The Futility of Normalcy: Exploring the Impact of Historical and Contemporary Discrimination and Racism on South Asian Students' Unexpected Encounters With Difference

Daniel Soucy
BA Saint Joseph's University
MA Erasmus University: The International Institute of Social Studies
Primary Advisor: Dr. Amber Abbas, Saint Joseph's University

Abstract:

Key Words: Migration Histories, United States Immigration Policy, South Asia, Identity, Higher Education

Abstract: In an effort further document non-permanent arrivals' experiences as well as better understand the complexity inherent in navigating the United States as a young, foreign and often financially insecure student, this study utilizes in-depth, oral history interviews with six Indian graduate students learning and exploring life at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA during the 21st century. In documenting and exploring these students' histories, one can begin to better understand the extent to which the banalities of their day-to-day lives are reveal the more embedded impact that historical and contemporary discrimination in U.S. immigration policy has on student migrants.

More specifically, this paper seeks to demonstrate the extent to which historical injustices and discriminatory experiences continue to impact graduate students of Indian nationality's daily lives. Furthermore, in light of major changes in immigration policy during the 20th century as well as a globalizing society in which belonging is idealized as universal, these experiences demonstrate the ways in which U.S. society prevents foreign students from accessing a sense of normalcy or inclusion in U.S. society. In exploring these narrators' life histories, we see that despite making the decision to invest their resources in the United States through education and subsequently putting up with endless challenges acclimating to a new society, generation after generation of South Asian students are perpetually prohibited from being fully included in U.S. society. Therefore, this paper argues that within the context of a globalizing world as well as a overtly racist immigration system in the United States, contextualizing these experiences within 20th century policy, serves to highlight the ways in which contemporary foreign students confront a sense of unanticipated difference and exclusion from the "normalcy" of U.S. society.

Complicating South Asian Identity in the 21st Century

In an effort to complicate traditional notions of South Asian identity, the popular Indian-American stand-up comedian Hari Kondabolu created "The Problem with Apu", a 49 minute critique against the stereotypical characterization of South Asian Americans in the legendary TV show *The Simpsons.* By focusing on Apu, the only prominent South Asian character in the show, Kondabolu narrates what it has meant for him to grow up Indian in an American society that brushes over complexity when characterizing South Asian individuals (Melamedoff, 2017). However, he does not only provide personal, anecdotal evidence but also utilizes other newly prominent South Asian actors' stories in the context of the (United Sttae's) (U.S.) immigration history. In doing so, he illustrates the extent to which South Asians struggle for real representation and reasonable depictions of their experiences. In commanding his frustration at the fact that *The Simpsons'* dynasty not only poorly depicted but also exploited the South Asian community through Apu, he assesses dominant notions of South Asian identity in the U.S. consciousness as unilateral, primitive and simplistic.

As obvious as this may seem to any South Asian or knowledgeable outsider, South Asian immigrants and their descendants are, like all of us, complex. Their histories demonstrate competing fears, ambitions and hopes as well as mundane day-to-day experiences. And yet, as Kondabolu demonstrates, even more recent depictions of South Asian experiences often fail to account for the realities of living as a South Asian and especially as a temporary student from South Asia studying in the United States (Melamedoff, 2017). Namely, students represent around 19 percent of all temporary visa allocations from the US Department of State each year (Esterline and Batalova, 2022). Within this category of temporary or non-immigrant visa holders, South Asian individuals are disproportionately represented across various fields of higher education (Diverse Issues in Higher Education, 2000). Yet, in the media, South Asian students and South Asian individuals more broadly are underrepresented, even in comparison to their East Asian peers (Nielsen, 2021). When depicted, South Asian communities are predominantly represented in stereotypical ways, often as second or third generation immigrants pursuing successful careers in science, technology, engineering or math (Mamtora, 2022). Furthermore, since the attacks on the world trade center on September 11, 2001, hate crimes against South Asian Americans have increased (*South Asian Americans Leading Together, 2022).* In addition, recent studies also show that half of all Indian Americans have reported discrimination in the past 12 months despite their high levels of financial stability compared to other immigrant groups (Badrinathan et al, 2021). These are not isolated incidents. Rather, by placing caps on the number of visas allotted to South Asian immigrants, students continue to face challenges accessing a permanent living situation even after graduating from and working in the United States (Kourth, 2021). However, these experiences seem to take a back seat across media and academic representations.

In an effort to further document how this precarity impacts (potentially) non- permanent students' experiences as well as better understand the complexity inherent in navigating the United State's racist and discriminatory immigration history as young, foreign and often financially insecure students, this study utilizes in-depth, oral history interviews with six Indian graduate students learning and exploring life at Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania during the 21st century. In light of major changes in immigration policy during the 20th century as

well as a globalizing society in which belonging is idealized as universal, these experiences demonstrate the ways in which U.S. society prevents foreign students from accessing a sense of normalcy or total inclusion. In exploring these narrators' life histories, we see that despite making the decision to invest their resources in the United States through education and subsequently putting up with endless challenges acclimating to a new society, generation after generation of South Asian students are perpetually prohibited from being fully included in U.S. society. In documenting these students' histories and comparing them with student experiences from the 20th century, it is clear how globalization and the United State's exclusionary, if not overtly racist immigration system causes students to confront a sense of unanticipated difference and marginality from the "normalcy" of the U.S. society.

Methodology, Historical Context and Ethical Considerations

This investigation is centered around a variety of oral historical sources and foreign students' experiences adjusting to life in the United States. The researcher conducted one-on-one oral-history interviews over the course of 3 months in early 2018 with six graduate students from India attending Saint Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Although the questions changed based on the unique experiences and life histories of the individual narrator, the interviews generally began by focusing on the narrators' lives growing up in India. They then focused on asking about their experience deciding to travel abroad for education, their preparation for departure and finally, their experiences adjusting to academic life in the United States. Short biographies about each of these narrators are available in Appendix 1.

To further contextualize the position of these life histories, Saint Joseph's University is located on the county line between Philadelphia and Lower Merion Township in Pennsylvania (Saint Joseph's University, 2018). Furthermore, it currently enrolls 8,066 individuals in all of its programs, 4,688 of which are traditional undergraduate students and 2,941 are graduate students (2018). Tuition for the academic year 2017-2018 was $43,700 (2018). More specifically related to the Indian student population, there were 62 graduate students from India and 1 graduate student from Pakistan enrolled in Saint Joseph's University in March 2018 (Halpern, 2018). 51 of these 62 students were enrolled in the Haub School of Business while 11 were enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. 26 of these students were female and 36 were male (Halpern, 2018).

In this context, oral history provided the best discipline for this research because scholarly literature often exclusively focuses on permanent immigration experiences. For this reason, it was important not only to understand these journeys but also to consider the specific context of their families, life histories and prior decisions. As Boyle et al. explain in their conversation on oral history and "humanist" approaches to migration, "A key element in this area of research has been to build up *migrant histories*, where individuals are traced through their lives and their biographies are built up, emphasis being placed upon the migrations that have shaped and have been shaped by these lives" (Boyle et al, 2014 p. 72). Therefore, rather than utilize targeted interviews about specific occurrences or difficulties this research attempted to contextualize the narrators experiences and memories within the individuals' historical and experiential context. Moreover, as a university that draws the majority of its students from

suburban, upper-middle class backgrounds (Saint Joseph's University, 2018), international voices are not always at the forefront of the University's collective memory and institutional history. Thus, oral history provided a mechanism for documenting stories that might otherwise be forgotten.

