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1 Introduction

A growing body of scholarship examines how migrant non-profit organisations facilitate immigrants’ settlement by providing access to social services (Bloemraad 2005; Breton 1964, 2005; Cordero-Guzman 2005); facilitating advocacy and political engagement (Bloemraad 2006; De Graauw 2008; Gleeson 2008; Jones-Correa 1998; Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008); promoting religious engagement (Breton 2012; Levitt 2007; Min 2010); and helping migrants sustain cross-border relations with their homeland (Lacroix 2011; Landoldt and Goldring 2010; Portes, Escobar and Radford 2007; Smith 2006).¹ The dominant analytical focus however, centres on how contextual conditions in the receiving society shape the prevalence and effectiveness of immigrant organisations (see Bloemraad 2006, 2005; Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008). Most studies limit their operationalization of local context of reception to certain government policies and institutional arrangements, which in turn are seen as the main determinant of immigrants’ organisational capability across neighbourhoods, cities and nations (Bloemraad 2005, 2006; Lacroix 2011; Portes, Escobar and Radford 2007; Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008). As such, previous research on immigrant organisations suffers from two limitations. First, it tends to employ a one-sided focus on the role of the state, thereby overlooking how other contextual dimensions, such as immigrants’ mode of economic incorporation, coethnic community conditions, and the dominant societal perceptions of and responses to immigrant groups may affect their organisational capacity.² Second, the immigrant organisations literature is split into two, apparently unrelated, epistemic camps: one focused on immigrant organisations as agents of immigrant settlement and incorporation; and the other focusing on their role as transnational actors and agents of development in migrants’ homelands.

This study addresses these limitations. We argue that in order to gain a better understanding of the contextual factors that shape the composition of immigrant groups’ organisational infrastructure, research must move beyond state-centred analyses and overcome the epistemological division between local and transnational organisations. After all, immigrant organisations – whether working locally or transnationally, and regardless of their domain of activity – are embedded in the same context of reception, belong to the same immigrant community, and thus form and occupy a collective social space. We thus analyse how multi-layered ‘contexts of reception’ including state policies, immigrants’ level of economic incorporation, characteristics of their co-ethnic community, and societal attitudes towards Pakistani immigrants shape the size, programmatic focus, and geographic scope of the collective organisational space serving the Pakistani immigrant communities in Toronto and NYC (NYC).

Data comes from an original database of the universe of Pakistani non-profit organisations in Toronto and NYC and from an analysis of data gleaned from 84 in-depth interviews conducted with organisation leaders, government officials and key-informants.³ As expected, findings show significant differences in the size, diversity, and spatial scope of Pakistani organisational spaces in Toronto and NYC. However, variations in the two Pakistani organisational spaces are not explained by differences in state-centred factors such as immigrant incorporation policies and national membership ideologies.

---

¹ This study uses the term non-profit organisations to refer to different types of immigrant organisations. While all immigrant organisations may not have an official non-profit status, the organisations used in this study are all registered non-profits. However, we also found some smaller organisations that have remained unregistered due to the high cost official oversight implies. This is discussed later.

² An exception is Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad’s (2008b) study of immigrant organisations in California which examines the effect of ethnic economic enclaves on organisational capacity.

³ The data for this article come from a larger doctoral dissertation project carried out by the first-author investigating the Pakistani immigrant non-profit sector in London, Toronto and NYC.
While local, national, and global contexts partly explain these disparate trends, the group’s internal composition and varying levels of the Pakistani immigrant community’s socioeconomic attainment across the two cities seem to better explain these variations. The only common phenomena found in both cities are significant local tensions and deepening rifts within both organisational spaces between the leadership of the locally oriented, and transnationally inclined Pakistani organisations.

2 Theoretical and empirical contexts

2.1 Organisational space

A growing literature within the field of international migration documents how contextual factors affect immigrant-serving organisations facilitating migrants’ settlement, integration, and transnationalism. Most existing studies however, tend to concentrate on a particular subset of organisations, thus creating an epistemic bi-polarity—where studies focus either on settlement and incorporation or transnational engagement (for an exception, see Gleeson & Bloemraad 2012). This epistemic fragmentation obscures the shared contextual environment inhabited by both locally and transnationally oriented organisations.

In order to analyse how an environmental context shapes the whole organisational infrastructure serving a given immigrant community, we employ the concept of organisational space. The concept of ‘organisational space’ builds on research examining organisational fields (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) and transnational social spaces (Faist 2000). It constitutes a heuristic tool to analyse the ecological environment in which organisations serving or representing an immigrant community are embedded. Analytically, immigrant organisational spaces (IOSs) refer to the dynamic set of relationships structuring the number, programmatic domain of action (i.e., social, economic, cultural, political, religious), and geographic scope (i.e., local or transnational) of non-profit immigrant organisations. Spatially, IOSs should not be equated with the geographical space in which they are located, for IOSs are formed by a diverse array of organisations engaged at different scales (local, national, international). Yet, for the present analysis, we limit the boundaries of Pakistani IOSs to the metropolitan areas where they are located – Toronto and NYC, respectively. IOSs are formed by a heterogeneous array of organisations constituting a complex geometry shaped by organisations’ size, ideological orientation, programmatic focus, and level of influence and socio-political recognition (status) in the immigrant community and receiving society.

We conceptualise the Pakistani immigrant organisational space as the universe of not-for-profit, Pakistani-led organisations in metropolitan Toronto or NYC offering services to or representing the Pakistani migrant community in both cities. Given the variations across the organisational environments, as well as the ethno-national, religious, historical, and geographical boundaries in which the two Pakistani immigrant organisational spaces are embedded, it is assumed that the size of the two spaces, their programmatic domain of action, and geographic scope will vary by location.

2.2 Contexts of reception and migrant organisations

Portes and Rumbaut (2006 [1996]) explain how migrants’ modes of incorporation are shaped in part by contexts of reception. These contexts are formed by four dimensions: state-centred policies of the host

---

4 The concept of ‘organisational field’ within organisation studies is primarily concerned with the micro-level interactions, patterns of domination and coalition among a group of organisations whose institutionally defined behaviours define the boundaries of their organisational field of action (Vaughn 2008). Similarly, the concept of transnational social space seeks to identify the actors in a given place who engage in transnational behaviours that ultimately generate a space of action that lies between an immigrant community’s country of origin and country of settlement. In contrast, our use of the concept organisational space is motivated by our analytic focus on how contexts of reception in a given environment shape the composition of a non-profit sector.
government; the conditions and incorporation into the labour market; socio-demographics of the co-ethnic community; and the perceptions the dominant society has about the immigrant group. The unanimous consensus seems to be that the legal, cultural, economic, and social conditions immigrants encounter upon arrival greatly shape their fate in their new homelands (Castles 2000; De Haas 2010; Portes and Böröcz 1989; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Such contexts are not, however, absolute conditions that equally affect each and every immigrant group in the same way. Moreover, contextual conditions of reception have significant effects not only on individual immigrants’ socioeconomic incorporation (Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmerman 2001; Boswell 2003; Brubaker 2010; Geddes 2003; Portes and Rumabut 2006), but also on their likelihood to remain transnationally engaged with their homelands (Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003). Recent research on the prevalence and effectiveness of immigrant organisations has examined how contextual conditions in the host society affect immigrants’ organisational capacity (Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008). Each of the four dimensions of the context-of-reception framework may help explain variations between the Pakistani organisational spaces in Toronto and NYC: examined in the next section.

