Positionality and the relational production of place in the context of student migration to Gilgit, Pakistan

Andreas Benz

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Benz, Andreas. 2017. "Positionality and the relational production of place in the context of student migration to Gilgit, Pakistan." In *Area studies at the crossroads: knowledge production after the mobility turn*, edited by Katja Mielke and Anna-Katharina Hornidge, 103–19. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan US.
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59834-9_6.

Positionality and the Relational Production of Place in the Context of Student Migration to Gilgit, Pakistan

Andreas Benz

The Gilgit-Baltistan (GB) region in Northern Pakistan is characterized by rapidly rising education levels and increasing numbers of students striving for higher education (Benz, 2013; Benz, 2014a). The number of schools and colleges has strongly grown in this sparsely populated rural high mountain region over the last decades and improved local opportunities. Though, the local possibilities for 'quality education' and for higher levels of education are still limited outside of the few urban and semi-urban agglomerations of the region. Particularly Gilgit, the most populous town and capital of Gilgit-Baltistan, has developed into an educational hub attracting students from all over the region. With its ever growing number of private schools and colleges and the Karakorum International University (KIU), the only university of the region, it offers education at all levels in a quality which is said to be among the best available in the area. More and more young people of Gilgit-Baltistan leave their home villages for getting higher education. In some areas virtually the whole batch of the young generation has left their valleys for the sake of education (Benz, 2014b). Even though Pakistani lowland cities are preferred by those who have the means for studying there, the bulk of student migrants end up in Gilgit for their higher studies. This education-driven mobility of a whole generation is probably the largest population translocation the region has seen in recent years, entailing far-reaching implications for people's identities, social situatedness and their understanding of themselves and others. Children and adolescents are transplanted from their childhood 'home' place of the village into the complex urban environment of Gilgit, situating them within a completely different,

unfamiliar and highly heterogeneous context. Being a migration hub, migrants and locals from different walks of life, areas, ethno-linguistic groups and sects gather in that place and are pushed into a shared arena of encounters and interactions.

In this paper, I inquire into the question of what happens to the people and the places involved in this new mobility of students. By applying a relational and actor-centered perspective on mobilities, places, interactions and positionality, it will be revealed that these dimensions are closely intertwined and interdependent. Places, therefore, cannot be conceptualized as closed and self-contained spatial entities, as suggested in conventional Area Studies. Rather, places need to be seen as highly dynamic and temporary nodes in networks of translocal flows and stillness, interconnections, interactions and power relations, which reach far beyond the geographical scope of the locale.

A number of new places are created in the context of student migration, such as new student hostels and private schools mushrooming in Gilgit. Hostels and schools all too often follow the well-established pattern of segregation along the lines of denomination and gender, which are characteristic for Gilgit in many social fields (Ali, 2010; Gratz, 2006; Grieser and Sökefeld, 2015; Hunzai, 2013; Varley, 2010). In contrast, the establishment of the KIU in 2002 has created a previously unknown arena for interaction and confrontation between youth of different sects and genders from different areas of Gilgit-Baltistan. The KIU main campus in Gilgit, populated by about 2,300 students (approximately 60 per cent female) (KIU, 2014), constitutes a kind of test field for new types of interactions, for which no fixed and commonly accepted norms and rules exist. In this newly established place, the norms and values, the codes of conduct and interaction are subject to more testing, experimenting and innovating than in other social arenas. This potentially allows the crossing of borders and limits set firmly in other contexts, but also bears considerable potential for conflict.

Positionality and the Relational Production of Place

In this paper, I apply a constructivist and relational perspective on space and place. In particular, I will follow Doreen Massey's understanding of place as being a crossroads, a "meeting place" (Massey, 1991, p. 28), which is produced by a certain constellation of actors meeting and (inter-)acting in power-charged social relations at a certain point or period of time in a particular locus. The constitution of a place, as a particular dimension of spatiality[1], is dependent on the mobilities and temporal stillness of actors and objects moving through or pausing there.

Actors in such arenas are understood as being socially and spatially situated within larger networks of social relations whose spatial reach goes far beyond the place in focus:

> Instead […] of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings are constructed on a far larger scale than what we happen to define for that moment as the place itself. (Massey, 1991, p. 28).