Considering oral history as a strategy for documenting and learning from migration experiences, it is also important to note some of the ethical considerations of this research. Although all the narrators agreed to be interviewed, signed a waiver consenting to the interview and ultimately maintained the right to withdraw this consent at any time, they were also temporary U.S. residents and students. As a result of these two positions, it was clear that many of these narrators wanted to obtain a job and permanently live in the United States after graduation. Many of them are also young and actively making new social connections in unfamiliar environments.

Therefore, this research had the potential to unwittingly make compromising information about their lives publicly available. More specifically, they may not consider the fact that their professors, colleagues and even unaffiliated researchers could access the recordings if they were automatically placed in an internet or physical archive. To quell these concerns without losing the interviews' value as publicly available, authentic historical sources, each narrator had the opportunity not only to approve the research purposes but also to approve each specific, potential use of the interviews after being informed about the risks each use could entail. Thus, in addition to having the option to withdraw their involvement in this research at any time, the narrators were able to partake in the interview and contribute to this paper without consenting to specific, potentially more risky uses (e.g. for deposit in an internet archive). In addition, although oral history is exempt from institutional review processes, the research proposal, consent form and tentative questionnaire received an official exemption from Saint Joseph's Institutional Review Board. Again, the consent forms are available in appendix 2.

Finally, as a white student who was born in the United States, it is impossible not to recognize the researcher's own positionality in documenting these histories. Although the researcher lived and worked in India and additionally, has navigated being a foreign student as well as attempts to permanently immigrate abroad, as this paper will demonstrate, the US immigration context and history has a uniquely marginalizing impact on students of color, especially those from the developing world. While oral history is inherently useful in that it provides an opportunity to contextualize and begin to appreciate the narrator's individual experiences and identity, the researcher will never fully understand the narrators' experiences and emotions. However, the researcher hopes that by developing relationships with the narrators through shared meals, reflections on our mutual experiences living in India, Hindi-speaking sessions and time spent studying together, they were able to begin to demonstrate the impact that history and policy has on South Asian students in the United States. For this, the researcher would like to thank and acknowledge each of the narrators' and reviewers' significant contributions without which, this paper would not exist.

Pre-1965 Indian and Asian Immigration Law in the United States

Before examining South Asian migration stories to the United States, it is critical to understand how immigration law and national sentiment toward immigration have restricted Asian and South Asian migration experiences in the 20th century. Despite its emergence in reconstruction era efforts to enact greater racial equality between White and Black individuals in the United States, the 1870 naturalization act cemented immigrant racial divisions and thus excluded immigrants who were not included in these two racial categories. More specifically, the law expanded naturalization eligibility to "aliens being free white persons, and to aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent" (Smith, 2002). The act also dictated immigration allowances based on race rather than merely geographical location. While prior to the act, only so-called "White" individuals (better understood as western European nationals) could migrate to the United States, the 1870 Act, expanded the rights and inclusion of former slaves (Daniels, 1990). However, it was also rooted in a racist world view that sought to maintain cultural homogeneity, social distinction and economic protection for "white" individuals born within the United States' territory. As such, it did not permit naturalization for all individuals but rather merely for those that could identify themselves as White. Between 1880 and 1889, a mere 247 individuals of Indian descent obtained legal permanent residence (Daniels. 1990). In accordance with the law, it can also be assumed that no individuals of Indian descent naturalized to gain full citizenship. Thus, it is important to note the way in which this act excluded Asians from any sort of equal engagement in the U.S. society while simultaneously perpetuating hegemonic notions of belonging as contingent on an undefined notion of whiteness.

Disputes over the act have also further cemented its xenophobic intentions. In 1922, the Supreme Court denied Tadeo Ozawa citizenship by defining the 1870 statute's use of the word "White" as equivalent to Caucasian (Daniels, 1990). Based on socially constructed racial and ethnic categories, the court decided that Ozawa was not white because he was not Caucasian. Therefore, he was also not eligible for citizenship. However, this ruling allowed the well-known Indian immigrant Bhagat Singh Thind to contend that he was a citizen since he, unlike Ozawa, was Caucasian (Daniels, 1990). Although it may seem counterintuitive based on popular understandings of Caucasian identity that an individual from India is Caucasian, it is important to note that the word Caucasian merely describes someone who's ancestry is from southeastern Europe (Painter, 2003). However, in 1923, the Supreme Court again changed its perspective instead stating that white "was to be construed 'in the understanding of the common man'" and as such, Thind's claim to whiteness was unsubstantiated since most individuals would not categorize him as white (Daniels, 2002). Thus Thind's case caused more orders demanding that Indian immigrants either demonstrate their citizenship or leave the United States (Daniels, 2002).

Furthermore, the 1917 Immigration Act, prohibited individuals from Afghanistan to East Asia (with the exception of Japan and the Philippines) from entering the United States (Agarwal, 2017). With congressional creation of this Asiatic Barred Zone, individuals from Asia were thus officially considered less fit and less desirable for immigration purposes based on assumptions about their mental capacity, propensity for sex work and corrupted morals (*The University of Washington-Bothell Library*, 2018). In addition to further exiling already marginal communities within South Asian and Asian populations, it also serves to demonstrate the extent to which Asian immigrants were viewed as deviant in the United States. These restrictions on Asian

immigrants were further cemented in 1921 with the "National Origin Quota" which limited the total number of authorized immigrants from all regions to just 350,000 per year (Ngai, 1999).

In addition to barring individuals from entering the United States, the 1920s also gave rise to a series of Supreme Court decisions that prohibited individuals "ineligible to citizenship" from any sort of lease, ownership or control over U.S. land.[10] The severity of these court decisions is perhaps best displayed by the fact that Asian immigrants could not even own stock in a company "formed for the purpose of farming" (Chan, 2010 p. 220). As 20-46% of the total population of Indian migrants in California, Punjabi migrants played a critical role in California agriculture and were thus severely impacted by not merely immigration restriction but also these alien land laws (Leonard, 1985 p. 126). Based on this information, what many scholars call the "third wave" of immigration to the United States (roughly between the 1880s and the 1920s) was clearly riddled with barriers and racialized restrictions on immigration. Mae M. Ngai not only describes this era through the mobilization of "race-nativist political interests" and isolationism but also as a product of the "high nationalism" that seemed to be commonplace before, during and after World War One (2007). Most importantly, Ngai points out that to understand contemporary research on immigration to the United States, scholars must understand the sentiment behind this era as well as its ultimate impact. "The foundations of restrictive policy that were consolidated in the 1920s- a bureaucratic state regime based on border control, numerical quota, and the removal of illegal aliens- have remained solidly in place" (Ngai, 2007 p. 14). This cemented 'Asian' as a unique and stigmatized racial category that the United States viewed as threatening to U.S. society (Ngai, 1999).

After contending with policies that restricted their ability to belong in U.S. society for close to 8 decades, Indian immigrants began to see these policies become more relaxed with the advent of the 1946 Luce-Celler Act. While the bill failed to make it out of the Immigration committee in 1944 and 1945, President Truman eventually signed the bill in 1946 (Daniels, 1969). It reinstated naturalization rights for both South Asians and Filipinos . In addition, it loosened the universal ban on South Asian immigration by allowing 100 individuals from India to immigrate to the United States each year (South Asian American Digital Archive, 2014). In 1952, the McCarran-Walter Act officially broke down the rest of the Asiatic barred zone by similarly permitting naturalization as well as 100-person quota for immigrants from countries in the rest of South and East Asia (U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian). However, individuals of Asian descent born in or residing in a non-Asian country still counted 'against' their ancestral homeland's quota. While both the 1946 and 1952 acts claimed to base their caps on national origin, this categorization demonstrates that the United States was continuing to institutionalize racialized but often ambiguous understandings of Asian identity as they did with the 1870 naturalization act and the subsequent Thind case.