2.2.1 State-centred policies

Existing research on immigrant organisations documents how the contextual environments shaped by state-policies partially explain the size and composition of a given migrant groups’ organisational infrastructure. Structural and institutional contexts ‘from above’ seem to equally impact not only organisations providing services to local immigrant communities (Bloemraad 2005, 2006; Breton 1964; Schrover 2006), but also those supporting transnational endeavours (Lacroix 2011; Portes, Escobar and Radford 2007; Portes and Zhou 2011; Smith and Bakker 2008). The state-policies and associated narratives of national membership relevant for the present analysis are official state-sponsored multiculturalism as observed in Canada and the more hands-off laissez-faire assimilation approach of the US (see Bloemraad 2006, 2005 for a similar comparison of US and Canadian state-policy).

Different state-policies may explain how migrants from the same country of origin experience divergent levels of immigrant incorporation, civic participation and organisational capacity in different host countries (Bloemraad and Wright 2014; Koopmans et al 2005). In order for migrants to benefit from either an assimilationist or more inclusive state-sponsored multicultural host society, they must follow the legal normativity regulating entry as determined by the host state. Failing to do so often engenders immigrants’ political and civic alienation, undermining the group’s organisational capabilities. For instance, Bloemraad’s (2005) comparative research on Vietnamese and Portuguese immigrant organisations in Toronto and Boston finds that the Canadian government’s official multiculturalist polices – considered the most inclusive state-sponsored approach to immigrants among all Western liberal democracies (see Kymlicka 1995) – offer symbolic and material support to immigrant organisations. Bloemraad argues that the Canadian approach explains why there is more immigrant organisational capacity among these two groups in Canada than in the US.

Indeed, the US does not have a comparable government policy for immigrant integration. While NYC may be considered to be multicultural in a demographic sense, as any other US immigrant gateway cities with high levels of ethnic diversity, it does not have official policies or philosophy associated with state-sponsored multiculturalism (see Bloemraad and Wright 2014; Wright and Bloemraad 2012). In contrast to Canada, in the US, the century-old model of assimilation continues to be the dominant national ideology advocated by the government, politicians, and US-based immigration researchers (Kivisto and Faist 2010). The latter generally employ assimilationist models, which under-theorize the role of the state by focusing exclusively on individual attributes such as human capital and sociocultural distance between newcomers and the dominant society (Chaudhary 2014; Waters and Jimenez 2005).
Schrover and Vermuelen (2005) argue that in addition to government policies, the size of an immigrant community is a key factor in explaining the focus and stability of immigrant organisations. They however add, the relationship between state intervention and group size is not linear. Somewhat contradicting Bloemraad’s argument, they contend that too much state intervention leads to reduced organisational activity. Similarly, communities that are either too small or too large experience problems in maintaining stable organisations. While illuminating, Schrover and Vermuelen’s argument fails to provide any clear parameters determining the limits of ‘too much’ state intervention, or of ‘too small’ or ‘too large’ community size. Despite these shortcomings, their argument contends that state multiculturalism may actually reduce, rather than expand immigrants’ organisational capabilities.

Evidently, there is not a clear consensus on which national approach, the laissez-faire ‘assimilationist’ or the state-sponsored ‘multiculturalist,’ is more conducive to promote the organisational capabilities of immigrants. Yet, the view that multicultural nations exhibit higher organisational membership and political participation among immigrants than non-multicultural nations, seems to predominate (Kesler and Bloemraad 2010; Wright and Bloemraad 2012). Bloemraad (2005: 867) contends that ‘government support, including funding, technical assistance and normative encouragement, plays an important role in building the size and diversity of an immigrant community’s organisational capacity.’ Following Bloemraad’s (2005) argument, we could hypothesise that the overall size and diversity of the programmatic domain of action of an immigrant group’s organisational space is associated with state-policies such as ‘multiculturalism’ or ‘laissez-faire assimilation’.

*H1-A: Because of the official multicultural context of reception, the Pakistani organisational space in Toronto is proportionally larger than that in NYC.*

*H1-B: Because of official multicultural context of reception, the Pakistani organisational space in Toronto is more diverse than in NYC.*

While previous research on immigrant organisations offers insights into how state-centred contexts of reception may affect the size and diversity of an immigrant group’s organisational space, the literature reviewed thus far does not explain how state-policies in the receiving society might be associated with the geographic scope of an immigrant community’s organisations space. To what extent are state-sponsored multiculturalism or laissez-faire assimilation more or less likely to be associated with a transnationally oriented immigrant organisational space? The vast literature of transnational communities and diasporas assumes that the motivations for migrants to engage in the social, economic and political issues of their homelands are more likely to be encouraged in receiving societies with commitments to the acceptance of cultural differences (see Koopmans et al. 2005:127). In other words, societies with state-sponsored multiculturalism such as Canada or Sweden may enhance a migrant community’s transnational connections to their homelands (Akesson 2011). Similarly, research examining the critics of state-sponsored multiculturalism in the case of Canada also find that migrant communities may be more likely to engage in what they refer to as ‘unhealthy’ transnational engagement due to their split loyalties and the weakening of a national identity within the framework of multiculturalism (Stazewich 2007).

In their analysis of transnational ‘claims-making’, Koopmans et al (2005) find that the frequency of migrant’s transnational activities are greater in countries without official policies of multiculturalism such as Germany and Switzerland – challenging the notion that such policies are associated with greater transnational engagement. In contrast, Akesson (2011) finds that multiculturalism in Sweden encourages transnational family relations among second-generation Swedish-Cape Verdeans. In brief, there is no consensus with regards to whether state-sponsored multiculturalism increases or decreases transnational activities. However, based on the viewpoints of
both proponents and opponents of official multiculturalism, we expect there will be more transnationally oriented Pakistani organisations in multicultural Toronto than laissez-faire assimilationist NYC.

H1-C: Because of the official multicultural context of reception, the Pakistani organisational space in Toronto is more transnationally oriented than in NYC.

Finally, and as discussed above, recent studies have demonstrated that immigrants’ degree of legal incorporation into the receiving polity plays a crucial role in predicting their organisational capabilities. Smith and Bakker (2008), for example, concluded that the leadership of the transnational organisations they studied, ‘is largely the domain of migrants who have established an economic foothold in the US and acquired US citizenship, rather than the domain of the poor and undocumented’ (208). It is plausible then to expect that for Pakistani communities:

H1-D: The higher the proportion of naturalised Pakistani citizens, the greater the proportion of transnational organisations in the Pakistani organisational space.