The idea of socio-spatial positionality as developed by Eric Sheppard (Sheppard, 2002) provides a helpful analytical tool to conceptualize the actors' spatial and social situatedness.

Encounters in place are not merely encounters between certain actors, but encounters between whole configurations of socio-spatial positionalities, as reflected in the actors' articulation of identity, habitus, understandings of symbols, meanings, norms and values, as well as patterns of perceiving and interpreting the surrounding world. Places provide an arena in which different actors' norms, values and conflictive understandings of identities compete

and clash and are re-negotiated. The actors' socio-spatial positionality is constantly challenged and reshaped in such encounters. Positionalities are shaped and modified in concrete places and thus positionality 'takes place' in the truest sense of the word. The dynamics of the re-production of places through the actors in place and the dynamics of these actors' shifting positionalities are closely intertwined.

The Places of Student Migration to Gilgit

Student migration from Gojal to the town of Gilgit <FIGURE 6.1 ABOUT HERE> means for the young migrants a fundamental translocation from their familiar and intimate socio-cultural environment of the village into a very different and unfamiliar other, characterized by heterogeneity, complexity, multifaceted contradictions and – often enough – conflict.[2] The societal norms and values prevalent in the village context strongly differ from those in Gilgit. The move from a rural, sparsely populated, ethno-linguistically and denominationally quite homogeneous social environment into the urban context of Gilgit, and its complex socio-cultural medley is perceived by many migrants and their families as a shift from a 'safe' into a rather 'unsafe' environment, which, in their views, demands several precautionary and protective measures. These may comprise of spatial and social seclusion, segregation, distinction and the reassurance of one's own identity and values. Such acts are part of the various processes of contestations and re-negotiations of socio-spatial positionalities in the migration context. Gilgit, as a destination for migrants, is much more than just *one* place where people move to and (temporarily) take residence. It rather forms a patchwork of different individual places as arenas for interaction between the migrant and the 'other', in which they are socially situated in different ways. Along with other spatial moorings of their translocal networks, these places form part of the specific lifeworlds of the Gojali migrants in Gilgit. Since space and the arenas for social interaction are highly

gendered in this context, the lifeworlds of young male and female student migrants in Gilgit differ considerably. In the following, some selected places of these migrants' lifeworlds will be presented and analyzed as arenas for (inter-)action.

Home – the Village Context in Gojal

The Gojal region is characterized by a relatively strong denominational, cultural and ethno-linguistic homogeneity. The overwhelming majority of the people of Gojal belong to the Nizari Ismaili denomination. The population is composed of the majority ethno-linguistic group of the Wakhi, speaking the Wakhi language, and of Burushaski-speaking Burusho immigrants from Central Hunza, forming a significant minority in Gojal (Kreutzmann, 1995; Kreutzmann, 1996). The Ismailis in Gojal have strongly benefitted from the directives and initiatives of their spiritual leader, Aga Khan IV, and his predecessor, Aga Kahn III, who have pursued a policy of modernization and socio-economic development for their followers, which has been implemented through a number of religious institutions as well as by a complex mundane organizational structure under the umbrella of the Aga Khan Foundation (Hasan, 2009; Ruthven, 2011; Thobani, 2011; Wood et al., 2006). Part of that policy is the propagation of 'modern' values such as a strong orientation towards progress and development, entrepreneurial thinking, formal education, scientific and technical knowledge, Western languages as well as certain Western societal concepts, such as gender equality and participation (Harlech-Jones et al., 2003; Kreutzmann, 1989, pp. 163-164; Sökefeld, 1997a, pp. 135-140; Steinberg, 2011). In Gojal, these policies have effected far-reaching socio-economic changes and developments, among them being a profound educational expansion, which turned Gojal into one of the leading areas of Gilgit-Baltistan in terms of education for both men and women (Benz, 2014a, pp. 157-164), a rising proportion of people pursuing highly qualified jobs, and women's empowerment.