A Changed Society? The Post-1965 Immigration Era

With changing immigration ideologies in the 1950s and 60s, the United States enacted a sweeping restructuring of its immigration system in the summer of 1965. Most critically, the Hart-Celler Act, also known as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, eliminated the

national origin quota system that was first established in 1921 (DeSipio and de la Garza, 2015). In addition to raising caps on immigration, the law also expanded family reunification and prioritized skilled labor. More specifically, "immediate family members" (parents, spouses and children) did not count 'against' these caps thus allowing for far more individuals to immigrate to the United States through their family and professional connections (Brown, 2006). As a result, the number of Asian immigrants and in particular, skilled Indian immigrants in the United States increased significantly (Zong and Batalova, 2017).

As one of the most impactful moments in the United States' immigration history, the Hart-Celler Act opened the doors for Asian and more specifically, Indian immigrants to become an important demographic group in U.S. society. Although its more substantive impacts have been most apparent in the past two decades with relatively major increases in the number of Indian immigrants coming to the United States, the act also created the opportunity for Indian students (and migrants more broadly) to come to the United States. Crucially, although the act was formally rooted in egalitarian rhetoric, various scholars note how it also garnered support based on the expectation that it would not have a major impact on native-born U.S. citizens (Tichenor, 2016). It is therefore important to note that even major shifts toward more accepting immigration policies in the United States during the 20th century were not based on a major ideological shift in either the legislature or citizenry's racialized and biased opinions of Asian immigrants. As such, these opinions and ideas have resurged, even becoming more explicit during Donald J. Trump's campaign for office as well as during his administration (Diallo, 2016). Seemingly arbitrary bans on categories of immigrants from particular nationalities in combination with a quick decline in the number of available student and non-immigrant visas (Esterline and Batalova, 2022; Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2022 and The White House, 2017). As the subsequent section will demonstrate, this combination of rhetoric and policy creates an increasingly competitive and precarious process that exasperates the narrators' experiences of difference and exclusion.

"I Am Not Sure What Will Happen Next": Visa Challenges and Restricting Belonging

Stemming from these contemporary visa reduction and historic discrimination against Asian immigration, the visa system's impact on the narrators interviewed is apparent. Not being able to obtain a visa prevented these aspirational foreign students from achieving their desire to start a life in the United States and take advantage of the emotional and financial investment they made as foreign students. These concerns were heightened among students under the Trump administration, in turn influencing the extent to which narrators viewed studying in the United States as realistic and worthwhile for future generations.

Although each narrator had their own story regarding their process applying for an F1 or F2 visa, Tanmay and Prasad's experience best highlights the stress associated with the application processes. Tanmay discussed the in-depth planning and time commitment required from the application Because he was working and studying while applying for his visa, it took Tanmay two years before he successfully completed his application and received his visa in 2017. Despite his typically relaxed personality, Prasad highlighted the insecurity he felt as he

watched other aspirational students at the embassy get their applications rejected (Prasad, 2018).

In addition to the impact that the F1/F2 visa process had on these individuals' ability and sense of security leaving India, they also expressed the extent to which the H-1B visa for work after graduation inhibited their ability to feel like confident and normal members of society. As Anuj anxiously shared,

> Every day it makes me nervous! [Anuj raised his voice slightly. He sounded exacerbated but also confident in what he was saying] At every job application they are asking… "You want a sponsor if you are going to work here?" And if you say yes, your resume will not be picked. It will be like, always a profile. Even if I am like meeting all the requirements of the job, I will not get it…During the interviews, they like ask us a lot of questions. "Okay what's your visa status?" So [instead of] asking me about my profile, what I've learned, [the] first question will be, "What's your visa status? (Anuj, 2018).

For Anuj, the need for an H-1B visa limited his competitiveness as a professional job applicant and restricted his ability to look forward with assurance and certainty. Despite investing in his future by coming to Saint Joseph's University, Anuj felt that employers solely considered the perceived burden of his immigration status. Anuj's concerns regarding his ability to obtain a work visa undermined his goals to live and work as a data analyst in the United States. Despite expecting to fully belong as a student in the United States, his inability to fully access the same opportunities as his American peers demonstrates the clear ways in which 1965 did not mark a real change in the inclusion of Asian immigrants in the population. Rather, Anuj's experience highlights Sharmila Rudrappa's argument that the U.S. government has merely exploited highly skilled migrant workers for its own benefit (2008). Through this lens and through Anuj's experiences, the opportunity to pursue education in the United States is less an opportunity to mutually benefit from immersion in U.S. society as much as it is a program intended to maintain the United States' access to foreign funds and talent pools without substantively changing its demography.

This same threat was also apparent during the conversation with Shinjini. While discussing the process she went through to obtain her F1 visa, she considered the impact that changing visa policies and rhetoric regarding immigration had on her experience in the United States and hopes for the future.

> I try to avoid those news to be very honest because that becomes very unsettling. It seems like we're not comfortable but on what grounds we do not know because you are not here illegally. You are here very much legally, very much because somebody said, yes you can come. And even if you work it's on that terms that yes you are saying that yes we can work (Shinjini, 2018).

As Shinjini continued to reflect on the shifting immigration climate, namely the call for restrictions on the H1-B visa, it was clear to me that she felt nervous about her future as an Indian in the United States. In addition to amplifying her feeling of difference, Shinjini's experience demonstrates the extent to which the Trump administration's policies and rhetoric on

immigration have undermined foreign students' ability to feel confident socially and academically. Obviously, Shinjini is authorized to be in the United States. However, as she notes, even this stable legal status feels insecure considering the history of violence, exclusion and restriction that the first few sections described. As a result, Shinjini tried to avoid thinking about the perpetual uncertainty of her status and potential for exclusions.

Changing challenges for visa applicants and long-term workers also impacted the extent to which Anuj viewed studying in the United States as a worthwhile and intelligent decision for future students. In fact, Anuj was hesitant to encourage friends in India to study in the United States.

> So I tell them the whole scenario: This is what I am facing. I am applying for jobs. I am not getting it. And you are investing a lot of money. And you have to think about how you will be like, whether you will be able to survive or not. So I tell them honestly like, even I am not sure what will happen next (Anuj, 2018).

Because of the barriers that the H1-B system created for Anuj's professional success in the United States, he also shares his own uncertainty as a clear reason for future students to critically consider avoiding a similar experience. In doing so, Anuj demonstrated his exacerbation with the larger immigration system. Although he invested time and energy not just as a student but also as a student adjusting to a wide variety of severe differences in the United States, he was unable to pursue the professional opportunities he so desperately sought. In sharing his feelings of dissatisfaction, he further illuminated the threat that this system poses to his future as well as his emotional and financial investment.

Shinjini and Anuj's frustration is further contextualized in ethnographer Susan Thomas's specific investigation of South Asian nationals studying in the United States (2013). By interviewing South Asian students in New York City, Thomas noticed how foreign students faced similar difficulties as migrant workers when attempting to fully access the benefits of their education because of the academic system's exploitative structure (2013). Like the H-1B system, universities rely on foreign students but do not proactively support their sense of belonging and inclusion in the campus environment. Thomas explains, "Educating foreign students not only represents a highly lucrative enterprise, these students also often serve as vital intellectual and technical labor at universities and are crucial figures in the knowledge economy. This global market-driven trend to internationalize universities and the resulting increase in student migrations are features of the neo liberalization of higher education" (2013, p. 3). In addition to feeding into a system that functions on temporary immigrant labor, Thomas argues that South Asian students in the United States are forced to contend with layers of racial stigmatization and hierarchy. Thus, these two forces serve to undermine South Asians ability to belong in U.S. society and further marginalize their identities (2013). From this perspective, Anuj, Shinjini and the rest of the narrators are not isolated nor just a part of historical trends but rather critically ingrained in a larger system that acts against their best interests.