It is important to notice, however, that most of these studies limit the meaning of the context of reception to the receiving society’s immigrant state policies and national membership ideology. While reducing the context of reception to state policies could be considered a valid analytical approach, it undoubtedly has significant shortcomings, for, as Schrover and Vermeulen (2005) have rightly indicated, it neglects or minimizes the other critical contextual dimensions (i.e., labour market incorporation, immigrant community’s resources, and dominant society’s perception the newcomers) that help shape immigrants’ capacity to construct an organisational space.

2.2.2 Socio-economic incorporation

The second contextual dimension shaping immigrants’ mode of incorporation and, thus, their organisational capabilities is the condition of the labour market and their participation in it. Here immigrants’ individual human capital and marketable skills, to a great extent, determine their socioeconomic fate. Gaining access to jobs matching their formal skills and work experience implies more chances for social upward mobility, acquisition of social and material resources, and social recognition. Civic leadership, both at the local and transnational level, more often than not, emerges from the ranks of the better off (Verba et al. 1995). This pattern has been found among different immigrant groups in the US (Portes, Escobar and Radford 2007; Portes and Zhou 2011; Smith and Bakker 2008). Thus, it is plausible to expect that the better-off the group is, the more likely it is to have a higher organisational capability – i.e., a larger organisational space.

A half a century ago, however, renowned Canadian sociologist Raymond Breton (1964) argued that the opposite was true: the larger the proportion of poor people among an immigrant group, the more likely the group will have a large and diverse set of organisations. This conclusion, based on the study of thirty immigrant groups in Montreal before the official adoption of multiculturalist policies, was informed by the logic of increasing needs (i.e., increasing demand to satisfy unmet wants), rather than that of increasing resources as more recent scholarship has shown in the case of the US. As Breton puts it, ‘If a large proportion of the members of an ethnic group have few resources of their own, as indicated for instance in rural origin and lack of occupational skills, then there is in this ethnic group an important “clientele” to support welfare and mutual benefit organisations’. Accordingly, unmet group’s needs represent an opportunity that a ‘social entrepreneur’ will seize by organising ‘something for the new immigrants in need.’ Indeed, in his study he found ‘a strong positive relationship […] between the
proportion of manual workers in an ethnic group and the degree of institutional completeness of that group’ (Breton 1964: 204).

By institutional completeness Breton refers to the relative ability of the immigrant community’s organisations to provide all the services required by its members. As such, institutional completeness ranges from zero immigrant organisations to a set of organisations able to provide the immigrant community with all the services required for everyday life, including education, religious services, health care, work, and so forth. Of course, absolute institutional completeness is an ideal type that cannot be found in reality. However, Breton’s central analytical point is that the higher the degree of social isolation and alienation of the immigrant group from the receiving society, the higher its degree of institutional completeness. Evidently, this conclusion is the antipode of that presented by contemporary analysts of locally-focused immigrant organisations, as we discussed in the last section.

In order to test these contradictory arguments regarding the meaning of immigrant groups’ institutional completeness, or organisational capacity, in addition to state policies and membership principles, it is essential to include measurements of the group’s socioeconomic attainment in its place of settlement. We therefore hypothesise that comparing the Pakistani communities in Toronto and NYC:

\[ H2-A: \text{The higher the average human capital of the local Pakistani community, the larger its total organisational space.} \]

\[ H2-B: \text{The higher the median income of the local Pakistani community, the higher the proportion of transnational organisations.} \]

\[ H2-C: \text{The higher the poverty rate among Pakistanis, the higher the degree of local institutional completeness.} \]

2.2.3 Immigrant community

Social research indicates that the immigrant community’s size, resources, and relative newness are significant factors moulding the group’s ability to organize and determine the viability of their immigrant organisations. Yet, the direction and meaning of such relationships are still in dispute. Scholars agree that the larger the community, the larger the number of potential members and clients that immigrant organisations would have – even heeding Schorover and Vermeulen’s (2005) argument of a non-linear relationship between group size and organisational capacity. Based on these arguments, and keeping in mind that the Pakistani population in Toronto is much larger (Table 1) than that in NYC, we hypothesise that, again,

\[ H3-A: \text{The Pakistani organisational space in Toronto, is larger than that in NYC due to the larger size of the Pakistani community.} \]

In addition, time since arrival appears to play a significant role in the group’s organisational capability. Echoing Breton’s (1964) argument, Bloemraad (2005: 881) argues that newer immigrants ‘have a greater need for settlement and social services than an older immigrant group.’ Therefore, newer immigrants are more likely to build organisations than older ones. We should thus expect that:

\[ H3-B: \text{The larger the proportion of recent Pakistani arrivals, the larger the local Pakistani organisational space.} \]

Breton (1964), however, presents a more nuanced argument about the main determinants of the degree of ‘institutional completeness’ of immigrant communities. He singles out three main determinants: uniqueness of the group’s ethnic characteristics vis-à-vis receiving society, the proportion
of people with few resources in the group, and a pattern of spatial mobility dominated by mass migration. The combination of these three factors, he argues, constitutes the basis for the formation of an “ethnic clientele” that fuels the formation, dynamics, and complexity of immigrant organisations. Yet, for him, ethnic communities and their organisations follow a life cycle that evolves from initial formation, growth, and disappearance. With their disappearance also comes the disappearance of ethnic organisations (Breton 1954: 205), an argument that coincides with Bloemraad’s and hypothesis H3B.

### 2.2.4 Dominant society

Finally, perceptions of and attitudes toward immigrants by the larger host society are an essential part of the newcomer’s context of reception (Portes & Rumbaut, 1996). Host society’s hostility toward outsiders can affect how and where immigrants settle and what kinds of jobs and opportunities are made available to them. Depending on the host society’s perception of the new entrants, immigrants may face more discrimination than others based on the colour of their skin, country of origin, or their religion. In some cases, the negatively perceived characteristics may be combined with the group’s size. Indeed, Zolberg and Woon (1999) contend that the size and visibility of the Mexican immigrant community in the US results in more discrimination and hostility than is experienced by other groups; meanwhile, they argue two years before 9/11, Muslim immigrants in Europe were facing similar prejudice for the same reasons. World events can also shift societal attitudes toward particular groups of immigrants.

In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, most Western countries introduced new policies restricting immigration from Muslim countries, while in countries like the US where Arabs and Muslims used to be ‘invisible,’ overnight became subject of close scrutiny and stigmatised as potential terrorists (Cainkar 2002; Cesari 2010; Peek 2011; Tirman 2004). Due to the 9/11 attacks and the intensity of anti-Muslim backlash in NYC, there seems to be more hostility directed towards Pakistanis in NYC than in Toronto. How might such hostility affect the programmatic focus or spatial scope of Pakistanis’ organisations in NYC?