In their narratives, Gojali migrants in Gilgit often portrayed their village home by using Gilgit as a negative contrasting foil. From their social situation as being student migrant in Gilgit, who come to visit their village and family mostly only for a few weeks per year in times of vacations for recreation and leisure, they perceived and described their villages as places of personal freedom and enjoyment. They perceived their village and the Gojal region as providing "a very open environment", which is "totally different" from the social environment in Gilgit, which in contrast is perceived as "restricted environment"[3]. Several social norms, which they feel obliged to follow in Gilgit, were felt as highly restrictive and severely limiting personal freedoms they were used to enjoy in Gojal. Particularly female migrants emphasized that in Gojal and in the village context, they were not used to wear a scarf in the public sphere; they were not restricted in their individual movements through village space and surroundings; they were not restricted in travelling unaccompanied between places; they were used to make friends with whoever other youth they wanted; and they were used to talk and interact with non-kin men in a self-confident and open way. They stressed that even walks without male company along the main road to neighboring villages or to the surroundings to have picnic were possible. The female migrants experienced that for them all these freedoms were severely curtailed or even had entirely disappeared in their Gilgit migration environment. One female migrant, who had spent some years in Islamabad for studies before coming to Gilgit, considered Islamabad with its comparatively liberal and open social atmosphere to be much more similar to her Gojali home village than Gilgit.

Gilgit – the Migration Context

Gilgit's population of about 90,000 people (Ahmed and Polack, 2011, p. 18) is characterized by a high level of diversity with respect to denomination, ethno-linguistic group, region of family origin and time of migration to Gilgit. The city has a long migration

record and virtually the whole population is either migrants themselves or have ancestors who migrated to Gilgit (Sökefeld, 1997b). Accordingly, the city society of Gilgit is a very complex fabric composed of various, often intersecting and conflicting group identities defined along the lines of denomination, language, region of origin and imagined or real descent group (Sökefeld, 1997a, pp. 39-43), with which a plurality of different socio-cultural norms and values is associated. In the recent past, Gilgit has seen severe and violent conflicts between different identity groups, most of all sectarian conflicts between Sunni and Twelver Shiite populations in Gilgit and surroundings (Ali, 2010; Hunzai, 2013; Kreutzmann, 2008; Stöber, 2007). While the Gilgit-Baltistan region has a Shiite majority population, the three Muslim communities of Sunna, Twelver Shia and Ismailia have a roughly equal share in the population of Gilgit city. Identities, as part of peoples' positionality, are used to define and articulate the 'self' in contrast to the 'other' and thus always entail processes of boundary making. In the attempt to create protected places for one's 'own' people and in which one's own group's norms and values form the authoritative normative order, social boundaries become manifest in the city space in form of segregated residential quarters, schools and colleges, student hostels, health facilities and other institutions and infrastructural facilities (Grieser and Sökefeld, 2015; Varley, 2010). The creation of such segregated places within the city space of Gilgit has been justified by many Ismaili respondents with their felt need for protection of their own group and family members within a difficult and dangerous social environment dominated by the non-Ismaili 'others' and their differing norms and values. Segregated places therefore are considered protected places in contrast to the unprotected public space of the city.

Gojali student migrants explained that they perceive Gilgit as being "totally different"[4] from their home village with respect to what can be done and said in public space. They perceived the norms and values 'in place' in Gilgit as "restrictive" and "intolerant"[5] and

felt “a lot of cultural difference”[6] between the people in Gojal and those in Gilgit (cf. Kriebel, 2014, p. 146). Male and females spheres are much more separated in the public space of Gilgit town than it is the case in a Gojali village. “Within the Ismaili community, we are allowed to meet each other, we are allowed to interact with each other, as sisters and brothers. But in Gilgit, I think it is totally different from the village. There is Sunni, there is Shia and we are bound. The thing is that we are bound.“[7] In Gilgit town, the public space is highly gendered: Women can’t enter and cross the main bazaar roads and the town centre of Gilgit without male company or being in a group of women, and they have to take hidden “women’s paths” (Gratz, 1998) to move through the city. Only within the denomination-wise homogeneous residential areas women can move more freely. In public space, women have to follow a dress code which is more restrictive than in the village or in cities like Islamabad, in order not to attract male attention and staring eyes. Wearing a *dupatta* (light shawl) or *chador* (long cloak) and wide, discrete, inconspicuous cloth fully covering arms and legs is obligatory for women in public space (Gratz, 2006, pp. 614-616). In addition, a woman in public space in Gilgit is expected to “lower her eyes, bend her head downwards, stand apart, [and] […] veil parts of her face” (Gratz, 1998, p. 490). One female student migrant said: “We were fashionable girls at that time [when we migrated to Gilgit] and these people [in Gilgit] were not able to accept us.” She had to learn quickly that “you should not go out with fashionable clothing”[8] in Gilgit.