Aside from considering the total control that the U.S. immigration system has in determining these individuals' ability to remain a part of U.S. society, it is also important to

consider the broader globalized context in which these experiences take place. As many narrators bring to light in the rest of this analysis, globalization seems to portray a 'new' world in which difference and belonging are eradicated in favor of a more homogenized and inclusive society. In line with this logic, many of my narrators expected their networks and experiences in the United States to align with their experiences in India. Within a globalized society, visas which restrict who is allowed to belong in a particular place appear counterintuitive. Of course, in academic settings, scholars like Sheila Croucher point out that globalization does not merely homogenize culture and society (2004). Rather, it also creates spaces of exclusion and backlash.[28] International students come to the United States seeking the egalitarian message that 1965 seemed to promulgate and globalization theoretically supports. Thus, their expectations for their educational experiences are centered around rhetorical support for their belonging in the United States. While one might argue that these individuals should have anticipated these legal challenges in the United States, it is important to note that these narrators were all highly educated individuals from urban backgrounds in which western companies, ideals, advertising and culture continue to be prominent. Their expectations for the United States were not rooted in a lack of exposure to Western society. Instead, globalization, in combination with the United States' own rhetoric regarding its own egalitarian identity created a liberal expectation for belonging regardless of one's background.

Therefore, while changes in the U.S. immigration system and the broader structure of global society seem to promise inclusion, contemporary student experiences struggling through the visa process reveals how this is not the case. Although Indian students' experiences attempting to take advantage of the United States' egalitarian, globalized identity are highly unique, mundane differences in their lifestyles serve as a constant reminder that their authentic belonging in the United States is unattainable and their futures perpetually under threat.

"Things Are Different Here": Lifestyle and Belonging

While anxieties pertaining to visas result from specific laws, restrictions and rhetoric, the impact of the United States contradictory message and history of exclusion also emerges in specific, seemingly unrelated moments of confusion and frustration in the everyday life of these narrators. Indeed, based on this context, they often expected preparation to be critical. However, they also expected there would be many commonalities between their lifestyles in India and their lifestyles in the United States. Instead, they encountered unexpected differences. In these moments, where everything took on a foreign character, attempting to gain a sense of belonging in U.S. society and construct a more permanent life often felt hopeless. While this may seem like a natural consequence of studying in a foreign country, this section will demonstrate how these feelings in fact emerge from and compound with the United States' racialized and restrictive immigration system. As a result, foreign students attempting to 'merely' acclimate to unanticipated lifestyle differences feel like they are battling against exclusion.

The impact that mundane, lifestyle differences have on feelings of belonging first became apparent as these narrators reflected on their experiences acclimating to food in the United States. Food traditions and more broadly, cultural traditions played a major role in each of these narrators' lives prior to and during their experiences in the United States. Many, if not all, attempted to prepare and account for the differences between their culinary and cultural traditions in India and those which are common in the United States. For example, each of the narrators brought an Indian pressure cooker with them to the United States as well as spices critical to their family's typical meals. While both objects demonstrate the important role that food plays in ensuring comfort and familiarity, the pressure cookers stood out because they are large, heavy and otherwise inconvenient to pack in a suitcase. Thus, the decision to bring a pressure cooker to the United States highlights not just its importance as a tool for cooking pulses and rice but also the value that these individuals placed on having the ability to recreate and find comfort in familiar cuisine. Despite this very intentional effort to prepare for changes to the most routine aspects of their lives, these foreign students were still confronted with moments in which they encountered broader cultural differences. In these unanticipated moments, where even the most banal aspects of my narrators' lives came to feel unfamiliar, community support and advanced knowledge of the challenge proved extremely useful in mitigating their unease.

As Anuj and I discussed the ways in which he prepared for his experience as a foreign student, he described, with great detail, the extent to which the differences between fast food in the United States and India impacted and disrupted the lifestyle he anticipated in U.S. society. More specifically, Anuj was familiar with and even comfortable eating at fast food restaurants like McDonald's in India however, he quickly found the menu in the United States to be extremely different. As a result, he went to McDonald's on his first day to eat while exploring Philadelphia. He recalled,

> So in McDonald's I find Aloo Tikki or I find like those Veggie burgers but here there was no veggie burger. Here all the meat was there. I am not a meat person. So for me…and they said, "Salad." For us salad is like side thing it's not food. And here people like eating salad. I said, "No!" Because my I have a big appetite because we eat like grains…so for me that was not filling (Anuj, 2018).

Rather than assume that McDonald's would be an unfamiliar experience in an unfamiliar country, Anuj expected to find many of the same options that he had found during his upbringing in North India. Although Anuj expected to feel different in the United States, he did not expect McDonald's to be different. Precisely because the change was unexpected, it created a moment of surprise; an experience filled with sudden reflection on the ways in which his lifestyle—as a vegetarian—made him feel different from mainstream U.S. society. This was exasperated by the fact that McDonald's has taken on such a widespread role in globalized food-ways (Barber, 1992). Anuj viewed all McDonald's as homogenous rather than impacted by place. Although the previous sections demonstrate the extent to which Anuj anticipated social challenges and thus prepared to confront them by developing deep connections with alumni and community members, the mundane, regular and routine aspects of his lifestyle caused the most

shocking moments in his transition. This example in particular highlights the ways in which globalization has complicated understandings and feelings of belonging in the 21st century.

This difference, on its own may have seemed incredibly banal and potentially meaningless to Anuj's experience in the United States. However, in combination with the feelings of fear and isolation associated with the United States historical and contemporary exclusionary rhetoric and policy pertaining to immigration, Anuj's expectation that his lifestyle in the United States would mirror what he experienced in India, exasperated his existing sense of insecurity. These unanticipated changes thus amplified Anuj's feelings of difference from the rest of society.

This point is further demonstrated by the ways in which a sense of inclusion and security helped mitigate this fear and subsequent sense of difference for other narrators. Unlike Anuj's confused reaction to his culinary surprises, some of the other narrators reacted to food differences with excitement or even fascination. In particular, Heema and Mokshita fondly remembered some of their first interactions with new food in the United States. Indeed, Heema was excited to share her experience trying new restaurants in Philadelphia, noting,

> Oh yeah, I told you my sister… she's a big Thai fan. So trust me, I have been to all the good Thai places around. I've tried all the cuisine and everything. After like, the first time I tried sushi, I was like what the hell is this!? And it tastes like nothing and then when you it it's so spicy! (2018).

Heema expressed a sense of interest and engagement when remembering this particularly unique opportunity to taste sushi. Even though Heema's opinion of sushi may seem obvious from her initial response, in this moment, it felt necessary to clarify her memory. After asking, "so did you you not enjoy it?" she quickly clarified,

> No! For the first time they actually took a video of me trying it and I was not doing it. So they just recorded my reaction and then they were like, "Heema you are so funny" (2018).