Breton (1964) offers an appealing answer to this question. He contends that the differentiating sociocultural characteristics of an immigrant group vis-à-vis the host society leads to a difficulty of acceptance and thus ‘constitute the basis for the formation of a clientele […] for ethnic organisations.’ Consequently, the possibility of immigrants’ socioeconomic mobility is reduced, confining immigrants to their ethnic group. He further argues that ‘This is particularly true – or perhaps only true – when the differentiating features are negatively evaluated by the native community’ (204). Breton’s reasoning leads us to hypothesise that,

**H4-A:** Because of the hostility directed towards Pakistanis following the 9/11 attacks, the Pakistani organisational space in NYC is significantly larger and more institutionally complete than that in Toronto.

To sum up, a well-established body of sociological research has demonstrated that not-for-profit organisations work as key meso-structural agents connecting individual citizens to larger socio-political and economic processes and structures (Bloemraad 2006; Breton 2005; Hechter 1978; Marwell 2004). In the case of immigrant organisations, the size and characteristics of IOSs are in part explained by the context of reception. Thus far however, there is not a clear scholarly consensus on the direction of such effects. This study seeks to contribute to this impasse.

### 3 Group and site selection

Despite their growing significance, Pakistani immigrants represent a relatively understudied ethnic group in North America. This is especially surprising given increasing scholarship on Muslims in the
West and the fact that Pakistanis comprise the largest Muslim immigrant community in North America. In the past decade however, a handful of studies examining the lived-experiences of the North American Pakistani community have emerged. Yet, much of this research is limited to issues of identity and how Pakistanis’ respond to the post 9/11 hostile environment in their day to day lives (Ameeriar 2012; Rana 2011; Maira 2009; Mohammad-Arif 2009). Very few studies examine how the ‘war-on-terror’ environment has affected organisational spaces of Pakistanis in North America (for an exception see Najam 2006).

Large scale Pakistani migration to North American began in the 1970s. Historically, the vast majority of Pakistanis identify themselves as Muslims, both in Pakistan and abroad (Bolognani & Lyon 2011; Mohammad-Arif 2009). The first waves of Pakistani migrants to North America were comprised of high-skilled professional such as doctors, scientists, entrepreneurs and students. Subsequent waves throughout the 1980s and 1990s represented a more diverse range of migrants including professionals as well as low-skilled migrants reuniting with family members. By the 1990s, the Pakistani population in Canada and the US reflected a migrant community experiencing divergent levels of incorporation.

3.1 Site selection

Both Toronto and NYC are paradigmatic symbols of the immigrant-rooted, national narrative of their respective countries. In addition to their function as global centres of finance, trade and culture, Toronto and NYC are iconic migrant cities with long traditions serving as gateways to North America and facilitating the incorporation of countless immigrant groups. These two metropolises are home to the largest Pakistani immigrant communities in Canada and the US, respectively (2006 Canadian Census; 2013 US Current Population Survey). Historically, however, the two cities dramatically diverge with respect to their national and local state policies of immigrant integration and, their local contextual environments, particularly since 9/11 attacks.

Following 9/11, NYC simultaneously became the symbolic epicentre of the moral panic surrounding international terrorism and the focal point of US domestic counter-terrorism policies and practices (Apuzzo and Goldman 2013; Nguyen 2005). The Pakistani community experienced first-hand the effects of counter terrorism inspired enforcement, including unpleasant encounters in a variety of everyday experiences (see Das Gupta 2006; Nguyen 2005). Hundreds of Pakistani migrants were rounded up, detained and eventually deported due to minor immigrant violations in the two years following the attacks (Mohammad-Arif 2009; Nguyen 2005). Recent journalist investigations have also revealed the New York Police Department’s wide covert surveillance programme targeting public meeting places, such as cafes and mosques frequented by Pakistani migrants as part of numerous investigations seeking to uncover potential ‘homegrown’ terrorists (Appuzzo and Goldman 2013; Greenberg 2012). The Pakistani community and its organisations all of a sudden found themselves experiencing collective fear, alienation and precariousness related to the moral panic surrounding a growing stigma linking Pakistanis with religious extremism and terrorism (Chaudhary forthcoming; Mohammad-Arif 2009).

Meanwhile, Toronto, and Canada in general, lacks direct experiences with terrorism on the massive scale of 9/11. As a result, the Pakistani community in Toronto is not subjected to the level of surveillance and counter-terrorism-related practices and stigmatising perceptions prevalent in NYC (Chaudhary forthcoming). As the metropolitan symbol of Canada’s official policies of multiculturalism, the city of Toronto projects a model of acceptance and inclusion that appears to contradict the exclusionary politics and policies associated with post-9/11 NYC. Yet, the global scope of the US-led ‘war on terror’ contributes to an increasing use of surveillance and negative media stereotyping directed towards Islamic extremism within Canadian society (Steuter and Wills 2009). This has lately
contributed to the emergence of stigma directed towards Pakistanis and Muslims in general within Canadian society, albeit not quite yet to the levels experiences and documented in NYC (Ameeriar 2012; Chaudhary-forthcoming; Kazemipur 2014).

4 Data and methods

Data were collected over an 11-month period in 2013 and consisted of 2 phases. The first phase sought to determine the size, composition, and spatial scope of the Pakistani immigrant organisational spaces in metropolitan Toronto and NYC. To do so, a new database consisting of the universe of registered Pakistani immigrant-serving non-profit organisations was constructed using national databases of non-profit organisations in each metropolitan area. This data collection strategy replicates previous studies by relying on comprehensive databases such as the UN Directory of Non-Governmental Organisations, Associations Unlimited (previously The Encyclopedia of Associations) and GuideStar (see Lacroix 2011; Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad 2008; Okamoto 2006 for examples using these same sources). Organisations were identified as Pakistani or serving the Pakistani community by searching for organisations with Pakistani, Muslim/Islamic or South Asian identities. In the case of Muslim and South Asian organisations, each organisation was closely examined and included only if they did in fact represent or offer services to Pakistanis. In cases where the Muslim organisations were primarily for Middle Eastern or African communities they were not included in the database. Similarly, South Asian organisations that did not serve Pakistanis and primarily served the Indian, Bangladeshi or Sri-Lankan communities were also excluded.

It should be noted that large databases such as the ones used here are notorious for undercounting immigrant organisations. To correct for possible undercounts, supplemental information about Pakistani organisations in each city was collected through in-depth interviews with key informants, consulting ethnic directories and media, and conducting intensive web searches. While it is possible that the databases used here could have missed some organisations, we strongly believe such sub-enumeration to be similarly minimal in both cities. Any missed organisations would most likely be very few, very small and informal, thus their exclusion does not significantly affect our findings. Once the main list was constructed, each organisation was coded and categorised according to its year of foundation, programmatic domain of action (social services, advocacy/politics, economic development, cultural, religious) and spatial scope of services (local or transnational). This database provides the core evidential information to compare the Pakistani organisational spaces in both cities.