Gojali parents often perceive Gilgit as a potentially unsafe place, where particularly their daughters need protection. To find a safe place for their daughters is a major concern for parents in the context of student migration. In many cases the (un-)availability of such a safe place, be it in a relative’s home or in a student hostel, had greater influence on their decision for or against a certain place to study than the spectrum of available study options and the quality of educational institutions. Parents value not only the short geographical distance of

Gilgit from Gojal and the comparatively lower education costs compared to 'down country' cities, but also the existence of local Ismaili communities and settlement quarters there, as well as the availability of safe and trustworthy hostels for their studying daughters.

Male students of a certain age, in contrast, are considered largely self-dependent and self-responsible for handling their affairs, and are trusted and even expected to arrange themselves and get along in a 'down-country' city, often enough even themselves earning their livelihoods besides studies. Male student migrants at the graduate and post-graduate study levels hardly ever live in student hostels but rather share privately rented flats with other students. For female students, it would be unthinkable to live in such autonomous, self-controlled flat-sharing communities in Gilgit due to normative constraints. A third option, feasible for both genders, is to join a relative's house to live with during the period of studies. Whenever a female student finds accommodation in a relative's home, she is normally expected to contribute to the household chores in a significant way, which limits her study time. The lack of a quiet and undisturbed study environment, cramped conditions, frequent visitors and many distractions in a relative's house are further arguments for preferring hostel accommodation even in cases where cohabitation in a relative's house would be an option.

Providing Safe Havens – the Girls' Hostel Place

For the parents it means a great risk to send their daughter to the city when not having a male relative in place, who could take care and look after her. The honor of the whole family is linked to the honor of its female members, and this honor is at risk in the context of female student migration. Therefore, the most important function of a girls' student hostel, in the eyes of many parents, is to provide a safe haven to live in for their daughters in the distant city in an environment perceived as inhospitable and threatening. A high level of security, trustworthiness and reliability is among the most valued features of a girls' hostel and forms

the basis for its reputation. This becomes emblematic in hostel names like "SAFE Girls Hostel Gilgit", which is an acronym for *Support and Access for Education*, but certainly does not miss its advertising effect by evoking associations of safety and security among parents. Gojali parents – and it is mostly the parents who decide about where to 'place' their unmarried daughters in a hostel – tend to place their highest confidence in hostels which are run by people of their own Ismaili sect, preferably being from their own area (Hunza, Gojal) and from their own language group (Wakhi or Burusho). Female student hostels run by Ismailis in Gilgit are mostly located in Ismaili neighborhoods. All female student hostels run by Ismailis, which I could visit during my field research in Sonikot and Zulfiqarabad, had exclusively Ismaili boarders, with a certain bias in each hostel towards Hunza, Gojal or Ghizer regarding the region of origin of its boarders. The representatives of some of these hostels stressed to be in principle open for boarders from other sects as well, but pointed out their view that sectarian diversity in the hostel would only be a source of unnecessary trouble and conflicts, which is better to be avoided. Parents are ready to pay high sums for knowing their daughters to live in safe places during their studies. In most cases, the costs for hostel accommodation, which have been found for girls' hostels in Gilgit to be between PKR 3,500 and 4,300 monthly, make up the major part of the total education costs and exceed college or university fees.

In their attempt to provide the promised level of security and safety, Ismaili girls' hostels exhibit a number of very similar physical features, organizational structures, rules and arrangements which in important ways shape the lifeworld of its boarders. The hostel space is physically hidden behind high walls and iron gates, clearly separating the protected hostel space from the outside public space. Behind these walls a new world begins not only physically with its green and clean gardens and well-maintained but frugal interior, but also in a normative sense. Safety and security in the context of girls' hostels can be at least partly