Heema's memory of experiencing a food extremely unusual to her was clearly not a palatable one. Nevertheless, as she remembered this experience, Heema did not express the same confusion, disorientation and sense of discomfort as Anuj. While Heema went into her new culinary adventure surrounded by a community that made her aware of the unusual food she would be tasting, Anuj went to McDonald's seeking comfort and security. Unlike McDonald's which has taken on a global identity that is supposed to be familiar and uniform, Heema intentionally diverged from her typical diet. Meanwhile, Anuj was not only going through an unanticipated change in his environment but also encountering this change alone. In the context of restrictive US rhetoric and policy, he felt demarcated as particularly different and unusual.

The same sense of security and comfort that Heema was able to find when engaging and reflecting humorously on her sushi adventure became clear when talking to Mokshita about some of her first experiences with food in the United States. Like Heema, Mokshita's existing social connection with her husband helped to facilitate her transition to U.S. food in a less

stressful manner. Unlike Anuj who found food independently on his first day in the United States, Mokshita's first meal was a potato sandwich with coffee. Not only was this combination recognizable to her, but her husband also made the sandwich and coffee for her in turn furthering her sense of appreciation, enjoyment and familiarity with the meal. Although one might argue that this experience cannot be viewed in the same light as Anuj and Heema's precisely because it occurred in Mokshita's new home rather than in public, this difference is precisely what makes the experience so meaningful. Mokshita was eating her first meal in an unfamiliar environment, however, she maintained a sense of confidence and belonging because of her existing connection.

Furthermore, during her experiences eating in public restaurants, Mokshita, like many of the other narrators, was worried she would accidentally eat something with beef in it. When she spoke about her Hindu cultural background and consequently how she often asks her server what dishes contain beef, it was important to ask if this was something that she thought about during her first few days in the United States. Mokshita replied,

> Yeah initially it was difficult for me to read the menu because they have many ingredients which I do not know or I am not aware about so I have to ask my husband okay, what kind of thing is this? And few names I can't even pronounce. [laughter] So, yeah but now I'm used to it.[33]

Even in this short memory, Mokshita made it tremendously clear through her statements and emotions during the interview that she had not reflected on the fact that adhering to her vegetarian diet in the United States could be burdensome. While the new menus and foods in the United States were unfamiliar and concerning to her, she was able to lean on the same support network that prepared her first meal. Mokshita's husband not only served as an initial point of social contact but also as an individual with experience sustaining cultural norms in a foreign and sometimes unaccommodating environment. Much like Heema, Mokshita remembered with humor, rather than embarrassment, the significant challenge of trying a new society's food. This reaction in large part resulted from the fact that she had a social network to support her throughout the experience and mitigate the disenfranchising feeling of difference that Anuj faced.

Despite relying on support from their Indian community to make new culinary experiences enjoyable rather than challenging, it is also important to note that many of my narrators struggled to find more routine and domestic ways of embracing not only their own culinary traditions but also new traditions in the United States. Even when preparing food in the home, there were challenges to ensuring a practical and comfortable food lifestyle. As Shinjini shared her desire to eat home-cooked Bengali food in the United States, she also reflected on her busy lifestyle and competing academic priorities. When I asked how she has coped with her various time commitments she said,

> To be very honest we haven't been able to come up with a solution because if you want to move to a very much of an American like a sandwich and that kind of a thing we can do that but then not more like 3 or 4 days like a week because then we start craving

> like… something's wrong. I don't know. That's actually something I'd like to know like what do the American dinner and lunch looks like and because I'm pretty sure there are more options than are visible to us because things that are visible to us is like sandwiches and burgers (Shinjini, 2018).

In addition to demonstrating the ways in which Shinjini craved familial recipes and thus relied on them for a sense of comfort, her experience also demonstrates how Indian food 'from home' can create a sense of comfort. Despite longing to engage with common foods in "American" cuisine, changing something so corporal and therefore engrained in her lifestyle suggested not just a major change to Shinjini's health and personal comfort but also one that seemed out of reach without significant experience or exposure to more Americans' lifestyles. While some of the narrators were able to tap into their social connections when experimenting with food outside of the home, for Shinjini, home-cooked Indian food created the closest experience to comfort for her. These challenges are thus not only related to moments of surprise but also to consistent and widely varied feelings of exclusion. Similarly, Sunil Bhatia, an ethnographer who studies Indian diasporas in the United States, utilizes dialogical analysis when studying South Asian migrants' experiences adjusting to life in Connecticut, illustrates the ways in which the kitchen and the wider home acted as an important haven of belonging and familiarity for the individuals she interviewed. Bhatia describes how one of her narrators hosted dinner parties with her Indian friends but without her American colleagues to minimize the stress and feelings of difference she felt when surrounded by individuals born in the United States (Bhatia, 2007 p. 135). Like Shinjini's experience, this portion of Bhatia's analysis illustrates how belonging is not merely defined in public moments of unfamiliarity with new food traditions but also in the private, domestic space. For Shinjini as well as the narrators involved in Bhatia's *American Karma*, Indian food offers an escape from external difficulty (2007). Rather than exclusively rely on a familiar community to foster connection, these narrators' experiences with food also demonstrate the importance of familiar lifestyles as a means of achieving belonging. Moreover, like Anuj's public experience, it demonstrates the challenges foreign students often face when trying to engage with their new surroundings in a meaningful way. Although globalization is meant to tear down barriers in belonging and provide all people with equitable access to global society, these narrators experienced belonging and exclusion as connected to these mundane experiences as a result of the policies and rhetoric undermining this globalized 'ideal.' As the rest of the narrators demonstrate, these moments, experiences of difference and strategies for dealing with difference are not merely related to food but rather with broader changes between their expectations for and realities of life in the United States.

Namely, Other essential lifestyle differences also challenged the narrators' ability to feel secure. In particular, Mokshita became extremely melancholic when asked about what she packed to prepare for life in the United States. She said that she very much missed being able to wear Indian clothing.[36] Despite this sense of loss, Mokshita expressed those feelings of difference prevented her from feeling confident wearing these clothes. Mokshita explained how she brought *kurtis, shalwar kameez* and *saris* with the expectation that she would wear them and

thus was surprised when she felt unable to do so. When pressed to explain why she felt unable to wear her Indian clothes in the United States, she explained,

> Just, I feel awkward wearing them. Because if you have a Indian society somewhere and everybody is wearing similar clothes then it makes sense. If I wear those clothes and come to university, it won't look good (Mokshita, 2018).

Although Mokshita did not find it challenging to adjust to new foods, she felt uncomfortable wearing the clothing that she once felt most confident in. Mokshita was surprised, as Anuj was, to find that her expectations for normalcy in the United States vastly differed from her reality. Although Anuj's memory was marked by a more intense visceral reaction of disgust and confusion, when looking back on her experience, it was visibly and audibly clear that Mokshita felt challenged and saddened when reflecting on this experience during the interview. Particularly considering the relative ease with which she has traveled to the other side of the world to sustain her relationship and ultimately pursue education, Mokshita's experience with clothing is surprising. Coming from a major Indian city, where western and Indian clothing are both worn without thought or concern, Mokshita expected to find that she could feel comfortable wearing any of her clothes in the United States. However, the only time Mokshita felt comfortable wearing her Indian clothes was at a small Diwali celebration with other Indian students. Therefore, Mokshita was surprised by her feeling of difference and reacted by homogenizing Indian identity with the rest of U.S. society.

Mokshita also emphasized her new and sudden fear of vehicle transportation when asked about her memories from her first day in the United States. Coming from India, Mokshita implicitly expected the driver's seat to be on the right side, rather than the left side, of the car. Therefore, she walked to the wrong side of the car and was fearful of this difference. When asked if this fear changed her behavior at all or if she ultimately adjusted to the transportation differences, Mokshita said,

> Even today I am scared. I love driving till now….I am bit scared. In India I used to drive, but here, I don't know. I'm bit scared. I prefer using public transport (Mokshita, 2018).