The second phase was designed to gather first-hand qualitative information on the inner working conditions, everyday experiences, and general landscape of the Pakistani organisational space in each metropolitan area. It consisted of 84 in-depth interviews with organisation leaders and executives, government officials, community leaders, and key informants, including scholars and non-Pakistani local residents who could provide information about the target population and their organisations. Organisation leaders and executives were selected using a stratified random sample of organisations drawn from the complete database of organisations in each metropolitan area. The local universe of organisations was stratified according to the main domain of action (social, economic, cultural, and so forth) and assigned unique identifiers. Random samples were then drawn within each domain. The first organisation in the random list was contacted to set up interviews. In cases when the selected organisation did not respond to the three attempts at making contact, the organisation was removed and the second organisation in the randomized list was contacted. In general, attempts to make contact were successful by the third attempt yielding a response rate of 73 percent. Overall, the recruitment strategy reduced possible homogeneity among the interview respondents.
All interviews were conducted in English and lasted an average of 1.5 hours, with some of them lasting as little as 45 minutes and others as long as 3 hours. Most interviews took place in organisation offices and a small number were conducted in public places – restaurants and cafes. Most interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed for coding and analysis. In addition to the in-depth interviews, Chaudhary conducted over 200 hours of observation in Toronto and NYC, attending organisations’ events in order to gain a first-hand perception of the dynamics within each organisational space, paying particular attention to inter- and intra-organisational relations, as well as relations between organisations and the local community. These observations were recorded on a daily log for further analysis.

5 Results

5.1 Comparing immigrant communities

The Pakistani communities in Toronto and NYC share some striking similarities in their socio-demographic characteristics, but dramatically differ in their socioeconomic mode of incorporation. As Table 1 shows, although the Pakistani population in Toronto is 2.5 times as large as that in NYC, both populations have a similar gender composition (47.5 percent and 45.4 percent women respectively), an identical median household size (4 members), and very high levels of homeownership and human capital. Indeed, while the proportion of Pakistani New Yorkers holding at least a college degree is 5 percentage points higher than that of Pakistanis in Toronto (47.4 percent vs 42.3 percent), the proportion of highly educated Pakistanis is substantially higher than that of the general population in their respective cities (32 percent in NYC and 26.8 percent in Toronto). Evidently, this is a very select group, not only in relation to the receiving societies, but most especially in relation to Pakistan, a country that according to UNESCO has some of the worst education indicators globally and ranks 113 out of 120 countries in the Education Development Index (2012). Pakistani immigrants in both cities have also relatively high levels of labour force participation (66.8 percent in Toronto and 60 percent in NYC), at rates very close to those of the local general population (68.1 percent and 61.7 percent in Toronto and NYC respectively). But it is here where the similarities end, for their paths of socioeconomic incorporation take them in sharply different directions.

Despite their similar high levels of human capital and labour force participation, Pakistanis in Toronto do not seem to enjoy any particular socioeconomic advantage over their counterparts in NYC. Notwithstanding Toronto’s official welcoming multicultural environment, they appear to fare far worse than both their co-nationals in NYC and the Toronto population as a whole. In effect, in Toronto, Pakistanis’ median per capita income is just 85 percent that of their co-nationals in NYC (US$12,000 and US$14,000, respectively) and just 48 percent that of the Toronto population (see Table 1). Meanwhile, Pakistani New Yorkers’ median per capita income is 89 percent that of NYC as a whole. These differences appear more acute when we look at their median household income, which is a better indicator of a group’s economic attainment. In effect, Pakistanis in NYC basically earn the same median household income as New Yorkers in general (US$68,000), while their co-nationals in Toronto earn (approximately US$52,000) around two-thirds of the median household income of Toronto as a whole.

The unequal economic rewards that Pakistanis receive for their high human capital are reflected in the startlingly different socioeconomic conditions they experience in the two metropolises. While those in New York have a poverty rate slightly higher than the general population (14.4 percent vs 13.6 percent), a staggering 40 percent of their Toronto counterparts live in poverty, more than twice the total rate for Toronto (see Table 1). It is worth emphasising here that such a high rate of poverty among Pakistanis in Toronto exists despite their higher labour force participation and lower unemployment.
rate than their counterparts in NYC. This strongly suggest that their high poverty rate is not because of a lack of economic participation or lack of employment. Rather, the data suggest that it is the effect of earning too little for their labours – a result of either labour force mismatch (i.e., being underemployed and thus underpaid vis-à-vis their high qualifications), or labour market discrimination. An alternative explanation could be their relative recent period of arrival, for nearly one-fourth of this population arrived after 2001, while just around one-sixth of Pakistanis in NYC have arrived since that year. At any rate, determining the factors shaping this process is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, what the evidence presented reveals is contrary to our initial expectations, Toronto’s official multicultural environment appears less inclusive in socioeconomic terms, than laissez faire NYC.

Table 1. Characteristics of Foreign-Born Pakistanis in the Greater Toronto Area and NYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greater Toronto Area</th>
<th>Metropolitan New York Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FB Pakistanis</td>
<td>Canadian Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population*</td>
<td>97,070</td>
<td>2,576,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School (%)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma (%)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree or higher (%)</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force Participation (%)</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Total Income Per Capita</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Total Household Income**</td>
<td>50–54,000</td>
<td>75–79,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income/Below Poverty***</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Size</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized††</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Arrived after 2001</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Total population estimates are taken from the 2011 Canadian National Household Survey and the 2012 American Community Survey for Foreign-Born Pakistanis over the age of 15 living in metropolitan Toronto and New York City.

**The 2006 Canadian Census only provides ranges of household income. The 200-2013 CPS provides specific estimates of household income.

***The Canadian “low income” measure reports the proportion of individuals who self-identify as members of a low-income family. The U.S. measure indicates the proportion of individuals with incomes below the official poverty line.

† The proportion of naturalized citizens is calculated among foreign-born Pakistanis and the total foreign-born Canadian and US Population in Toronto and New York City.

†† This measure represents the proportion of the foreign-born Pakistani population that arrived in Toronto and New York City since the year 2000.

Notwithstanding these aggregate differences, direct observations for this study, as well as results from previous research, the Pakistani community in both cities appears to be deeply fragmented along sharply marked class lines between a small affluent professional class and a growing, impoverished working class toiling in the service sector as taxi drivers, retail clerks, petty merchants, and gas attendants. Such social fragmentation appears to be more acute in Toronto than in NYC (Fieldwork notes; Das Gupta 2006; Mohammad-Arif 2009, 2002). It is into these disparate and stratified socio-economic conditions that the Pakistani population has managed to construct diverse and vibrant,
albeit very different, organisational spaces in the Toronto and NYC metropolitan areas. We now turn to the description of our findings about them.