translated into the exercise of control over the boarders' daily life and activities. For this purpose, a number of rules and regulations, duties and bans are in effect in the girls' hostel place. A strict daily time schedule assigns certain activities to different times throughout the day, leaving only very few slots for leisure and recreation. Obligatory study periods in the evenings and at the weekends ensure the boarders to focus on their studies. Monday to Saturday, the girls are taken by particular bus services from and to their educational institutions. Leaving the hostel for other purposes is highly restricted and only allowed in company of a registered guardian, mostly a close male relative. The lifeworld of these girls therefore mainly consists of two secluded places (the hostel, the school) and the secure transport (bus service) in between them. Other channels to connect with the outside world, such as TV, radio, newspapers, and phone-calls are highly restricted or not available in the hostels, and the use of mobile phones and internet are fully banned. In case a girl is caught with a mobile phone, she will be expelled from the hostel. In sum, these regulations aim at separating and encapsulating the protected, inner world of the hostel place from the outside world. The girls and young women are cut-off from the outer world in many respects. The totality of these rules is designed around the two central concerns of the migrant students' stay in Gilgit: they shall focus on their studies and shall preserve their honor. Any disturbances of the two have to be prevented and shielded off. This is what the parents expect from the hostel to provide in the first place. The female boarders, often young women of 18 years and older, are to a considerable extent incapacitated under the hostel regime and severely restricted in their personal freedoms. Nevertheless, for getting an education and for fulfilling the expectations of their parents, who often take on great efforts for enabling and financing their studies, these young women accept and comply with the hostel rules.

Encounters on New Ground – the Campus Place of Karakorum International University

The establishment of the KIU in Gilgit in 2002 not only meant the introduction of a new type of educational institution, being the first university of Gilgit-Baltistan, but also the introduction of a new type of place in the context of education. Since the university brings together students of all sects and genders and from all areas of GB, the campus of the KIU became a ground for encounters between students of different backgrounds, who had been carefully segregated along their previous educational paths. All the anxiously arranged boundaries of segregation, all the elaborate efforts for creating protected places inside these boundaries, and all normative and organizational setups to exercise control over the female student, are thwarted by the inability to extend these regimes to the KIU campus. Interactions of the female student with male students and students from other sects are unavoidable and cannot be prevented or fully controlled. Actually, being a university, such interactions are tolerated and welcomed as long as they are limited to academic exchange and concerns of studies, but the students are expected to meet for that purpose in an open, public place on the campus, where social control can be maintained. The security personnel constantly keeps an eye on students' interactions on the campus and uses to request mixed couples sitting separate and too much apart from others to move back into a more crowded place (Kriebel, 2014, p. 148).

Internet access is available and mobile phones are allowed on the campus. Gojali students at the KIU, who were living in girls' hostels and therefore were not allowed to have mobile phones, explained that they simply use their friends' mobile phones when they are on the campus. SMS messaging and secret calls, which with great efforts are prevented in the hostel place, become easily possible in the campus place. All interviewed KIU students reported that there were a number of cases in which female students were messaging with

males, partly from other sects, who were meeting with these males, who were seen leaving the campus on the backseat of their motorbikes, and who were said to have illicit friendships and romantic relations with them. Female Ismaili students, moving across the campus in outfits they were used to wear within their own community and in the protected hostel-school-place, and talking to their male fellow students in the self-confident and open way as it is the normal conduct in their own community, sent signals which were misunderstood by some non-Ismaili students. What is a normal female outfit from an Ismaili perspective, that is young women going without a headscarf and wearing 'fashionable' dresses, may be interpreted as signaling 'openness' and 'liberal virtue' in the eyes of Sunni and Twelver Shiite young men. Female students from the Sunni and Twelver Shiite sect wear on the campus the same kind of dress which they usually wear in public spaces: *chador* and *niqab* (face veil), sometimes even *burqa* (one-piece garment fully covering face and body) . The deviating dress style of many Ismaili students has obviously encouraged some male students (and even non-students entering the campus for that purpose) to approach Ismaili female students on the KIU campus in search of friendship and possibly romantic affairs. In at least two cases, the KIU administration has, based on the recommendation of KIU's Disciplinary Committee, expelled two female Gojali students from university and the KIU hostel, on the basis of allegations of having had illicit relationships.[9] Ismaili KIU students informed me about ten more female Ismaili students from Hunza who were expelled from the KIU on similar accusations. In a climate of latent and occasionally violent sectarian conflicts in Gilgit (Hunzai, 2013), the KIU administration tends to quickly react on such rumors, partly to safe the university's reputation as an honorable place where illicit relations are not tolerated, and partly in succumbing to pressure exercised by religious organizations and parties in Gilgit.