Unlike her social experience, this seemingly minor difference was not at the forefront of her thoughts and concerns. As a routine aspect of daily life, Mokshita did not consider the ways in which transportation might impact her emotional and psychological well-being as well as her sense of belonging in U.S. society. This moment of unexpected difference created a new array of difficulty and fear for Mokshita. Thus, her experience further illuminates the extent to which emotional moments of unpredictability severely impair foreign students' ability to fully acclimate to lifestyle differences in the United States.

Many of these narrators also felt insecure about their ability to interact with Americans in a way that was perceived as normal. For example, Prasad brought to light the ways in which

linguistic insecurity intensified his feelings of difference despite the fact that he grew up learning English in school and at home. As he explained,

> I used to speak in English yes. But you always had someone somewhere who speaks your native tongue. And it was just English all around you. And also it is completely different the way they speak. The dialect and the vocabulary also is different because India uses British English. Like for instance, I say the word fireworks, in India we call it as crackers. Here crackers are actually the crackers that we eat (Prasad, 2018).

Prasad expected that his English would allow him to fit in with the rest of U.S. society. Instead, it illuminated his position apart from most of the individuals he interacted with in Philadelphia. Although Prasad did not express the same concern and confusion that Anuj and Mokshita did when thinking back on their experiences, he did remember feeling insecure not being able to speak English in the same way as his counterparts. This difference further demonstrates the ways in which Prasad was suddenly forced to confront exclusion in new and unanticipated ways. Like Anuj who expected McDonald's to be the same, Prasad was basing his understanding of the U.S. on a globalizing context as well as the United State's egalitarian message. In reality, life in the United States continued to mark him as different or unusual.

Prasad's sense of belonging was also routinely disrupted in the United States due to his extremely long last name and the immigration authority's attempt to routinely document and vet his presence in US society. In addition to expressing frustration at the fact that few people were able to pronounce his name or understand its roots, Prasad also found that his full name rarely fit onto his identification cards.

> My I-20 had a different last name. My Saint Joe's ID card has all three names together as a single last name. My driver license has a different last name. My bank card has a different last name. Social security has a different last name. So when I go to some place to show my proof, like I need to show 2,3 different proof to actually show that's me (Prasad, 2018).

Although his name was viewed as normal in India, in the United States it created new and unexpected difficulties that Prasad could only alleviate by changing his name through an arduous and emotional process. In consideration of the United State's racialized immigration context, Prasad's name provided a clear indication that he was not the same as his fellow classmates, neighbors or colleagues. Importantly, this challenge also specifically relates to the ease with which he could go through legal identification processes like obtaining a visa. This mundane experience amplified other fears of legal, social and cultural exclusion. Thus, in addition to noticing his linguistic differences in the supermarket, many of Prasad's experiences were also shaped by this initial, unexpected divergence from the status quo.

Shinjini also discussed some of the difficulties that she found when attempting to interact with other students born in the United States. She noted that she always thought about whether or

not her social interactions were acceptable or strange to the American students around her. Shinjini shared one particularly poignant example:

> So it is very common in our community to ask how much you earn. Okay, it's nothing… like I'm going to steal your money, I'm just asking. I just want to compare notes. It is offensive probably in the American culture to ask how much you earn or something. And it is sometimes if people ask me… should I say or not because of a comparison kind of thing (2018).

Shinjini's struggle to navigate social interactions in a manner that U.S. society deems appropriate prevented her from interacting with the surrounding society. Taken alone, this experience is certainly difficult. However, taken in the context of the exploitative immigration system and legacy of racism that plagues the United States', this mundane difference acts as yet another powerful reminder of Shinjini's precarious situation. As Thomas further points out in her study regarding South Asian student experiences in the United States, "Rather than homogeneously framing these students as global elites, these experiences demonstrate that students' legal status, class backgrounds, and cultural differences position them in particular raced and classed ways at the university, and inform their ideas and practices of community and belonging as transnational students in the US" (2013, p. 253). As this investigation demonstrates and as Thomas explains, foreign students are not merely experiencing the United States as privileged individuals with the unique opportunity to travel the world (2013). Rather, they are making a crucial decision to seek opportunity and potentially a long-term life in the United States. However, upon arriving, they do not find the inclusion and homogeneity that the 1965 Act and globalization seem to advertise. This context is thus an integral part of these students' widely varied but ultimately discriminatory experiences. Because Indian students do not face just one major change or adjustment but instead a whole slew of changes to what they often expected to be 'normal' and comfortable based on their globalized understandings of the world around them, they are often confronted with fear, confusion and insecurity.

Conclusion: "And Sometimes You Feel like You Came for This?"

Despite wide variations in these narrators' experiences, their distinctive familial and social connections, triumphs and challenges also overlap in critical and poignant ways. Compounded by and contributing to the inherent difficulties that each narrator found in connecting with their new societies, many individuals also encountered unanticipated experiences of difference and uncertainty regarding their place in U.S. society. While overt exclusion against Asian immigrants by congressional authority does not appear in contemporary immigration policy, it is important to remember that many of the narrators interviewed at Saint Joseph's expressed concerns and uncertainties emanating from histories of exclusion and violence against South Asian immigrants in the United States. Not only was the F1 visa process arduous for many of them, but the fear that they might not obtain an H-1B visa or alternative authorization to pursue their lives in the United States, was highly concerning. Thus, decades of negative immigration rhetoric and discriminatory

experiences in U.S. society have remained highly relevant to contemporary experiences. Ultimately, this history and its continuing impact on official rhetoric and policy cannot be disconnected from these narrators' experiences. Furthermore, increases in physical and emotional violence and discrimination against South Asians after 9/11 make clear how Indians are perceived as a threat simply because of the color of their skin (South Asian Americans Leading Together). Based on these growing instances of discrimination and hate, it is clear that Indian identity in the United States continues to be under threat merely based on their appearance as "non-white" that was encoded in the legal and political decisions of the 20th and 19th centuries (Daniels, 1990). These experiences of discrimination are thus critical for understanding the fears and exclusion inherent in the unexpected disruption to the 21st century narrators' routines. Through this lens, Mokshita's attempt to assimilate her clothing, Shinjini fears about behaving in a way that is viewed as socially inept and Anuj's extreme reaction to feelings of difference based on food are in fact, natural reactions to a new society that symbolizes inclusion but in reality, provides no security to new students' investing their time and lives here. In disrupting the most mundane aspects of their lives, the experience of adjusting to U.S. society, compounded with demanding visa restrictions, created moments of difference that carry past and present fears of exclusion. Thus, the memories of and reactions to these past ills are very much ingrained in the histories and experiences of Indian students studying in contemporary U.S. society. As Heema struggled to unpack her experiences, she sighed and uttered in frustration,

> And sometimes you feel like you came for this?? Are you here for this?? (2018).

Marred by failed expectations, intense obstacles, and stress, living as a foreign student under Trump exasperated the country's long history of exclusion and discrimination. While cultural and social adjustment present challenges in every context, globalization and the United State's rhetoric creates an expectation for inclusion and opportunity that the country fails to meet.

References

Agarwal, Kritika (2017, February 5). *Shadows of the Past (South Asian American Digital Archive)* https://www.saada.org/tides/article/shadows-of-the-past.

