded in the governing logic of many immigrant countries such as Australia, as many writers note (Dauvergne, 2016; Groutsis et al., 2015; Hennebry et al., 2018; Mares, 2016; Robertson and Runganaikaloo, 2014; Ruhs, 2013; Wright, 2014).

In conceptualizing distinctions in the experience of temporary migration from long-term or permanent migration, Ottonelli and Torresi argue that the dislocation of social and political space is unique, creating a “split” status in those who are temporary, which has not been adequately recognized in liberal societies. Notably, these same liberal societies are often marked by high levels of immigration including temporary migration. The schema Ottonelli and Torresi (2010: 11) discuss is where vulnerability, marginality, and subaltern status flow from migrant’s decisions to focus on work and saving rather than social investment and building new relationships in a receiver society together with the lack of institutional recognition faced in liberal states for those with a temporary status. These arguments are not in themselves new, building on earlier critiques of guest-worker programs, for example, as having potentially corruptive effects in creating second-class members of a polity. They are, however, timely arguments to return to in light of the prevalence of temporary over permanent migration. Arguably, both individual and institutional constraints and forms of discipline relate directly to the largely exclusionary nature of citizenship in liberal societies.

With regard to access to citizenship, despite some developments toward more transnational and global justice-oriented forms of membership and rights that address inequalities within and between states, the privileged form of citizenship encapsulated by Aylet Shachar’s (2009) *citizenship-as-inherited-property* remains dominant in liberal societies. Temporary migrants are actively recruited when economic circumstances demand, yet are simultaneously also subject to rapid change in policy, in visa requirements, and in access to rights. Drawing on the analysis of Etienne Balibar, Mezzadara and Neilson (2012) argue that new forms of borders and bordering practices have

proliferated in the contemporary period, and indeed, are now in the center of political space with fundamental transformations of citizenship, labor, and of culture and discourse. The processes and practices of bordering, spatial, material, cognitive, and conceptual, entrench and extend inequalities and exclusions. Yet, importantly, the inequalities and exclusions that emerge from restrictive bordering are also likely to be hidden and invisible through the transnational character of temporary migrants' lives. That is, the prevalences of circular migration, return migration, and the lack of substantive rights temporary migrants experience in a receiver society are factors that render their needs and lack of rights' fulfillment hidden and invisible. Temporary migrants, such as those filling labor shortages and international students, are in some ways fortunate on a migration continuum which also includes irregular migrants such as asylum seekers, who have little or no access to the documents and status that allow official, regulated passage across the territorial borders of states as well as to the social recognition, respect, and dignity that is a corollary to official status through visas, passports, and pathways to citizenship or residency.

As has been briefly discussed above with reference to emerging literature bringing together the impact of globalization, new migration patterns, and debates on rights and citizenship, temporariness can be evaluated as an unexceptional state of being, but nevertheless as integral to contemporary economic and political systems. From this perspective, not only new systems of rights allocation and protections, but also renewed attention to forms of belonging are necessary to accompany the complexities surrounding new migration flows. Having sketched some of the challenges of temporary migration projects within the broader context of regulation/deregulation and the contestations over place, space, and culture, I turn now to the specificities of the temporary migrants' experience in everyday life.

Everyday life and the challenges of temporary status

The everyday experiences and encounters of temporary migrants are conditioned in the context of the society in which they are present as newcomers. The cultural context of a receiver society, the openness to diversity of encounters, and the practices of civility and conviviality are key aspects of the field of experience for newcomers. For some analysts, this is captured in "everyday multiculturalism" or "multiculturalism from below" (Wise and Velayutham, 2009); for others, the concept of transversality captures the often unpredictable and fluid contours of political inclusion, exclusion, and cultural separation experienced across time and space by migrants through mobility (Pickerking and Weber, 2013; Soguk and Whitelhall, 1999). Alongside everyday encounters and the impact they have on migrants, the legal norms codified in citizenship and formal rights are also critical to the migrant experience through access or exclusion to social and economic participation, political membership, and representation.

Temporary migrants tend to settle in a new society for indeterminate periods of time, mediated by negotiations over work, further education and visas, and family and friendship ties. Temporary migrants display a nimble approach of adaptation to fast changing rules, conditions, and opportunities. Herein, however, lies a central conundrum for contemporary societies under the conditions of neoliberal globalization. Temporary migration and the irregular status often closely associated with temporariness are fundamental aspects of contemporary global transformations that require this nimble adaptability. However, the impacts of legal, economic, and sociocultural exclusions that result from contemporary bordering practices are largely experienced unevenly by "marginal people" such as migrants, Indigenous people and the long-term unemployed (Mezzadara and Neilson, 2012: 63).

The article now turns in more detail to the applicability of ambivalence to the migration context, later drawing on some migrant narratives from in-depth interviews with migrants involved in

temporary migration projects, to elucidate these concepts in the everyday life of migrants in the vulnerable circumstances of temporariness.

Feelings, emotions, and ambivalence

A rich and growing literature on the effect and role of emotions has expanded to include migration studies (Svasek and Skribis, 2007; Volpp, 2013; Vukov, 2003). The widely used concept of liminality, the spaces “in between” lived or imagined ways of being in the world, forms the experience of many temporary migrants caught between official and unofficial forms of recognition, status, and place in a society. In Australia, as in many liberal democracies, the heated debates around terrorism, Islam, and the arrival of “irregular migrants” shape attitudes and social norms toward immigrants (Hage, 1998). In this context, ambivalence as an approach to decisions as well as to feelings may well be a common and even rational response on the part of temporary migrants (Kivisto and La Vecchia-Mikkola, 2012).

Ambivalence as a feeling, attenuation, or attitude—as a response to life’s risks and uncertainties—is an emergent response to the experiences, actions, and reactions of temporary migrants. By emergent, I propose a double meaning; first, that ambivalence is an expression particular to the uncertainties and “splitting” that mark temporary migration, and second, in the sense that migration scholars recently gravitated to this concept for its explanatory use (Kivisto and La Vecchia-Mikkola, 2012; McIlwaine and Bermudez, 2015; McNevin, 2013; Uehling, 2002; Warriner, 2013; Weisberger, 1992). Ambivalence is a common dynamic in key social processes from the development of conscience and the opposing forces of repression and domination of impulses and feelings (Freud, 1955), to the migrant as stranger experiencing life as “matter out of place” (Bauman, 1991), to the dynamics of seemingly oppositional affective orientations understood beyond the range of consciousness and calculation as “rational choice” expressed in behavior as “adaptation” and being “reasonable” (Smelser, 1998).