The male Ismaili students perceived the attempted approaches of Sunni and Twelver Shiite male students as an inacceptable, objectionable behavior towards 'their' Ismaili girls

and as a threat not only for the girls' and their families' honor, but for the reputation of the whole community. A male Gojali KIU student explained: "[In our community] we are living in a very open environment, being Gojali, being Ismaili. Some girls are innocent, they come here for the first time and they think that we can implement that environment of the village here. But these people [Sunnis and Twelver Shiites in Gilgit] could not understand them, that this is their environment, but they think that these are girls like that, very liberal minded girls. There is a clash of ideas. […] The impact on our [Ismaili] students is very bad. They just started to target our girls, teasing[10] our girls. That is why it is a very big challenge for us."[11] In 2006, some Ismaili KIU students from Gojal formed a student organization (Bam-e Dunya Pluralistic Society) with the aim to prevent what they perceived as illicit interactions between female Gojali Ismaili students and male students from other sects. After violent clashes between students from this group and Sunni students from Kashrot, the organization was disbanded. In 2007, the Hunza Student Federation (HSF) was established as its follow-up organization with the same purpose on a broader basis together with Ismaili students from Central and Lower Hunza and from Gilgit. The Gojali students, who normally stressed their Gojali identity as being something different from the rest of Hunza, welcomed the support by Ismaili Hunzukuts in that respect. Besides providing general support for Hunza's students in Gilgit, for example in terms of financial assistance and advice, spreading information about scholarships, advocacy in dealings with the KIU administration and helping in finding hostel accommodation, the organization is concerned with what they call "social issues"[12] on the KIU campus. The HSF members started to keep the Ismaili girls and their conduct on the KIU campus under close surveillance, advised them not to talk and make friends with males from other sects and rebuked them in case of what they perceived as misbehavior. One female KIU student narrated: "Students from our [Ismaili] community, especially from Hunza to Gojal, they always come to us and guide us in terms of that this is a different

environment and you have to behave in this and that way. Like, you have to dress according to the situation, what is acceptable in Gilgit. And you should not speak with non-Ismaili guys who are not your class fellows and with whom you are not familiar. [...] In our situation, in our context, it is said that friendship [with male students from other sects] is not good."[13] A HSF member described their approach in cases of perceived misbehavior of a female Ismaili student as follows: "If such a case happens, if the case is related to a social issue, the members of HSF firstly meet the girl, they guide her not to go in the wrong way. But if the girl is not following them, they use to make a phone call to her father and brother [saying] that your sister or your daughter or your wife is not able to study in this university, [and request] to take her home."[14] Some female KIU students explained to agree with these 'guiding' activities of HSF members, and many of them actually are themselves members in that organization, but some others opposed to being controlled in that way.

Conclusion: Gendered Lifeworlds, Shifting Positionalities and the Relational Production of Place

In this paper, I have illustrated how places of student migration in Gilgit come into being and can be understood by the particular actors' positionalities meeting and interacting in place and forming a dynamic relational social field in which their positionalities are re-negotiated.

Part of the production of place is the production and re-negotiation of the norms valid in that place, for example the normative and symbolic acquisition of space, in which access to or exclusion from this place as well as the norms of social (inter-)action in this place are negotiated. Based on the outcomes of former interactions, normative ascriptions and the actors' awareness and knowledge of them, every place prescribes certain types of normative behavior for (inter-)actions, that is what and how things can be done and said there. These

norms are not the same for all actors, but vary depending on the actors' socio-spatial positionality and the particular constellation of actors.

The norms in place are particularly pluralistic where heterogeneous actors of different socio-spatial positionalities, identities, norms and value systems come together and (are forced to) act, react and interact among each other. From the plurality and heterogeneity of norms and values in such places and the related uncertainty about which rules in place are actually in force, potentially normative conflicts may arise. The norms in place are under constant negotiation and thus continuously reproduce the character of the very place. It is places, their norms and the interactions unfolding there which shape and reshape socio-spatial positionalities of the actors.

The case study showed that actors tend to categorize places in hierarchies according to the levels of safety/protection and insecurity they associate with them. In their mental maps, local actors applied multiple dimensions of spatiality, such as territory, scale and networks, to position places of their lifeworlds and imaginations in larger contexts. The perceived level of safety and protection of a place varied with the socio-spatial positionality of the actor, and the level of control over and consent with the norms in place. Perceived dichotomies between 'one's own' vs 'the others' normative territory existed at different scalar levels reaching from schools, hostels and residential quarters up to larger areas such as valley sections or sub-districts, resulting in fine-grained and often geographically fragmented regionalizations.