Anuj (28 January 2018). Interviewed by Daniel Soucy. Saint Joseph's University Post Learning Commons. Interview is in Soucy's possession.

Barber, Benjamin R. (1 March 1992). *Jihad vs. McWorld (The Atlantic).* https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/ 1992/03/jihad-vs-mcworld/303882/.

Badrinathan, Sumitra; Kapur, Devesh; Kay, Jonathon and Vaishnav, Milan (10 June 2021). *The Washington Post* https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/06/10/discrimination-against-indian-americans-happens-more-than-you-might-think/

Bhatia, Sunil (2007). *American Karma: Race, Culture and Identity in the South Asian Diaspora.* New York: New York University Press.

Boyle, Paul;. Halfacree, Keith H and Robinson, Vaughan (2014). *Exploring Contemporary Migration* London: Routledge.

Brown, Judith M. (2006) *Global South Asians: Introducing the Modern Diaspora.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chan, Sucheng (2010). Asian American Struggles for Civil, Political, Economic, and Social Rights. In Jean Yu-wen Shen Wu and Thoman C. Chen (Eds.), *Asian American Studies* (pp. 213-238). Rutgers University Press. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.36019/9780813549330-014

Croucher, Sheila L. (2004). *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World.* Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Daniels, Roger (2010). The Indian Diaspora in the United States. In J.M. Brown and R. Foot (Eds.) *Migration: The Asian Experience* (pp. 83-104). Palgrave Macmillan. 10.1007/978-1-349-23678-7_5

DeSipio, Louis and De la Garza, Rodolfo O. (2015). *U.S. Immigration in the Twenty-First Century: Making Americans, Remaking America*. Colorado: West View Press.

Diallo, Mariama. (2017, January 5). *Will trump's anti-immigrant rhetoric discourage foreign students?* VOA. Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://www.voanews.com/a/donald-trump-anti-immigrant-rhetoric-foreign-students/3657270.html

Diverse Issues in Higher Education. (2000, February 2). *The 'other' Asians*. Diverse Education. Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://www.diverseeducation.com/demographics/asian-american-pacific-islander/article/15076767/the-other-asians

Esterline, Cecilia., & Batalova, Jeanne. (2022, March 23). *Frequently requested statistics on immigrants and immigration in the United States*. migrationpolicy.org. Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states#temporary

Halpern, Mary (22 March 2018). Interviewed by Daniel Soucy Saint Joseph's University.

Heema (7 February 2018).Interviewed by Daniel Soucy. Saint Joseph's University Post Learning Commons, Interview is in Soucy's possession.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2022). *Sevis by the numbers 2020* . Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://www.ice.gov/doclib/sevis/pdf/sevisBTN2020.pdf.

Koshy, Susan (1998). Category Crisis: South Asian Americans and Questions of Race and Ethnicity. *Diaspora: a Journal of Transnational Studies.* 7(3), pp. 285-320 10.1353/dsp.1998.0013

Mamtora , Bhakti. (2022, April 7). *Changing stereotypes of South Asians on screen*. The Revealer. Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://therevealer.org/changing-stereotypes-of-south-asians-on-screen/

Mokshita (March 2, 2018). Interviewed by Daniel Soucy. Saint Joseph's University Post Learning Commons. Interview is in Soucy's possession.

Melamedoff, Michael. (Director) (2017). *The Problem With Apu* [Film]. truTV

Ngai, Mae M. (2007) "Nationalism, Immigration control, and the Ethnoracial Remapping of America in the 1920's." *OAH Magazine of History*. 21(3). 11-15 https://www.jstor.org/stable/25162123

Nielsen. (2021, July 21). Closing the gap for South Asian representation on screen. Retrieved July 26, 2022, from https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2021/closing-the-gap-for-south-asian-representation-on-screen/

Painter, Nell, !. (2003, November). *Why White People Are Called 'Caucasian?* Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Gilder Lehrman Center International Conference at Yale University. https://glc.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/events/race/Painter.pdf

Prasad (28 January 2018). Interviewed by Daniel Soucy. Saint Joseph's University Post Learning Commons. Interview is in Soucy's possession.

President Lyndon B. Johnson's remarks at the Signing of the Immigration Bill Liberty Island New York. *LBJ Presidential Library.* October 3, 1965. http://www.lbjlibrary.org/lyndon-baines-johnson/timeline/lbj-on-immigration.

Rudrappa, Sharmila (2008). Braceros and Techno-Braceros: Guest Workers in the United States, and the Commodification of Low-Wage and High Wage Labor. In Koshy, Susan and Radhakrishna, R (Eds.), *Transnational South Asians: The Making of a Neo-Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saint Joseph's University (5 May 2018). "About Saint Joseph's University: SJU Facts and Figures," Saint Joseph's University, https://www.sju.edu/about-sju/facts-figures.

Shinjini (February 26, 2018). Interviewed by Daniel Soucy, Saint Joseph's University Center for Inclusion and Diversity. Interview is in Soucy's possession.

Smith, Marian. L. (2002). Race, Nationality, and Reality INS Administration of Racial Provisions in U.S. Immigration and Nationality Law Since 1898. *Prologue Magazine*, *34*(2).

The White House (17 January 2017). *Executive Order Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States* https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/.

Thomas, Susan (2013). "In Pursuit of the American Degree: Internationalization, national security, and the making of South Asian foreign students." University of Pennsylvania *Dissertations available from ProQuest*. AAI3594865. https://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI3594865

Tichenor, Daniel (2016). *The Historical Presidency:* Lyndon Johnson's Ambivalent Reform: The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. *Presidential Studies Quarterly.* 46(3). link.gale.com/apps/doc/A485442904/AONE?u=anon~4e1d9406&sid=googleScholar&xid=ed6d0ba0

U.S. Department of State (2022) *Fiscal Year 2017, Nonimmigrant Visas Issued*. https://travel.state.gov/content/dam/visas/Statistics/Non-Immigrant- Statistics/NIVDetailTables/FY17NIVDetailTable.pdf.

U.S. Department of State Office of the Historian. (n.d) *The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The McCarran-Walter Ac*t. U.S. Department of State, https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/immigration- act.

Zong, Jie and Batalova, Jeanne (31 August 2017). *Indian Immigrants in the United States*. Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/indian-immigrants-united-states.

Appendix 1: Narrator Biographies

Mokshita: Mokshita, was born on March 14th, 1987 in the North Indian city of Haridwar, Uttarakhand. She speaks Hindi and English fluently. After completing English-medium primary and secondary school in Haridwar, she went on to pursue a bachelor's degree in computer science at HNB Garhwal University. After Mokshita completed her undergraduate education, she worked as a software engineer for Accenture in Hyderabad. Following her husband's move to the United States in 2014, Mokshita met him in Seattle, Washington state in 2015 and described herself then as "a housewife" while her husband worked outside of the home as a software engineer. After living in Seattle for about one year, Mokshita and her husband moved to a small town outside of Cleveland, Ohio for a few months and relocated to Philadelphia, PA in 2006.

Mokshita enrolled in Saint Joseph's University's Master's in Computer Science program in Spring 2017. Back in India, Mokshita's father continues to work in the private sector as the owner of a stationary business while her mother is a housewife. Mokshita also has an elder sister, younger sister and younger brother who all live in India.

Anuj: Anuj was born in the town of Sandila, Uttar Pradesh on January 5th, 1991. Anuj speaks both Hindi and English. He earned his Bachelor's of Technology in Electronics and Communication Engineering from the Dehradun Institute of Technology. Soon after, in August 2016, Anuj traveled to the United States to pursue a Master's degree in Business Intelligence and Analytics. His mother, a housewife, and his father, who worked in banking, raised three additional children of whom Anuj is the youngest. They all continue to reside in India.