As a sociological concept, ambivalence is a core idea explored here in relation to the experiences of temporariness. Building on an alternative to rational-choice theory, Smelser (1998: 6) frames ambivalence as an adaptive behavior to fast changing, perhaps unpredictable, circumstances. For Bauman (1991), modernity exemplifies the set of processes that seek predictability and order, setting in trained mechanisms to deal with the indeterminacy that abounds in contemporary life. Moreover, ambivalent responses operate in an affective register, which, following Freud, becomes established in the psyche and cannot quickly be resolved, removed, or prohibited (Freud, 1955).

Geographic mobility through international migration is one form of separation through which loss and its associated grief are experienced by those migrating and, albeit in different measure, by those left behind. Ambivalence in such circumstances of strangeness and uncertainty may well appear as expressions of seemingly contradictory or unstable emotions or behaviors (Smelser, 1998: 5). Yet, viewed from the perspective of temporary migrants, the emotions aligned to certainty and decisiveness would be illogical. In Bauman’s (1991: 53) terms, symmetry is an illusion, and for Derrida (1981), binaries are dissolved into “baffling yet ubiquitous unities” as a family of “undecidables” (p. 71, 99). For example, home is a key idea in migration studies, with associated plans by newcomers for settlement, resettlement, or return. It is widely accepted, at least in the social sciences, that having multiple emotions about home and even conflicting or contradictory plans for settlement or return is not a pathological response, but rather a predictable, rational response to the complexities faced in the contemporary world (Uehling, 2002: 389). In other words, complex and even contradictory emotions and signals and their articulation in actions and life plans are not unusual responses and may even be anticipated in circumstances of heightened fluidity such as temporary status.

In the social sciences, ambivalence is usually assigned as the opposite to rationality; “born of the horror of ambiguity,” a sign of disorder (Bauman, 1991: 61). The classification and naming systems discernable in the structures of bureaucratic management and governance deeply impact the lives of migrants with “paper walls” (Torpey, 2000). These bureaucratic systems and paper walls gesture toward order to avoid indeterminacy and chaos. Yet, for temporary migrants, indeterminacy is at the core of their experience in daily insecurities; economic, legal, personal, and cultural. Insecurities are manifested through the rules, regulations, and disciplinary practices of migration management as well as through attitudes and actions of citizens and permanent residents toward newcomers, through, for example, public and political rhetoric of migrant as a costly, threatening figure. Some recent sociological studies that focus on migrants’ experience utilize the concept of ambivalence as a particularly relevant concept to understand the particularities of temporariness (Kivisto and La Vecchia-Mikkola, 2012; McIlwaine and Bermudez, 2015; McNevin, 2013; Uehling, 2002; Warriner, 2013).

Deployed as individual, psychological attitudes as well as socially embedded processes and actions, ambivalent behavior and decision-making provides and individual with a protective mantle, a kind of buffer, against the increased uncertainties of temporary status. Ambivalence can be traced both in the social sciences, particularly through the sociology of organizations, organizational theory, and rational choice theory (Bauman, 1991; Coser, 1956; Smelser, 1998; Weisberger, 1992), and in psychological approaches, particularly in psychoanalysis. In psychoanalysis, the focus of drawing on ambivalence for analysis can be traced to individual behavior and reactions in intimate relations. Denial, repression, reversal, or substitution are the various faces of this psychological splitting where anxiety produces adaptations that display “*opposing affective orientations* toward the same person, object or symbol” (Smelser, 1998: 5).

In theorizing ambivalence, Smelser’s social psychology approach accounts for loss or separation which can be applied to the experience of human mobility in international migration as one phenomenological, episodic example. Smelser outlines ambivalence as a “rational choice” of humans in complex social situations. Migration is one such complex and compressed life experience, where the certainties of everyday life are in flux with even simple tasks of meeting daily needs and having to be deciphered and understood in the context of a new society, often requiring new language acquisition and negotiating a different cultural and normative context. In such circumstances, a flexible outlook and the capacity for adaptability are characteristics likely to enhance migrants’ lives in facing the myriad new encounters and hurdles of temporary settlement and further onward migration. Moreover, the simultaneity of ambivalence (Smelser, 1998: 5) as attraction and repulsion, love and hate, may not only be reasonable responses to the conditions that accompany temporariness, but it is argued here that they ought to be anticipated. Indeed, it can be postulated that ambivalence provides evidence of a healthy level of self-reflexivity in the actions of temporary migrants.

Physical mobility over geographic terrain, as international migration, is one form of separation through which loss, grief, and mourning are experienced by those migrating, and in different measure, by those left behind. Though more difficult to detect, define, and quantify than physical separation, the cultural and emotional separation that mobile bodies experience is a significant aspect of migrants’ responses and actions in a new society. The logic of ambivalence in such circumstances of strangeness and uncertainty may appear as seemingly contradictory or unstable emotions or behaviors (Smelser, 1998: 5). Yet, building on the work of Hirschman and Smelser, migration scholars consider the role of ambivalence through appraisals of the categories, “exit,” “loyalty,” and “voice,” as metaphors for the complex and intersecting signals migrants experience (Hoffmann, 2010; Kivisto and La Vecchia-Mikkola, 2012). Hirschmann’s (1970: 4) highly influential schema centers on the workings of the market, with categorization of human action under

circumstances of constraint or pressure into the evaluative categories of exit, loyalty, and voice. The exit option may be costly, but sends a clear signal; the exercise of voice is a mechanism of negotiation, while loyalty delays exit as well as voice.

Hirschman's schema is conceived as sets of alternative options for those facing dissatisfying situations, with the mutual exclusivity of the categories becoming exchangeable, overlapping, and interpenetrating. Applying Hirschman's schema to the context of temporary migration would see emigration as a renouncing of the possibilities and space for voice (aligned with citizenship status, for example). Yet, migration scholars also argue that exit can lead to a transnationalization of "voice" (Hoffmann, 2010: 60) as a positive rather than restrictive strategy. The contemporary possibilities of circular migration, rather than previous eras of primarily one-way, permanent migration, extend such possibilities. An ongoing question is the extent to which formal rights frameworks (citizens' rights) and the particularities of sociocultural belonging are also transformed into more malleable forms that account for the needs of temporary migrants. Through the less stable and often opaque boundaries and demarcative characteristics of the current globalized system of exchange (transnational capital and finance), expressions of voice can be hypothesized as less predictable than in a traditional nation-state model as container of people, cultures, resources, and territory—akin to the "firm" in the organizational terms of Hirschman's original theorization. Ambivalence, then, is a feature of the psychological splitting evident in the many combinations of exit/voice/loyalty exercised by an individual; a splitting that is hypothesized here as prevalent in the lives of migrants and perhaps particularly where mobility is marked by temporariness. For Weisberger (1992), ambivalence is assessed in the context of marginal persons such as migrants. Weisberger draws on and extends Robert Park's seminal work on migration, *Migration and Marginal Man*, to unmask marginality in the responses that he categorizes as *poise*, *return*, *transcendence*, and *assimilation*. Interestingly, these categories resonate with the categories of *exit*, *voice*, and *loyalty* from Hirschman's study of behavior in organizations.