5.2 Comparing immigrant organisational spaces

Neither a supportive state multicultural context, nor group size or human capital resources seem to work in favour of Pakistanis in Toronto vis-à-vis Pakistani in NYC regarding their organisational capacity. As Table 2 shows, the Pakistani organisational space in Toronto is much smaller both in absolute and relative terms than that in NYC. The total number of immigrant organisations in Toronto (54) represents just 3/4 of those housed in NYC (71). Given the significant difference in the size of the two communities however, the absolute number of organisations does not truly reflect their respective organisational capacities. We thus use the rate of organisations per thousand immigrants. Results, presented at the bottom of Table 2, show that the difference in the organisational capacities of the two communities is surprisingly high; Pakistani New Yorkers have an organisation rate 3.2 times higher than their compatriots in Toronto (1.77 vs .56 organisations per thousand immigrants, respectively).

These results challenge hypotheses H1-A predicting that the organisational space would be greater in Toronto due to its more inclusive, official multicultural context. Similarly, these findings refute hypothesis H3-A, which also predicted a larger organisational capacity in Toronto due the larger size of its Pakistani community there. These results also counter the predictions of hypothesis H3-B according to which immigrants’ organisational capacity is positively related to the proportion of recent arrivals. This does not seem to be the case since the proportion of recent arrivals in Toronto (i.e., since 2001) is higher than that in NYC. However, these results do lend support to hypothesis H4-A, which expects Pakistani New Yorkers to possess a larger organisational space than their co-nationals in Toronto as a result of the hostile post-9/11 environment they confront in NYC.

In sum, these initial results strongly suggest that, contrary to expectations drawn from previous studies, an active, multiculturalist state is not enough to promote immigrants’ organisational capabilities. So far, findings actually support the opposite, namely, that it is in the least engaged state and the least auspicious environment where Pakistani organisations seem to flourish – which is hardly surprising for students of social movements and ethno racial conflicts (see Horowitz 1985; McAdam and Scott 2005; Okamoto 2006; Olzak 2006, 1992). This leads us then to enquire the extent to which Pakistanis’ socioeconomic resources affect the formation of organisational spaces, as posited by some of our general hypotheses.

At first glance, the differences in the organisational spaces between the two locations seems to be explained by the higher human capital in NYC, as posit by hypothesis H2-A. While plausible, it could be argued that the difference in human capital (a mere 5 percent higher proportion of highly educated Pakistanis in NYC than in Toronto) cannot fully explain the gargantuan difference in organisation capabilities (i.e., 3 to 1) between the 2 cities. This leads us to look into another dimension of the migratory experience of the Pakistani population.

Evidently, the strongest explanation of the Toronto-NYC organisational difference seems to be the disparate mode of incorporation Pakistanis experience in Toronto and NYC. Toronto’s smaller organisational space seems to be closely related to the lower resources in the hands of the Pakistani community there. As discussed earlier, Pakistanis in Toronto receive much lower individual and household median incomes, have very high rates of poverty, and tend to have less access to homeownership, the most important financial asset for average North American families. This situation, however, seems to have two different, contradictory effects. On the one hand, it limits the size of Toronto’s organisational space. On the other, and as expected by hypothesis H2-C, and in accordance
with Breton’s (1964) expectation, a higher poverty level leads to a higher degree of institutional completeness of the organisational space, which is the topic we turn to next.

**Table 2. Programmatic domain and scope of Pakistani Non-Profit Organisations in Toronto and NYC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic domain</th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>New York City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Transnational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy/Political</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural (non-religious)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations per scope/city</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion per city (%)</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organizations (N)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Rate</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Database of Pakistani Non-Profit Organisations in London, Toronto and NYC (Chaudhary forthcoming).

*The organisation rate refers to organizations per 1000 immigrants in each city.

5.3 Institutional Completeness

Results regarding the diversity of the two organisational spaces suggest that, generally speaking, the Pakistani organisations that form the Toronto organisational space are more evenly distributed across domains of action than in NYC (see Columns 1 and 3: Table 2). Indeed, the Toronto Pakistani organisational space contains a roughly similar number of social, political, cultural, economic, and faith-based organisation. This composition confirms predictions from hypothesis H2-C about poorer immigrant communities being more likely to have a higher degree of institutional completeness. Incidentally, the proportion of secular organisations providing cultural services to Pakistanis in Toronto is twice as large as that in NYC, where cultural outfits represent the smallest proportion of organisations. Such a marked difference may be related to the Canadian government’s policy of multiculturalism that promotes ethnic and cultural manifestations as part of the national mosaic of Canadian society (Breton 2005).

The composition of the organisational space in NYC is very different, where it is dominated by religious organisations that represent over half of the total. In contrast, Toronto’s organisational space is much more secular with just one-fifth of the organisations being faith-based (Table 2). The apparent ‘overrepresentation’ of religious organisations in NYC should not be seen as surprising. Rather, what should be seen as surprising, is the predominant presence of secular organisations in the Toronto organisational space, for multiple studies have documented the central role religious organisations have played facilitating the settlement process of immigrants throughout North American history until the present (Breton 2012). In fact, similar findings have been reported in the case of contemporary Indian and Korean immigrants in NYC (Min 2010), as well as Pakistanis in Boston (Levitt 2007). Again, it is highly plausible that the secularized organisational space of Toronto may be a result of the multicultural hand of the Canadian and Toronto states. On the other hand, the lack of diversity within the NYC organisational space due to the dominance of religious organisation may also be a result of the US and
NYC governments’ ‘hands-off’ approach to immigrants and their historical tendency to rely on religious organisations to gain access to socioeconomic services, rather than on the State.

5.4 Geographical scope

Unsurprisingly, the vast majority of organisations forming Pakistani organisational spaces in Toronto and NYC are local services providers. Which organisational space contains the largest proportion of transnational Pakistani organisations? We expected Toronto would because of the inclusive, multicultural official Canadian context (hypothesis H1-B). We also expected that the city with a higher proportion of naturalized Pakistani migrants (hypothesis H1-D) and a higher median income (hypothesis H2-B) would also be the home of a more transnationally focused organisational space. As Table 2 shows, NYC’s Pakistani organisational space is actually more transnational than Toronto’s, with a full one-fifth of its organisations being transnational, as compared to Toronto’s one-eighth. This result refutes the hypothesis that a more inclusive, multicultural state would encourage more transnational engagement (hypothesis H1-B). This result does lend support to hypotheses H1-D and H2-B, for NYC’s Pakistani community has a higher median income and a higher naturalization rate than its counterpart in Toronto. Again, keeping in mind the different contexts of reception, it is plausible to conclude that the spatial scope of Pakistani organisational spaces are mostly shaped by immigrants’ mode of incorporation, rather than by state policies and ideologies of national inclusion.