Place and socio-spatial positionality are closely interlinked relational processes which are embedded in translocal configurations. Every actor is situated in a multitude of places as arenas for interaction in a relational, trans-local social field. Based on the actors' situatedness in such translocal networks, events effecting shifts of their positionality in one place also impact on their positionality in other places. Since places and place-based actors are positioned in translocal corresponding webs of interrelations and interdependencies, places

cannot be conceptualized as closed and isolated spatial entities. The dynamics and interactions unfolding there cannot be understood by focusing on what is enclosed within arbitrarily drawn boundaries of the local. These considerations bear two major implications of certain importance for attempts of re-thinking Area Studies: First, places and actors cannot be conceptualized as pre-given entities which are then linked by relations and interactions; rather, they are constituted and only come into being through their embeddedness in a web of interrelations. And second, the dynamics of places and place-based interactions can only be understood in the context of their and the situated actors' positionality in translocal relational networks. The relations and linkages which go beyond a particular place are crucial for gaining a better understanding of the dynamics and interactions within a particular place and need to be stronger taken into account in research and teaching in Area Studies.

Bibliography

Ahmed, N. and Polack, A. (2011). *Report on Gilgit City.* Karachi: Department of Architecture and Planning, NED University of Engineering and Technology.

Ali, N. (2010). Sectarian Imaginaries: The Micropolitics of Sectarianism and State- Making in Northern Pakistan. *Current Sociology,* 58(5), pp. 738-754.

Benz, A. (2013). Education and Development in the Karakorum: Educational Expansion and its Impacts in Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan. *Erdkunde,* 67(2), pp. 123-136.

Benz, A. (2014). *Education for Development in Northern Pakistan: Opportunities and Constraints for Rural Households.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Benz, A. (2014). Mobility, Multi-Locality and Translocal Development: Changing Livelihoods in the Karakoram. *Geographica Helvetica,* 69(4), pp. 259-270.

Gratz, K. (1998). Walking on Women's Paths in Gilgit: Gendered Space, Boundaries, and Boundary Crossing. In: I. Stellrecht, ed., *Karakorum - Hindukush - Himalaya: Dynamics of Change. Part II.* Pakistan German Research Project Culture Area Karakorum Scientific Studies 4-II, Köln: Köppe, pp. 489-508.

Gratz, K. (2006). *Verwandtschaft, Geschlecht und Raum. Aspekte weiblicher Lebenswelt in Gilgit/Nordpakistan.* Köln: Köppe.

Grieser, A. and Sökefeld, M. (2015). Intersections of Sectarian Dynamics and Spatial Mobility in Gilgit-Baltistan. In: S. Conermann and E. Smolarz, eds, *Mobilizing Religion: Networks and Mobility*, Berlin: EB Verlag, pp. 83-110.

Harlech-Jones, B., Sajid, S. and Ur-Rahman, S. (2003). The Spread of English in Two Parts of the Northern Area of Pakistan, 1980-2002: A Comparative Study of Chilas and Hunza. *English World-Wide,* 24(2), pp. 163-200.

Hasan, A. (2009). *The Unplanned Revolution. Observations on the Process of Socio-Economic Change in Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Hunzai, I. (2013). *Conflict Dynamics in Gilgit-Baltistan.* Special Report 321. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace.

Jessop, B., Brenner, N. and Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing Sociospatial Relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 26(3), pp. 389-401.

Kiu.edu.pk, (2014). *About KIU*. [online] Available at: http://www.kiu.edu.pk/about_kiu.html [Accessed 17 Nov. 2014].

Kreutzmann, H. (1989). *Hunza: Ländliche Entwicklung im Karakorum*. Berlin: Reimer.

Kreutzmann, H. (1995). Sprachenvielfalt und regionale Differnzierung von Glaubensgemeinschaften im Hindukusch-Karakorum. Zur Rolle von Minderheiten im Konfliktfeld Nordpakistans. *Erdkunde,* 49(2), pp. 106-121.