Adding further nuance to ambivalence as an active aspect of human agency, Geissler's historical analysis of knowledge production clarifies the idea of actively *not* knowing, or deciding to "unknow" something in social relations. "Unknowing," as a deliberative turning away, is distinct from the common sense equivalent of ignorance, erroneous belief, or a false consciousness (Geissler, 2013: 15). Indeed, this deliberative (un)knowing is akin to creative dissent, a deconstruction of privileged or taken-for-granted meanings and systems. This can manifest as attitudes or sets of dispositions that social actors embrace in conscious or unconscious actions and reactions to social situations that embody discomfort or uncertainty, as well as to the architectures of regulation and control (Tazreiter, 2013, 2014, 2015; Tazreiter et al., 2016). The theorizing of "unknowing" complements the psychological splitting apparent in the operation of ambivalence. For example, the strategy of "unknowing," where a person appears to be naïve or innocent, is a mode of coping with circumstances of great uncertainty or precariousness. Such "unknowing" could be expressed as ambivalent feelings, either/or, good/bad, or committed/uncertain. Ambivalent feelings and actions may be performed for later withdrawal, face saving, or for the re-launching of a new strategy or project in the face of an insurmountable obstacle (a lapsed visa, the end of a work contract, or program of study).

The rich literature on affect enhances the consideration of ambivalence as a key idea in the migrant experience. For the present article, it is the figure of migrant as stranger, in-between, here and there, and in constant motion, with indeterminacy as a result. This conceptualization of ambivalence relates to the broader field of social change through the processes of modernity, where Bauman, for example, sees the stranger as a member of the group of *undecidables* "those baffling yet ubiquitous unities that in Derrida's words again, "can no longer be included within philosophical (binary) opposition, resisting and disorganizing it" (in Bauman, 1991: 55). Derrida also

introduces the idea of separation or barrier as a membrane (hymen) to symbolize the subtlety at play in the flux of making distinctions. Later in the article, these concepts appear in light of the everyday experiences of temporary migrants.

The importance of migrant narratives

Across the humanities and social sciences, vigorous debates are apparent on the role of research in social change, articulating a variety of perspectives on questions of theoretical as well as methodological motivations. Some migration scholars question the viability of cosmopolitan thought in its historical association with elite representations of universal ethics and human rights, which may also eschew questions of sociability, conviviality, and friendship that, if addressed, would capture the social nuances of everyday experience of the lived realities of cultural, ethnic, religious, and other forms of “difference” (Braidotti, 2013, Glick Schiller et al., 2011, Nowicka and Vertovec, 2014). Notably, migration scholars continue to make significant contributions to the understanding of social transformation not merely in a bracketed view from the perspective of human migration (Castles, 2010), but, importantly, as a set of overlapping, enmeshed relationships. This social transformation perspective sheds light on human agency responding to, and in turn shaping, structural factors. The present article acknowledges the important legacy of these interrelated fields of scholarship that have their origins and interests in the perspectives and realities of marginality and migration.

Deliberative approaches to research that eschew the accumulation of facts and statistics *about* the other (particularly marginal groups) are gaining favor with researchers working *with* communities and individuals and building new knowledge in considered collaborations (Hyndman, 2000; Mackenzie et al., 2007). This article draws on fieldwork conducted for a four-year, multi-country study of temporary migration.² One case study from this larger study is examined here. The aims of the project are to understand the everyday lives and survival strategies of individuals and families who are temporary migrants. Büscher and Urry’s (2009) articulation of “mobile methods” and Richter’s (2012) use of a transnational space provide insights where temporariness and permanence and belonging and not belonging sit side by side. These tensions and their effects on the lived experience of temporary migrants in Australia are drawn on for this article through the case study of temporary migrants from Indonesia.³

The Indonesian case study is discussed with a particular focus on the strategies, attitudes, and actions that appear as ambivalent, “either/or” decisions, or judgments. Importantly, the Indonesian case study connects a sample group interviewed and surveyed in Australia with family, friends, and other “familiar” in the country of origin. The project design represents mixed and mobile methods, with the researchers able to “follow the people.” Adopting Lynch’s position regarding the mobility of researchers: “Analysts being ‘on the move’ in this sense create a kind of ‘double transparency’ that allows them to study and describe mobility phenomena in the making while simultaneously drawing the methods used in their production to their own and their audiences’ attention” (Lynch in Büscher and Urry, 2009: 111). The case study explored in this article focuses on migrants’ self-understanding of cultural security, highlighting the processes of reception and inclusion.⁴

The process of building relationships with individuals and communities in the research process relies on the researcher as “engaged advocate” and is consistent with a transformative paradigm approach (Mertens, 2007, 2011). Consequently, the research establishment phase was lengthy due to the time required to build trust and sustained relations. Timelines had to be adjusted to fit the needs of each case study and to enable the “engaged advocate” role to be a part of the process, including reporting to community meetings, providing information on migration rules where appropriate, or expanding to new locations in the study to respond to recommendations of

community leaders, friends, or family members of migrants. For the Indonesian case study considered here, community members were initially reluctant to engage with researchers, which led to frequent reflections by the research team on why the identified groups were not participating and what assumptions had been made in the research design. Ultimately, using snowball sampling, the study commenced locally in Australia with community organizations, community leaders, or advocates who assisted with finding participants both in Australia and in Indonesia. The result was the recruitment of 44 participants initially using a purposive sampling strategy with essential criteria for selection (not a permanent resident of Australia; born in case study country) and desired criteria (breadth of ages, gender, access to work experiences). The purposive sampling was implemented with the assistance of community organizations, community leaders, or advocates and subsequently some snowball sampling was used to recruit additional participants.