Contrary to expectations, the material and symbolic support of state multiculturalism appears to stymie, rather than encourage the formation of transnational organisations, while enhancing organisations aiding with local incorporation processes. Conversely, organised transnational activism seems to be more likely to develop in a context of reception in which the state refrains, for the most part, from aiding the immigrants. What is missing in this preliminary conclusion, however, is the dialectical relationship between state’s role and the conditions offered by the local labour market. As discussed earlier, while the former seems to devalue Pakistani high human capital, the latter appears to provide higher rewards to it. The state-labour market interconnected relationship and effects were corroborated by the significant differences in income, homeownership, and poverty rates between the two communities.

5.5 Internal dynamics and tensions

The interconnection between the state’s role and immigrants’ mode of incorporation is further substantiated by data gleaned through interviews with Pakistani organisation leaders. As their narratives make it clear, the official Canadian government’s financial support for migrant organisations is minimal and primarily used for services and activities related to settlement and integration. Such state intervention helps mould the way Pakistani organisations strategize their sustainability. The strategies adopted by both local and transnational organisations are interrelated as they are embedded in the same structural context that also include the receiving state’s interest in their homeland. This is nicely captured in the comments provided by a leader of a transnational Pakistani charity in Toronto, who when asked about his organisation’s source of funding explained:

We have to rely on donations from the community for our work in Pakistan. You see, these big social service organisations get all of the grants. You get a few Pakistanis or South Asian together and make a Board. Then you get [official] non-profit or charity status and make sure your mission is about integration. That’s it! Then you can get all of the government grants for multiculturalism. But for us? We don’t get those funds. We want to help poor villages in Pakistan and help improve our homeland. There is no government help for us. The aid money the government gives goes to big NGOs who are in
cahoots with the UN. It’d be easier to throw a bunch of dances, or have a big dinner, then we could get grants and say we are doing multiculturalism.

From the point of view of state policies, while the lower proportion of transnational organisations in Toronto could be explained by the Canadian state multicultural intervention, the higher proportion of transnational organisations in NYC may be explained by the state’s lack of action. However, a closer analysis reveals the key role migrants’ mode of incorporation plays in the process. Funding for organisations in NYC is primarily a function of corporate and individual donations. Since the Pakistani community there is, on average, more affluent than Toronto’s, its transnational organisational space ends up being bigger. Evidently, transnational organisations appear to be the exclusive domain of the better off in both cities. Wealthy Pakistanis, our observations indicate, seem to have many ties to transnational organisations promoting economic and social development in Pakistan. The better off could afford to participate and co-sponsor transnational organisations moved by personal, economic, political, or nationalist interests. The poor, even if they would like to, often cannot afford to do it – either because of lack of resources or lack of time due to long-working hours required to survive in North America. This finding coincides with what has been observed in the case of individual transnational political engagement, which also has been described as the space for the better off (Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Smith and Bakker 2008).

Additional vignettes from in-depth interviews help illustrate the common rationale and strategies used by Pakistani leaders and executives of transnational organisations, and the extent to which their arguments and practices overlap and contrast with those deployed by their locally focused counterparts. When asked about his organisation’s funding sources, the director of a transnational social organisation in Toronto emphatically stated:

Donations! Donations! Donations! We are completely funded by the community. Many people think that we are one of those big NGOs that gets million dollars grants from the government. But we don’t. […] Our organisation relies on donations from the community to carry out the work we do in Pakistan. […] We also target individuals that we know have deep pockets. Many of our volunteers here are your successful professionals. We use their networks to find people who can make donations that are really going to make a difference.

Answering the same question, the treasurer of a transnational social organisation in NYC described the fundraising strategies his organisation deploys. The elitist character of such strategies is palpable in his description:

We have several ways in which we raise funds for our organisation. Donations is the most common way. People donate at our events and through our website. You get a tax-deductible receipt so people like that. But we also hold competitions among our staff and board members to see who can sign up the most donors and raise the most. […] The winner received two tickets to a show at the MET. We raised over 10,000 dollars in a month doing that. We also have many dinners throughout the year where many professionals will donate large amounts…

The discursive and practical funding practices utilized by locally-oriented Pakistani organisations in part resemble, although at a much reduced scale, transnational organisations’ practice of mobilizing a co-national sense of solidarity and obligation to elicit private financial support. Indeed, in his discussion of fundraising challenges, the director of a local cultural association interviewed in
Toronto, puts in perspective the funding role of the Canadian government and the key role that private co-ethnic donations play in the financing of this kind of organisations:

We get donations and we have [also] received some grants in the past. [For our last event,] some of the money came from a grant that one of our board members found out about. It was something from the government…you know, multicultural….uh. I can’t remember exactly. It wasn’t a lot of money… I think maybe 2500 dollars. But it really helped. We used it to rent the hall and pay for the catering. We also used some of our own money to help put it together.

Q. How often have you received grants like that from the government?

I would say, probably 3 or 4 times. They’re never big amounts. But everything little bit helps.

The disparate class origins and the uneven competition for scarce financial resources has led to a growing rift between transnational and locally-focused Pakistani organisations. Approximately 70 percent of the interviewees from organisations focusing on their respective local Pakistani communities, expressed resentment towards the often larger and better funded Pakistani transnational organisations. This sentiment is well captured in the remarks of a 46-year old female director of a Pakistani social service organisation in New York:

Those rich Desi’s just pretend like there are no problems here. The Imams do the same. They all want to send their money and volunteer their time to help poor people in Pakistan, but don’t want to lift a finger to help Pakistanis suffering here in New York. Many of them act like big shots when they go back to Pakistan…they’ll say, ‘look at all the good I have done for the country, show me some respect!’ It’s bad enough that the foundations and the city don’t give us anything, but when you have these rich Pakistanis doing the same thing, it really hurts and shows you how divided the community is between the have nots and have nots.

Similar frustration against transnational organisations was also found among locally-focus Pakistani organisations in Toronto. As a member of the executive board of a Pakistani organisation working on housing issues in Toronto puts it:

Yes, [there are tensions] but the tensions are not like in your face. […] But the tensions rise when it comes to getting people to donate or attend our dinners. At the end of the day, poor Pakistanis are not going to donate to organisations. Only the Pakistanis with money will donate. So all of us are trying to use our networks to get donations. There is this myth that the government funds ethnic organisations in Canada, but it just isn’t true. Every time we apply for a government grant, we never get it! We rely mainly on donations. But the big [transnational] Pakistani charities have lots of big shots working for them. They use their connections to bring famous singers from Pakistan or something and hold big event and raise like 20,000 dollars in one night. We don’t get the same kind of people at our events because rich Pakistani here don’t want to be bothered about other Pakistanis struggling here. They just focus their resources on Pakistani because I think they feel guilty for everyone they left behind.