Shinjini: In 1985, Shinjini was born in Calcutta where she also attended English-medium school though she also speaks Hindi, English, Bengali and some Punjabi. She completed an undergraduate degree in International Relations. She then went on to complete her Master's degree in journalism from the Asian School of Journalism in Chennai. Having completed her Master's, Shinjini moved to Delhi where she worked for a political magazine. In addition, she lived in the city of Chandigarh and worked for a newspaper called *The Tribune* before moving back to Calcutta to be with her husband. Soon after, her husband began pursuing his Master's

degree from Temple University in Philadelphia, USA. After graduating, Temple accepted his application to pursue his Ph.D. As a result, Shinjini decided to join him in the United States in 2015. She then applied to Saint Joseph's University and enrolled in the Business Intelligence Master's program in January 2017. Shinjini's mother passed away when she was young but her father continues to reside in Calcutta while her elder sister works in Australia. Although her extended family resides in many parts of the world, most of her family continues to live in Calcutta.

Heema: Heema was born in Rajkot, Gujarat in 1994. Prior to coming to the United States, Heema attended English medium primary and secondary school in India and lived with her two parents as well as her extended family. She also attended the Atmiya Institute of Technology and pursued a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science. She began pursuing a Master's degree in Computer Science at Saint Joseph's University in the Fall of 2017. Both of her parents continued to reside in Rajkot, India at the time of the interview. She has no siblings but many cousins that live throughout the world including in California, New Jersey and Delaware. Heema typically visits her cousins, Uncle and Aunt in Delaware on a weekly basis.

Prasad: Prasad was born in the city of Vellore, Tamil Nadu but spent most of his life in Chennai, Tamil Nadu. He completed his primary, secondary and undergraduate education in the English medium in Chennai. In addition to English, Prasad also speaks Tamil, Hindi and French. He then worked for 3 years in Chennai for a biogenetics company named Xcode Life Sciences before moving to Bangalore and working for a fashion company named Oxley Threads Lanka Pvt. He then moved to Philadelphia in January 2017 to pursue his Master's degree in Business Intelligence and Analytics. His mother, father, sister and girlfriend all still live and work in India. While in the United States he is also learning Japanese and Spanish.

Appendix 2: Initial Consent Form[46]

Oral Historical Investigation of South Asian Migrants' Experiences in Philadelphia
Daniel Soucy, ds620370@sju.edu
With guidance from Dr. Amber Abbas, aabbas@sju.edu

Oral History Project Preliminary Release Form

Date of Interview:

Speaker/ Interviewee:

Location of Interview:

Recorder/ Interviewer: Daniel Soucy

I understand that the purpose of this research is to document and better understand South Asian immigrant histories and experiences in the United States. I agree that Daniel Soucy may interview me on the date listed above. I also understand that this document is intended to inform me fully of what I am being asked to do and of my rights as an interviewee.

My initials indicate that Daniel Soucy has my permission to make copies of the audio/video recording, photographs, and transcripts of the interview noted above, according to the provisions and restrictions below:

- □ for bona fide research purposes
- □ for educational use (in seminars, workshops, conferences or teaching)
- □ for broadcasting purposes
- □ for public performance, display or exhibition
- □ for deposit in a research library or archive
- □ For deposit in an internet archive

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

[46]Every narrator from Saint Joseph's University signed this form

Participants for this study are being recruited from the Saint Joseph's University student body.

How You were Chosen: Participants were chosen through the investigator's connections with individuals at Saint Joseph's as well as other educational institutions in Philadelphia.

The Oral History Interview Duration and Additional Information: Participation in this study will consist of one or two, 90 minute interviews. This interview will be recorded within the period of time previously agreed upon by me and Daniel Soucy. Should Daniel Soucy feel that more time is needed to complete the interview, arrangements can be made to extend the interview at my convenience. Once my interview is complete, it will be transcribed and edited for readability in accordance with the Oral History Association's best practices. I will be given an opportunity to make changes to my interview before the final transcript is completed. No one except Daniel Soucy, Dr. Amber Abbas (the project's academic supervisor) and myself will be able to access my interview until after the final transcript is finished. At that time I will have the opportunity to place restrictions on access and reproduction of the interview if I so desire.

My Rights: I understand that I have the right not to answer any of the questions asked of me during the interview should I consider them uncomfortable or inappropriate. If I need to take a break from the interview or if I have a question or point for clarification during the interview, I can ask that the recorder be turned off temporarily. ***My participation in this interview is completely voluntary and I am free to withdraw consent and cease all participation in this interview at any time without any consequences whatsoever.***

Risks, Benefits, and Costs: Although Daniel Soucy is unaware of any direct risks associated with this research, it is important to note that these interviews may be made available to other researchers in the future. ***I have considered the fact that future employers, friends, family members and university community members could gain access to these transcripts.*** I also understand that some interviewees may find benefit in reflecting on and thinking about their experience studying in the United States.

My Obligations: Once Daniel Soucy has sent me a copy of my oral history transcript, I agree that (a) I will return the transcript with my edits to Daniel Soucy within two weeks. If I do not

return the edited transcript within that time, I agree that Daniel Soucy may complete the processing of the transcript and make it available in accordance with the Oral History Association's best practices.

Institutional Review Board Approval: This research study has also been *exempted* by the Saint Joseph's University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research. If you believe that there is an infringement upon your rights as a participant in this research you may contact the Research Compliance Coordinator, Jena Fioravanti Burkett, (irbadministrator@sju.edu) in the Carriage House, on the Maguire Campus, Telephone (610) 660-1298.

Agreement: I have read the information contained within this release form, and Interviewer(s) offered to answer any questions or concerns I had about this document or the interview. I hereby consent to participate in this oral history interview.

☐ agree

Interviewee Signature: _____

Interviewer Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Final Consent Form[47]

Oral Historical Investigation of South Asian Migrants' Experiences in Philadelphia
Daniel Soucy, ds620370@sju.edu
With guidance from Dr. Amber Abbas, aabbas@sju.edu

Undergraduate Oral History Project FINAL Release Form

This document contains my understanding and agreement with respect to my participation in the

[47] After having the opportunity to review the interview transcript, each narrator was asked to sign this form. Some narrators from Saint Joseph's University took advantage of the opportunity to review the transcript and thus signed this form. Some did not.

audio interview recorded by Daniel Soucy on_____. I have read the transcript supplied by Daniel Soucy.

1. The recordings, transcripts, photographs, research materials, and memorabilia (collectively called the "Work") will be maintained by Daniel Soucy and made available in accordance with general policies outlines on the preliminary release form.

2. I hereby grant, assign, and transfer to Daniel Soucy all right, title, and interest in the Work, including the literary rights and the copyright, except that I shall retain the right to copy, use, and publish the Work in part or in full until my death.

3. The manuscript may be read and the recording(s) heard/viewed by additional scholars unless restrictions are placed on the transcript as listed below.

This constitutes my entire and complete understanding.
Signature: _____
Interviewee's Name: _____

Date:_____

OPTIONAL: I wish to place the following restrictions on the use of this interview:

PERMISSION TO DEPOSIT COMPLETED ORAL HISTORY TRANSCRIPT AND AUDIO IN EXTERNAL ARCHIVES

I,_____grant exclusive permission to Daniel Soucy to deposit my completed oral history transcript conducted on_____at _____in external archives as described in the preliminary release form. Signature: _____
Interviewee's Name:_____Date: _____