The two sites approach—the country of citizenship and Australia—is an adaptation of Mazzucato's (2010) "simultaneous matched samples" method (p. 206). The matched samples linked the migrants in Australia to their families or friends and to migration agents. The research incorporates aspects of Richter's (2012) "moving methods," which itself builds on the "mobilities paradigm" (Büscher and Urry, 2009; Urry, 2007) in retracing the journey taken. In the Indonesian case study, the matched samples involve temporary migrants and students in Australia for study and work with their families, friends, and extended networks in Indonesia. Careful preparation preceded the fieldwork, the most significant aspect being relationship-building.

Indonesian temporary migrant mobility to and from Australia

The article now moves to the Indonesian case study, drawing on interviews with Indonesian temporary migrants. The interviews explore the particular expressions of cultural unease or insecurity, linking these responses to the theorizing of ambivalence as an important response in circumstances of temporariness.

In a developing country context, for Indonesians with limited educational and economic resources, migration is a pathway to greater economic security and access to a range of "basic rights" (such as education, healthcare, and adequate housing).⁵ In Indonesia, this occurs in the form of internal migration to the outskirts or slum regions of large urban centers and by labor migration to countries that actively recruit low-skilled labor migrants such as domestic workers, construction workers, and workers in other labor-intensive, low-skill industries. The Indonesian state does not have a robust social welfare safety net, as does Australia, with the result that individuals and families bear a greater burden in meeting basic needs. Migration may be the only opportunity to meet individual and family needs as well as a pathway to plan more robust and predictable futures, despite the elusive pathways to permanent residence status in a state such as Australia. While temporary migrants are excluded from access to most aspects of the social welfare safety net in Australia, the aspiration toward a more secure future was articulated by the majority of respondents in this study.

One notable factor that proves problematic in the temporary migration field is the haphazard nature of advice given by migration agents. Prior to emigration, Indonesian migrants rely on the advice and work of migration agents to navigate both Indonesian and Australian regulations. A lack of rigorous training as well as a lack of monitoring of the migration agent sector in Indonesia means that many Indonesians using these services face significant hurdles and financial hardship and enter into exploitative arrangements and contracts, as a result of engaging ill-informed or corrupt agents. Due to the numerous monetary and logistical hurdles, as well as the complexity of the Australian visa system, many Indonesians who contemplate Australia as a potential destination for

temporary migration are middle or upper class and hence able to afford the complex and often lengthy bureaucratic hurdles. As a proactive country of immigration, with a yearly quota of immigrants, Australia's visa system is subject to regular change and amendment and is costly to navigate through. Permanent migration, with a relatively straightforward pathway to permanent residency and to citizenship, dominated Australia's immigration system until the late 1990s. During the time of the conservative Government of Prime Minister, John Howard (1996–2007), the emphasis changed to favor temporary migration, and at the same time, the family reunion program was cut back (Crock, 1998).

For the temporary migrants interviewed for the case study explored here, the Business Long Stay (457)⁶ Visa and the International Student Visa (subclass 573 visa)⁷ were the two primary visas sought. In addition, tourist visas were accessed by some interviewees as a way to enter Australia and later seek to change their visa status. The 457 Visa (now replaced by the 482 visa) requires the visa holder to be sponsored by an employer prior to entry to Australia. The visa may be held for up to four years. The visa holder is tied to the sponsoring employer as a visa condition. International student visas have a number of conditions. Students must have a good score in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS); students are expected to remain in good standing with their education institution; students may work for up to 21 hours per week.

For the Indonesian respondents to this study, temporary migration was articulated as attractive due to educational advancement, leading to higher status work opportunities and increased economic benefits. This also means that it is primarily a younger demographic who seek to migrate. Nevertheless, despite the dominance of materialist motivations for migration, the Indonesian case also reveals narratives of yearning for greater access to freedom of expression, the rule of law, and due process.

Indonesian respondents interviewed in Australia express anxiety over the uncertain nature of their temporary visa status and, therefore, their visibility in Australian society. They are concerned about the limited access to permanent residency rights, as well as to work and other subsistence rights, including access to health care. These concerns are manifested in a more individualized focus on self, family, and community. It is notable that, in the Indonesian case when faced with the hurdles of negotiating the intricacies of everyday survival as well as the complex institutional rules and points of entry, respondents turn to family, friends, and ethnic community members for support and advice. Notably, neither the receiver society (Australia) nor the formal institutions of the state are apportioned blame for the circumstances Indonesian temporary migrants face. On the other hand, respondents interviewed in Indonesia who were planning to emigrate communicate narratives of distrust toward Indonesian institutions. Respondents mentioned about informal barriers to institutions and officials saturated with high levels of nepotism at all levels of negotiating, including formal applications for work or entry to an educational institution. Such barriers are most acutely felt by poorer Indonesians without the resources to "play the game." A young Indonesian interviewed in Jakarta with family members and friends studying overseas reflected on the problems of evenhandedness of institutions of governance: "With Indonesian policy ... with (the) Indonesian situation, especially with our government policy, the political situation, the corruption ... that is really exhaust(ing) to see that the government are not getting a better environment, (an) atmosphere of being a very good government in implementation. So (people) may (make) a decision to leave the country, to stay abroad, to work abroad and they are not coming back to Indonesia some day ... I think so" (INDG207).⁸ As one Australian migration agent said,

Well, that's always an issue and that affects lifestyle choices. Often clients accept temporary visas because it's all they've got and they won't complain about the temporary nature of it because they are aiming towards something else (INDG303).

Notably, some migrant narratives indicate more subtle forms of cultural difference that are not experienced as forms of inequality or exclusion, but rather as the intricacies of everyday life. Even long after gaining permanent residency, for example, feelings of acceptance take time:

- Interviewer: It's just maybe like try to be—what we said—try to be friendly. ... And then trying to be close. ... Maybe for first, it's hard, right?
- Interviewer: So, your friends have found that it takes some time?
- Yeah. ... Because not even my friends—even my uncle too. ... He got permanent resident already, like one or two years ago. And then he worked in a restaurant cook in Albury. And only him, I think, is Asian. But the status is same, like permanent resident have to present. Yeah. But still, he sometimes he got bullied, he got harassment, and then he got—I forget another word. It's like I'm not doing this, but someone tells to the manager I do this. What we call?
- Interviewer: *They dob them in?* [Australian colloquial expression meaning to tell on someone to authorities].
- Yeah, something like that. Yeah, something like that. It's because he is Asian.
- Well, but he's still working there. He needs money [*laughs*] (INDG102).