In general, the competition for scarce resources found in both the Toronto and New York Pakistani IOS generated tensions between local and transnationally-oriented organisations thus reflecting the growing class polarisation within both communities. The interview data also reveal
misconceptions regarding assumptions that multiculturalism policies offer material and symbolic support for immigrant organisations in Toronto.

6 Discussion and conclusions

Immigrant non-profit organisations are central to processes of settlement, integration and transnationalism. These organisations help new immigrants settle and integrate into the social, economic and civic fabric of their new home societies, and help maintain linkages to their homeland. Drawing on key perspectives from existing research this study examined nine hypotheses in light of the findings from our comparative study. One of the most important findings is the counterintuitive effect of the context of reception on the size, diversity in programmatic action, and geographic scope of the organisational spaces. The inclusive official state-sponsored multicultural context of reception associated with the city of Toronto does not appear to be the strong, positive factor promoting the formation of a larger immigrant organisational space, as previous studies have reported it to be. In contrast to previous research examining the role of official multiculturalism as a mechanism fostering immigrants' organisational capacity (Bloemraad 2005), in the case of Pakistani migrants, the active state-sponsored multicultural support in the form of symbolic or material resources does not seem to unleash immigrants’ organisational capacity as expected. Conversely, a rather hostile post-9/11 context of reception ruled by a hands-off US laissez-faire system of governance coupled with successful socioeconomic incorporation appears to be more conducive for the construction of large Pakistani immigrant organisational space with more complex morphology vis-à-vis Pakistanis in Toronto.

The state’s role by itself, we argue, does not constitute a sufficient condition or explanatory factor of the process at hand. Rather, the effects of state’s policies seem to be contingent on immigrants’ mode of socioeconomic incorporation and internal social stratification. Our evidence suggests that a state-sponsored multicultural, inclusive context of reception could prove insufficient a factor to promote immigrant organisational capabilities if it is accompanied by an economic context that does not adequately reward immigrants’ human capital. Conversely, the evidence suggests that in a labour market in which immigrants’ human capital tends to be fairly rewarded, their organisational capabilities and spatial scope significantly expands, even if they encounter a hostile sociocultural reception, as in the case of Pakistanis in NYC. In other words, immigration and integration policies tend to ‘scratch the surface’ with respect to both socioeconomic incorporation and organisational capacity. It appears that the socioeconomic contexts of reception and non-migration related policies within an organisational environment may ultimately be the determining factor shaping the composition and scope of a migrant group’s organisational space. At the same time, it is very important to emphasize here that the immigrant organisational space’s morphology could neither be attributed, nor explained solely by immigrant groups’ social and human resources, as if they were dis-embedded, ‘independent’ variables. For such resources are embedded in specific contexts in which they are variously valued or devalued, depending on the conditions of specific contexts of reception. This explains why, for example, Pakistani communities possessing very similar human capital characteristics ended up experiencing very different social conditions and having quite different organisational spaces in Toronto and NYC.

In this sense, we submit, the structure and composition of immigrant organisational spaces are mostly shaped by immigrants’ mode of incorporation and socioeconomic environments, rather than migration policies 'from above'. Immigrant organisational capacities do not depend just on the state’s action or omission, but rather on the resources their mode of incorporation allows them to build and accumulate upon arriving - not necessarily those they have brought with them. Immigrants’ mode of incorporation has to do with the way in which their presence is negotiated and dealt with by the receiving society, not simply as new members of society with a different culture, but also how they are perceive
and accepted as members with equal access to socioeconomic rewards on par with the native-born national members.

Organisational spaces are mostly formed by organisations with a local scope of action – seeking to facilitate immigrants’ settlement and incorporation. Meanwhile, transnational organisations constitute a smaller fraction of immigrant organisational spaces. Contrary to the expectation that Canadian multiculturalism will foster a more transnationally-oriented Pakistani organisational space, findings suggest the opposite is true. At first glance, it appears that the official symbolic and material support provided by the government to immigrant organisations constrains them from pursuing issues and activities that transcend national borders. The evidence collected, again, leads us to propose that it is the intersection between immigrants’ mode of incorporation and state policies that better explains the unequal distribution of transnational Pakistani organisations.

Alternatively, it could be argued that the greater number of transnational organisations in NYC may be explained by the absence of official multiculturalism and that the lack of interaction between NYC-based organisations and the state translates into more organisational autonomy—enabling organisations to pursue a wider repertoire of spatial options beyond the city. However, we counter, such autonomy would never be possible to realize, unless the Pakistani community accumulated enough of the disposable resources necessary to finance transnational endeavours. To emphasize, state action or inaction by itself is not enough to spearhead neither immigrant organisational spaces, let alone organisations with a transnational scope.

A question that future research should address is how local and global processes of stigmatisation and racialization affect the spatial scope of organisational spaces serving a single migrant group across different places of settlement. In principle, it could be argued that stigmatised groups are less likely to create stable institutional linkages that foster transnational ties between the home country and migrants abroad. Thus, more scholarship should be devoted to the studies of cases in which geopolitical tensions have negatively impacted transnational linkages, making them more difficult to gain the level of stability and institutionalization reached in dozens of other cases where countries send large numbers of migrants abroad (Guarnizo et al 2003; Guarnizo and Chaudhary 2014; Rodriguez 2010; Smith 2006). Specifically, more comparative research is needed to examine how processes of racialization and/or stigma affect contexts of reception and in turn, how these racialized contexts impact immigrant organisations facilitating settlement, incorporation and transnational engagement.

Organisational spaces are social spaces in which societal conditions are reproduced. As seen in the Pakistani case examined here, organisational spaces are also the stage of social tensions and class skirmishes. Thus, contrary to existing studies in which immigrant communities are, for the most part, perceived as homogeneous social constructs, organisational spaces are conceived as arenas of open and subtle power struggles and social tensions. While processes of individual assimilation and transnationalism have been found to be complimentary among Latin American migrants (Guarnizo & Chaudhary 2014; Guarnizo et al 2003), at the level of organisations, these same processes present a different dynamic and character as organisations providing local incorporation services are perceived as institutionally diametrically opposed to those involved in transnational activities. Their antagonism is, in part, explained by the fact that both types of organisations represent different social groups and interests within the same immigrant, qua ethnic, group. Notwithstanding their divisions, both organisations are embedded in the same socio-political context, thus inexorably end up competing for the same scarce resources in a process that irremediably exacerbates the original social divisions separating their leaders. Evidently, many locally-focused Pakistani organisations resent the wealth they associate with Pakistani organisations facilitating transnational engagement with Pakistan. Many of these transnational Pakistani organisations are viewed by grass-roots integration/settlement
organisations with the same resentment reserved for international NGOs and multilateral organisations operating in Pakistan. The observed tensions between local and transnational Pakistani organisations, thus, reflect a growing fragmentation between affluent cosmopolitan elites and the impoverished segments of the Toronto and NYC Pakistani communities.
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