Kreutzmann, H. (1996). *Ethnizität im Entwicklungsprozess. Die Wakhi in Hochasien*. Berlin: Reimer.

Kreutzmann, H. (2008). Kashmir and the Northern Areas of Pakistan: Boundary-Making along Contested Frontiers. *Erdkunde,* 62(3), pp. 201-219.

Kriebel, N. (2014). Die Wahrnehmung von ‚Gendered Space' in Gilgit. *EthnoScripts,* 16(1), pp. 141-153.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E. and Sziarto, K. (2008). The Spatialities of Contentious Politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 33(2), pp. 157-172.

Massey, D. (1991). A Global Sense of Place. *Marxism Today,* 38, pp. 24-29.

Nagar, R. and Geiger, S. (2007). Reflexivity, Positionality and Identity in Feminist Fieldwork: Beyond the Impasse. In: A. Tickell, T. Barnes, T. Peck and E. Sheppard, eds, *Politics and Practice in Economic Geography*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, pp. 267-278.

Ruthven, M. (2011). The Aga Khan Development Network and Institutions. In: F. Daftary, ed., *A Modern History of the Ismailis. Continuity and Change in a Muslim Community*, London: Tauris, pp. 189-220.

Sheppard, E. (2002). The Spaces and Times of Globalization: Place, Scale, Networks and Positionality. *Economic Geography,* 78(3), pp. 307-330.

Sökefeld, M. (1997). *Ein Labyrinth von Identitäten in Nordpakistan. Zwischen Landbesitz, Religion und Kaschmir-Konflikt*. Köln: Köppe.

Sökefeld, M. (1997). Migration and Society in Gilgit, Northern Areas of Pakistan. *Anthropos,* 92(1/3), pp. 83-90.

Steinberg, J. (2011). *Isma'ili Modern: Globalization and Identity in a Muslim Community.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Stöber, G. (2007). Religious Identities Provoked: The Gilgit 'Textbook Controvery' and its Conflictual Context. *Internationale Schulbuchforschung/ International Textbook Research,* 29(4), pp. 389-412.

Thobani, S. (2011). Communities of Tradition and the Modernization of Education in South Asia: The Contribution of the Aga Khan III. In: F. Daftary, ed., *A Modern History of the Ismailis. Continuity and Change in a Muslim Community*, London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 161-185.

Varley, E. (2010). Targeted Doctors, Missing Patients: Obstetric Health Services and Sectarian Conflict in Northern Pakistan. *Social Science and Medicine,* 70(1), pp. 61-70.

Wood, G., Malik, A. and Sagheer, S., eds, (2006). *Valleys in Transition. Twenty Years of AKRSP's Experience in Northern Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

---

[1] On the multi-dimensionality of space, see: Jessop et al., 2008; Leitner et al., 2008.

[2] The study is based on three months of field research in September/October 2011 and October/November 2012 in Islamabad, Gilgit, Central Hunza and different villages of Gojal. A qualitative set of methods has been applied for this study, mainly based on guided interviews and group discussions with current student migrants, interviews with hostel wardens and representatives of educational institutions.

[3] Interview with 27 years-old female student migrant from Shimshal on 22 September 2011 (in the following abbreviated as: 27f-Shimshal-22.09.2011) and a 26 years-old male student migrant from Gulmit on 17 September 2011 (26m-Gulmit-17.09.2011) (identical quotes in both interviews).

[4] 22m-Chupursan-17.09.2011.

[5] 27f-Shimshal-22.09.2011.

[6] 23f-Ghulkin-20.09.2011.

[7] 26m-Gulmit-17.09.2011.

[8] 27f-Shimshal-22.09.2011.

[9] The Notification Letter of the KIU administration, dated 27 March 2010, is available at: http://theterrorland.blogspot.de/2010/10/ [Accessed on 13 Nov. 2014].

[10] In the South Asian use of English, the word ‚teasing' has, besides ‚annoying, bothering, mocking', also a second meaning with a sexual connotation: according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word 'eve-teasing' is used in Indo-English for "sexual harassment of a woman by a man in a public place". Available at: www.oed.com [Accessed 13 Nov. 2014].

[11] 26m-Chupursan-17.09.2011.

[12] 26m-Gulmit-17.09.2011.

[13] 27f-Shsimshal-22.09.2011.

[14] 26m-Gulmit-17.09.2011.