An Indonesian Australian, now a permanent resident for many years, who had taken an extremely difficult road to achieve that status, spending some time in immigration detention after a temporary visa had expired, and subsequently spending vast economic resources to secure permanent residency for himself and family, commented,

Probably we feel—half-Australian against full ... Yes, hybrid, yeah. I can't say if I'm Australian or not because—yeah, I still—identity, probably just kind of in the middle for me (INDG101).

Experiences of social exclusion, mistrust, and discrimination are commonly reported by Indonesian migrants. Feelings of outsider status result from expressed cultural differences rather than overt actions of social exclusion by agencies of the state or through social interaction, as one participant described:

Yeah, for me it's, maybe, they call it like soft culture, maybe. I don't know what they call it. But for me, it's—I don't feel really happy, life in Australia, living in Australia, because I think people in Australia they are too individual, I mean, they're not social (INDG103).

Such ambivalent feelings expressed by temporary migrants are unpredictable and are fluid feelings and actions in response to signals from the state and its institutions as well as to everyday interactions in the social world. Temporary Indonesian migrants in this study demonstrate a high level of nuance in recognizing the sources of discrimination and deciding on responses. For example, a level of distrust for immigration officials was commonly reported; however, this was clarified as not relating to the wider Australian society—“I don't trust them [immigration] because the way they treat me but I [am not] judgmental—of a whole people. I'm sure there are a lot of nice people” (INDG105).

Some respondents describe their children or friends as becoming more open-minded, outgoing, and brave than previously (INDG207); some dream of opportunities for themselves from the trail blazed by others (INDG209); a majority reflect on the role of new virtual technologies in keeping networks of care, love, and companionship nurtured; parents of children sent abroad for work or study reflect in particular about time—the future as holding prospects for their children that they

did not have, the past as holding cherished memories that give life context and meaning, and the present as a difficult period of separation to be endured.

Visual flash cards were used in the research process to trigger responses on themes such as surveillance, policing, and to identify cultural markers of belonging. Respondents were invited to peruse the 12 images on cards in front of them and to select those most relevant in relation to personal challenges and experiences. The physical act of placing cards together enabled time for reflection. In many cases, the action of looking, thinking, and reflecting engages cognitive processes expressed through abstract ideas and emotions such as loneliness or fear. As an example of this process, a flashcard on cultural difference prompted the following reflection on feelings of exclusion from an Indonesian student in Australia:

But—if they are friendly they are so friendly—very, very friendly. I like them. I like it here. But for the others they are just so cold like that. It’s hard to get close to them. Even in here, like I said, I joined the Indonesian community, I did. And some of them [are] already born here. Their parent in Indonesia, but they’re already born here. Even [with] them, it’s hard for me to getting close to them (INDG103).

As part of the visually structured process, participants selected the three most important issues (ranked) and the sources of assistance to deal with these issues. Another visual method used a different set of eight images on cards in which respondents ranked the trustworthiness of organizations, groups, and people migrants engaged with in their daily lives. This ranking activity, designed as a complementary method to the in-depth interview, provides some insights into the role of ambivalence related to trust and insecurity. The process of ranking the cards also results in unsolicited responses, moving an interview in new directions. An Indonesian respondent’s comment on the differences in trust in police and immigration authorities in Indonesia, in contrast to Australia, highlights some of the inadequacies of an interview schedule in dealing with some of the complex issues migrants express:

In here (Australia) you break the law, you are going to end up (with a real consequence). But in my country, if you don’t break the law, we are not going to be something, like, better. You know what I mean? So, in my country, we need to break the law to get the better life (INDG102).

Visual methods are effective in engaging participants at multiple sites and a range of cultural and linguistic contexts. Such a supplement to the interview process indicates possibilities for further exploration of methods. In this project, the visual methods illuminate attitudes of ambivalence and the employment of strategies of deliberative “unknowing” in migrants’ choices, actions, and behaviors. For example, Indonesian temporary migrants in Australia expressed attitudes and strategies aligned with ambivalent feelings as a way of coping with dislocation, loneliness, and cultural insecurity and in response to forms of prejudice or rejection by Australian citizens and residents. At times, ambivalent actions and behaviors can also be detected in more subtle utterings evident in narratives about comfort or discomfort, both physical and cultural, and a yearning for home expressed as feeling “cold” in Australia and aversion to different culinary habits. “I’ve got a problem in healthiness [sic] now; its’ a problem with my stomach. Yeah, I think, the habit—eating habit is different” (INDG103). An application of Smelser’s “rational choice” is evident here with migrants’ expression of ambivalent decision-making about food in response to the uncertainty and flux of their status.

In addition, anxieties over physical safety are expressed by many of the interview respondents in forms of existential angst about general loss of control of feelings, or of discomfort when living in a suburban context that is “too quiet” (INDG103), or as generalized unease about planning futures where all the coordinates of stability (economic, legal, social) are absent (INDG107).

One interviewee, an Indonesian student said,

... sometimes when I go to the local students, they are sort of like—they look at me weird ... I (don't) belong with them. ... The worst part was when I was in uni actually, because yeah, it was really hard for me ... first because of the language barrier, right, and then second, because I didn't get the chance to talk much with my colleagues, with my friends at uni. So, because they studied in groups, so I'm, sort of like ... an outsider. (INDG107)

Notably, another interviewee expressed feelings of belonging/exclusion as qualitatively distinct from the status of stranger, reflecting on the reality of Australia's multiethnic population: "No, I don't think I have ever felt like (a) stranger, because people in Australia also come from many places and even you can see yellow skin like me and she is Australian, so in Australia no, I have never felt like being a stranger" (INDG0108).

Family members of Indonesian migrants interviewed in Indonesia expressed largely positive feelings about the migration process, as not only economic opportunity, but as life affirming, in some sense a duty to explore other ways of life and to develop the self.

Indonesian people, in general, regardless (of) their religion or ethnic(ity) want to migrate to other places to try their fortune and to become successful people ... So not only for studying, but also for working, the parents would feel really proud and this is really desired by Indonesian people ... And even in Islamic tradition, if people do not travel, they are like water that stays in one place and therefore it gets dirty, but if it flows, it will stay clean and give benefits to its surrounding. And there's another proverb that encourages people to pursue knowledge even if they have to travel to China. People will not get much if they stay in their hometown, but if they travel overseas, they'll learn a lot more and more life experiences, know other languages, other cultures. So, they'll have rich experiences—when they travel overseas they will not only gain formal knowledge but they'll have valuable life experiences from living in different countries. So, it's really a proud (thing for) Indonesian families (to) have relatives or children who live overseas (INDG201).

Another parent expressed similar sentiments:

There's a teaching in our religion that's called *Hijra* which means (to) move from one place to a different place for a better condition. If someone wants to be successful, the person has to (practice) *Hijra*: seek knowledge even if you have to come to China. This means that people are instructed to travel far away to seek for a better life and meaningful knowledge and skills or good education, don't just stay in (one) place but (practice) *Hijra* (INDG206).

Interestingly, the parents of temporary Indonesian migrants anticipate the "in-between" and ambivalent circumstances their children face in negotiating everyday life in Australia.

Applying ambivalence in a temporary migration context

Arguably, migrants experience everyday life with plans, hopes, and desires not dissimilar to non-mobile populations. Those who engage in international border crossings experience an intensification of the social, political, and cultural processes all humans face in negotiating everyday life and in engaging with the institutions of the state. To be sure, migrants experience existential questions in an intensified manner to those whose lives are more sedentary, not because migrants are necessarily extraordinary people (though they may be). Rather, the act of mobility requires an additional dose of reflexivity, planning, and will. The relative stability of the categories, nation and citizen, marking membership of a polity and identity group, tends toward timescales that reference a

collective national past and validate memory-making practices that occlude new members in subtle processes of “othering.” In contrast, migrants with a more precarious and unstable tenure in a society fragment and challenge such timescales by their presence. At the same time, newcomers are asked to cleave to a new society, to integrate or assimilate, often through a severing of the past and imagining a new future (Baraitser, 2013). However, as migration scholars have highlighted, the very nature of temporary migration projects forecloses the opportunities for migrants to be able to enjoy the benefits that citizenship offers—even as a distant possibility. Therefore, at least within liberal democratic societies, temporary migration remains a flawed response to temporary economic needs of the labor market, without adequately addressing the needs of the people who arrive to fill such gaps (Ottonelli and Torresi, 2012: 20).

The concept of ambivalence, outlined earlier in the article, can usefully be considered in the space of temporary migration projects such as the case study of Indonesian temporary migrants explored in this article, where individuals, families, and communities negotiate the uncertainty in everyday life in a new society. Indeterminacy is one experience that shapes many aspects of temporary migration projects, indicating the experiences and barriers individuals face in negotiating new experiences and expectations.

One key motif recurring in much migrant literature is that of home, homeland, and the associated plans for long, or short-term settlement, or return. As outlined earlier in the article, drawing on Smelser, it is widely accepted in the social sciences that balancing multiple and conflicting emotions about a homeland and contradictory plans for settlement or return is not a pathological response to the pressures migrants face, but rather an expression of the complexities faced in the contemporary world (Uehling, 2002: 389). In other words, complex and even contradictory emotions and their articulation in action are not unusual responses. Indeed, such contradictions may be anticipated and mapped against research focused on better understanding of the lives of people in precarious circumstances of heightened fluidity such as irregular and temporary migrants (Groutsis et al., 2015; Henneby et al., 2018; Mares, 2016; Robertson and Runganaikaloo, 2014; Tazreiter et al., 2016).

Reflecting on the migrants’ narratives discussed in this article provides a bridge to the earlier discussion of ambivalence as a psycho-social response—with an affective quality. Rather than the binary of insider/outsider and all its corollaries in the “structuring structures” of state/nation/bureaucracy/citizenship, the experiences of those living out temporary migration projects require more subtle articulations and analytic tools. For example, being mindful that a relation between two entities occurs through membranes, rather than the hard barriers suggested through traditional binaries associated with migration, is a new insight from migration studies. That is, in the act of *passing through* a barrier, there is great variability between barriers, walls, and membranes in terms of the stability as well as permeability of a barrier with the result that violence is able to be wreaked on the thing passing through in ways that may be unseen, but very much felt (Bauböck, 2015: 172). Herein is also the power of the affective realm of feelings and emotions evident in the narratives of temporary migrants’ experiences explored in this article.

Through the migrants’ narratives drawn on earlier, ambivalence is evident in more subtle forms and articulations of the exclusive categories of Hirschmann’s schema: “exit,” “voice,” and “loyalty,” outlined earlier. Subtle forms of interchange and overlap of such categories as exit, voice, and loyalty apply also to the migrant’s experience. To reiterate the earlier argument, ambivalence and “knowing unknowing” are expressions of psychological splitting of the many possible combinations of exit/voice/loyalty exercised by individuals. In the case study explored in this article, the realities of negotiating temporary migration status further heighten the overlaps and combinations of exit/voice/loyalty that migrants express and connect with. This creates what may on the surface appear as contradictory, discordant narratives, yet in the context of the

transnational lives negotiated by the migrants interviewed, such complexities are clearly an integral part of everyday life.

This article ponders how temporariness shapes and conditions the migrant's experience in distinct ways and asks whether these processes and experiences are incommensurate with the utility of state projects of creating temporary categories. Importantly, this article concurs with the approaches of justice-oriented researchers who stress the vitality of research generated with and through the experiences, views, and needs of the individuals, groups, and communities that researchers work with. In this sense, temporary migrants are able to speak back to the state—even if modestly. Braidotti (2009), for example, highlights important ethical questions at the heart of projects dealing with transformation or understanding the processes of transformation. Importantly, it is those who experience extremes, hardships, and pain who are likely to be best placed in the evaluation of these processes:

“Their ‘better quality’ consists not in the fact of having been wounded, but of having gone through the pain. Because they are already on the other side of some existential divide, they are anomalous in some way—but in a positive way: they have already endured. They are a site of transposition of values.” (p. 53)

Taking up Braidotti's argument, the selected (or taken for granted) epistemologies that drive and undergird research also frame and condition the way in which the subject is positioned and shape the very questions that come to be asked and the methods of enquiry chosen. According to Braidotti, Marxist, post-colonial, and feminist epistemologies already “acknowledge the privileged knowing positing of those in the ‘margins’” (Braidotti, 2009) due to the wounding and pain they endure through the prevailing power of structuring structures. In this regard, the interplay between the theoretical and methodological origins of research remains an ongoing exchange, one that requires interpretation and sensitivity to the nuances of context and case studies and to the conduct and framing of research. A transformative potential, or moment, finds life in ideas and in the method applied to an investigation.

The core of the article has considered the theoretical insights gained from the application of the concept of ambivalence in the lives of temporary migrants. These insights are assessed through the attitudes and strategies deployed by temporary migrants experiencing uncertainty regarding their migration status and navigating everyday life in Australian workplaces, universities, and public space. The findings from the everyday encounters add novel insights to the existing scholarship on “mobile labor” reviewed at the beginning of the article. The case study of temporary migrants reveals a range of actions and feelings conditioned through temporary status. These include the following: heightened anxiety due to the insecurities of daily life that are exacerbated through a lack of formal rights; social isolation and feelings of surveillance even where these may be imagined; and generalized mistrust of the receiver society, but particularly mistrust of formal institutions. The very vagaries of the “paper market” that temporary visa holders face also condition everyday life and “life chances,” a finding in line with other research (Torpey, 2000; Vasta, 2010).

The case study and life experiences of temporary migrants in Australia explored in this article show ambivalence as strategy, attitude, and action exacerbated by the very conditions of temporariness. These findings provide enriched understanding of the experiences of temporary status, extending existing literature that analyzes intercultural encounter and lived diversity as a vernacular cosmopolitanism (Wise, 2016), the link between temporality and mobility as key markers of difference and labor hierarchies (Robertson, 2016), and the links between migrant experience and public policy (Castles, 2016; Dauvergne, 2016; Hennebray et al., 2018; Koleth, 2017; Mares, 2016, 2017; Robertson, 2014; Wright, 2014). Notably, recent research has also revealed the extent of wage theft temporary migrants in Australia have experienced (Berg and

Farbenblum, 2018), facts that corroborate the experiences of the temporary migrant workers and students discussed in this article.

The case study explored in this article identifies some of the core problems temporary migrants face as encapsulated by a deficit of rights and protections that, at the same time, are expected by members of liberal states. Temporary status turns migrants into nomadic global laborers. The paper walls erected by the state, in turn, drive a thriving economic subsystem of agents and traders that operate beneath the state bureaucracy of migration control, marketizing migration opportunities in ways that are perhaps unintended by the state—yet with deep impacts on migrants' lives and opportunities. This article has discussed a small case study focused on the everyday experiences of temporary migrants in the Asia Pacific, moving between Indonesia and Australia. Future research may further demonstrate how migration journeys, the experiences of marginalization, or indeed, positive transnational experiences are flowing with, through, or against the material and cultural effects of global and regional processes and interventions such as the particular nodes of official and unofficial governance of mobility.

The case study of temporary migrants' experiences explored in this article demonstrates that the concept of ambivalence is an important heuristic device, though it is also no doubt a more fundamental category of analysis related to emotions, feelings, and attenuations in response to the risks and uncertainties of life that are amplified and perhaps unique expression in human mobility encapsulated here in temporary migration projects. The article finds that actions and responses that appear ambivalent are far from irrational, hasty, or disloyal. Rather, migrants' decision-making in response to the uncertain and shifting economic and sociocultural environments they enter often comprises subtle calibrations and switching actions observable as ambivalent behavior in adjusting to the unanticipated demands of a new society. What remains outside the terms of this article, as a more ambitious and wide-ranging set of questions for future research, is the extent to which ambivalence is manifested in the migrant's experience in unique ways and the qualitative distinction between ambivalence in migration and as a more regular characteristic of behavior and responses of humans to change and uncertainty.

Funding

The author received funding from the Australian Research Council, Discovery Project DP1093107 to support the research discussed in this article. "Fluid Security in the Asia Pacific" is funded by the Australian Research Council Discovery Grant, number DP1093107.

Notes

1. Thank you to the anonymous reviewers, the editor-in-chief, and the two guest editors for their comments and feedback on an earlier draft.
2. The project "Fluid Security in the Asia Pacific" is funded by the Australian Research Council Discovery Grant, number DP1093107.
3. The other two mobile populations that together make up the four case studies that form this study of temporary migrants are Chinese students on temporary visas and Samoan and Tongan migrant workers in Sydney and the Sunraysia region of Victoria, respectively.
4. The full results of this study are published in Tazreiter et al. (2016).
5. Indonesia's population of 250 million is the fourth largest in the world after China, India, and the United States.
6. The 457 visa has been replaced by the Temporary Skill Shortage visa (subclass 482)
7. The student 573 visa was replaced from 1 July 2016 by visa subclass 500.
8. Please note that the reference at the end of each quote is the coding used in the project and refers to the following: IND = Indonesian migrant; G1 = Indonesian temporary migrant in Australia; G2 = family or extended network member of Indonesian migrant interviewed in Indonesia; the final two numbers refer to the number of the interview.

ORCID iD

Claudia Tazreiter  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0225-5093>

References

- Baraitser L (2013) Collecting time: Some reflections on the psychopolitics of belonging. *New Formations* 79: 8–25.
- Bauböck R (2015) Rethinking borders as membranes. In: Weber L (ed.) *Rethinking Border Control for a Globalizing World: A Preferred Future*. London: Routledge, pp. 169–178.
- Bauman Z (1991) *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berg L and Farbenblum B (2018) Remedies for migrant worker exploitation in Australia: Lessons from the 7-eleven wage repayment program. *Melbourne University Law Review* 41(3): 1035–1084.
- Boltanski L and Chiapello E (2006) *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Braidotti R (2009) On putting the active back into activism. *New Formations* 68: 42–57.
- Braidotti R (2013) Becoming world. In: Braidotti R, Hanafin P and Blaagaard B (eds) *After Cosmopolitanism*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 8–27.
- Büscher M and Urry J (2009) Mobile methods and the empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory* 12(1): 99–116.
- Castles S (2010) Understanding global migration: A social transformation perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(10): 1565–1586.
- Castles S (2011) Migration, crisis, and the global labor market. *Globalizations* 8(3): 311–324.
- Castles S (2016) Rethinking Australian migration. *Australian Geographer* 47(4): 391–398.
- Coser L (1956) *The Functions of Social Conflict*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Cresswell T (2010) Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D; Society and Space* 28: 17–31.
- Crock M (1998) *Immigration and Refugee Law in Australia*. Leichardt, NSW, Australia: Federation Press.
- Dauvergne C (2016) *The New Politics of Immigration and the End of Settler Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dauvergne C and Marsden S (2014) The ideology of temporary labor migration in the post-global era. *Citizenship Studies* 18(2): 224–242.
- Derrida J (1981) *Disseminations* (trans. B Johnson). London: Athlone Press.
- Faist T (2015) Transnational social spaces. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38(13): 2271–2274.
- Freud S (1955) Totem and taboo. In: Strachey J (ed.) *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press, pp. 1–16.
- Geissler PW (2013) Public secrets in public health: Knowing not to know while making scientific knowledge. *American Ethnologist* 40(1): 13–34.
- Glick Schiller N and Salazar NB (2013) Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(2): 183–200.
- Groutsis D, Van den Broek D and Harvey WS (2015) Transformations in network governance: The case of migration intermediaries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41(10): 1558–1576.
- Hage G (1998) *White nation: Fantasies of white Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press.
- Harvey D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hennebry J, Hari KC and Piper N (2018) Not without them: Realizing the sustainable development goals for women migrant workers. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Epub ahead of print 22 April. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1456775.
- Hirschmann AO (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hoffmann B (2010) Bringing Hirschman back in: “Exit,” “Voice,” and “Loyalty” in the politics of transnational migration. *The Latin Americanist*, 54: 57–73.
- Hyndman J (2000) *Managing Displacement: Refugees and the Politics of Humanitarianism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Kivisto P and La Vecchia-Mikkola V (2012) Immigrant ambivalence toward the homeland: The case of Iraqis in Helsinki and Rome. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 11(2): 198–216.
- Koeth E (2017) Unsettling the settler state: The state and social outcomes of temporary migration in Australia. *Migration, Mobility, & Displacement* 3(1): 33–50.
- McIlwaine C and Bermudez A (2015) Ambivalent citizenship and extraterritorial voting among Colombians in London and Madrid. *Global Networks* 15(4): 385–402.
- Mackenzie C, McDowell C and Pittaway E (2007) Beyond “do no harm”: The challenge of constructing ethical relationships in refugee research. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(2): 299–319.
- McNevin A (2013) Ambivalence and citizenship: Theorising the political claims of irregular migrants. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 41(2): 182–200.
- Mares P (2016) *Not Quite Australian: How Temporary Migration Is Changing the Nation*. Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Text Publishing.
- Mares P (2017) Locating temporary migrants on the map of Australian democracy. *Migration, Mobility, & Displacement* 3(1): 9–31.
- Mayes R (2017) We’re sending you back’: Temporary skilled labor migration, social networks and local community. *Migration, Mobility, & Displacement* 3(1): 71–84.
- Mazzucato V (2010) Operationalising transnational migrant networks through a simultaneous matched sample methodology. In: Bauböck R and Faist T (eds) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 205–226.
- Mertens D (2007) Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1(3): 215–225.
- Mertens D (2011) Mixed methods as tools for social change. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 5(3): 195–197.
- Mezzadara S and Neilson B (2012) Between inclusion and exclusion: On the topology of global space and borders. *Theory, Culture & Society* 29(4/5): 58–75.
- Ness I (2011) *Guest Workers and Resistance to U.S. Corporate Despotism*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Nowicka M and Vertovec S (2014) Comparing convivialities: Dreams and realities of living-with-difference. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17(4): 341–356.
- Ottoneilli V and Torresi T (2012) Inclusionist egalitarian liberalism & temporary migration: A dilemma. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 20(2): 202–224.
- Pickering SJ and Weber L (2013) Policing transversal borders. In: Aas KF and Bosworth M (eds) *The Borders of Punishment. Migration, Citizenship and Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 93–110.
- Richter M (2012) Researching transnational social spaces: A qualitative study of the Spanish second generation in Switzerland. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 13(3): 1–21.
- Robertson S (2014) Time and temporary migration: The case of temporary graduate workers and working holiday makers in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(12): 1915–1933.
- Robertson S (2016) Student-workers and tourist-workers as urban labor: Temporalities and identities in the Australian cosmopolitan city. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42(14): 2272–2288.
- Robertson S and Runganaikaloo A (2013) Lives in limbo: Migration experiences in Australia’s education–migration nexus. *Ethnicities* 14(2): 208–226.
- Rubio-Marin R (2000) *Immigration as a Democratic Challenge: Citizenship and Inclusion in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruhs M (2013) *The Price of Rights: Regulating International Labor Migration*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen S (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen S (2014) *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Schiller NG, Darieva T and Gruner-Domic S (2011) Defining cosmopolitan sociability in a transnational age: An introduction. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(3): 399–418.
- Shachar A (2009) *The Birthright Lottery: Citizenship and Global Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smelser N (1998) The rational and the ambivalent in the social sciences. *American Sociological Review* 16: 1–16.
- Soguk N and Whitelhall G (1999) Wandering grounds: Transversality, identity, territoriality, and movement. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 28(3): 675–698.
- Standing G (2011) *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class* Bloomsbury Academic. London.
- Svasek M and Skribis Z (2007) Passions and powers: Emotions and globalisation. *Identities Global Studies in Culture & Power* 14: 367–383.
- Tazreiter C (2013) Emergence, the politics of crisis and future horizons in irregular migration. *Australian Journal of Human Rights* 19(3): 125–144.
- Tazreiter C (2014) Insecure communities: Temporary migration status and its impacts in everyday life. In: Pickering S and Ham J (eds) *Routledge Handbook on Crime and International Migration*. Abington, PA: Routledge, pp. 193–205.
- Tazreiter C (2015) Lifeboat politics in the Pacific: Affect and the ripples and shimmers of a migrant saturated future. *Emotion, Space and Society* 16: 99–107.
- Tazreiter C, Weber L, Pickering S, et al. (2016) *Fluid Security in the Asia Pacific: Transnational Lives, Human Rights and State Control*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Torpey J (2000) *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 122–157.
- Uehling G (2002) Sitting on suitcases: Ambivalence and ambiguity in the migration intentions of Crimean Tatar women. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 14(4): 388–408.
- Urry J (2007) *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Vasta E (2010) Immigrants and the paper market: Borrowing, renting and buying identities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(2): 187–206.
- Vertovec S, DeWind J and Levitt P (eds) (2003) International perspectives on transnational migration: An introduction. *International Migration Review* 37(3): 565–575.
- Volpp L (2013) Imaginings of space in immigration law. *Law, Culture & Humanities* 9(3): 456–474.
- Vosko LF, Preston V and Latham R (eds) (2014) *Liberating Temporariness? Migration, Work and Citizenship in an Age of Insecurity*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Walzer M (1983) *Spheres of Justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Warriner DS (2013) “It’s better life here than there”: Elasticity and ambivalence in narratives of personal experience. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 7: 15–32.
- Weisberger A (1992) Marginality and its directions. *Sociological Forum* 7(3): 425–446.
- Wise A (2016) Becoming cosmopolitan: Encountering difference in a city of mobile labor. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 4(14): 2289–2308.
- Wise A and Velayutham S (eds) (2009) *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright CF (2014) How do states implement liberal immigration policies? Control signals and skilled immigration reform in Australia. *Governance* 27(3): 397–421.