



Legal Identity Formation Among Diaspora Communities: Culture, Recognition, and Belonging

1. Farshad. Taheri: Department of Cultural Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
2. Shirin. Poursina: Department of Cultural Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
3. Alireza. Dastjerdi*: Department of Public Law, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: alireza.dastjerdi.pub@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore how members of diaspora communities in Tehran construct, negotiate, and reinterpret legal identity through cultural attachment, institutional recognition, and experiences of social belonging. This qualitative study was conducted using an exploratory phenomenological design. Participants included 24 adult members of diaspora communities residing in Tehran, selected through purposive and snowball sampling. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews focused on migration history, legal documentation, institutional encounters, cultural belonging, and perceptions of recognition. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was achieved; saturation was reached after the twenty-first interview, and three additional interviews were conducted to confirm thematic stability. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. NVivo software was used to organize transcripts, generate initial codes, compare emerging categories, and develop final themes. Credibility was enhanced through member checking, peer review, prolonged engagement with the data, and maintenance of an audit trail. Analysis generated four main categories: legal identity as negotiated status, cultural memory and hybrid self-identification, institutional recognition and misrecognition, and belonging as conditional membership. Participants described legal identity not merely as citizenship, residence permits, or documentation, but as a lived and relational process shaped by bureaucratic encounters, family narratives, language, cultural practices, labor-market access, education, and everyday social interactions. While some participants viewed legal documents as a source of protection and legitimacy, others experienced them as fragile, temporary, or insufficient for social acceptance. The study suggests that legal identity formation among diaspora communities is a dynamic process situated between formal law, cultural continuity, social recognition, and affective belonging. Legal status alone does not guarantee belonging; rather, belonging emerges when institutional recognition is accompanied by social respect, cultural inclusion, and meaningful participation in public life.

Keywords: legal identity; diaspora communities; recognition; belonging; cultural identity; migration; qualitative research; Tehran

How to cite this article:

Taheri, F., Poursina, S., & Dastjerdi, A. (2025). Legal Identity Formation Among Diaspora Communities: Culture, Recognition, and Belonging. *Contemporary Issues in Law, Culture, and Globalization*, 1(4), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.61838/cileg.1.4.6>

© 2025 the authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

Introduction

Legal identity has traditionally been associated with formal membership in a political community, most visibly through nationality, citizenship, residence permits, civil registration, and access to legally recognized rights. In migration and diaspora

contexts, however, legal identity cannot be reduced to formal documentation alone. It is also produced through social recognition, cultural memory, everyday encounters with institutions, and the emotional experience of belonging or exclusion. Diaspora communities often live across multiple legal, cultural, and symbolic spaces: they may be legally present in one society, culturally connected to another, and emotionally attached to both. This layered condition makes legal identity formation a complex process in which law, culture, recognition, and belonging interact continuously.

Diaspora has become a central concept in migration studies, but it remains analytically contested. Safran (1991) described diasporas through displacement, collective memory, orientation toward a homeland, and maintenance of group consciousness. Cohen (2008) later expanded the concept by emphasizing the diversity of diasporic formations, including victim, labor, trade, imperial, and cultural diasporas. Brubaker (2005) warned against treating diaspora as a fixed group category and argued that it should also be understood as a stance, claim, or mode of identification. From this perspective, diaspora identity is not simply inherited; it is produced and reproduced through narratives, institutions, rituals, family histories, and encounters with host-society structures. Legal identity formation among diaspora communities must therefore be studied as both a juridical and sociocultural process.

The concept of transnationalism is particularly useful for understanding this process. Migrants and diaspora communities often sustain connections across national borders through kinship, remittances, communication, political engagement, religious practices, and cultural reproduction. Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) conceptualized migrants as embedded in transnational social fields, where individuals may participate in multiple social, cultural, and legal environments simultaneously. This perspective challenges methodological nationalism, which assumes that social life is contained within the boundaries of the nation-state. For diaspora members, legal identity is often shaped not only by the laws of the country of residence, but also by memories of the country of origin, expectations of family networks, and comparative interpretations of rights, duties, and legitimacy.

Citizenship studies also provide a crucial framework for this article. Marshall (1950) classically conceptualized citizenship as a bundle of civil, political, and social rights. Yet migration complicates this model because many non-citizens may work, study, pay taxes, raise families, and participate in community life without enjoying full political membership. Soysal (1994) argued that postnational forms of membership have expanded certain rights beyond national citizenship, especially in liberal democracies. However, the lived experience of migrants and diaspora communities shows that formal rights, partial rights, and social recognition do not always align. A person may hold residence documents but still be treated as an outsider; conversely, another may have strong community belonging but lack secure legal protection.

Recognition theory deepens this analysis by explaining why formal status alone is insufficient for identity formation. Honneth (1995) argued that individual self-realization depends on forms of recognition, including love, rights, and social esteem. In legal terms, recognition means being treated as a rights-bearing subject whose dignity and claims are acknowledged. Fraser (2000) added that recognition must be linked with redistribution and institutional justice, because symbolic respect without material access can reproduce inequality. For diaspora communities, recognition operates at several levels: the state recognizes or fails to recognize legal status; institutions recognize or misrecognize names, documents, languages, and qualifications; and society recognizes or denies cultural legitimacy. Legal identity formation is therefore affected by both juridical status and the everyday politics of respect.

The politics of belonging is another key dimension. Yuval-Davis (2006) distinguishes between belonging as emotional attachment and the politics of belonging as the boundary-making process through which communities decide who is included and who is excluded. Belonging involves social location, identification, emotional attachment, and ethical-political values. This framework is especially relevant to diaspora communities because belonging is often conditional, negotiated, and situational.

A diaspora member may feel culturally close to the country of origin, socially integrated in the host society, and legally uncertain in both. Legal identity formation occurs within these tensions: between attachment and exclusion, documentation and dignity, recognition and suspicion.

Legal consciousness scholarship further clarifies how people understand and use law in everyday life. Ewick and Silbey (1998) argued that law is not experienced only in courts or formal institutions; rather, it appears in routine interactions, narratives, expectations, and strategies. Merry (1990) similarly showed that ordinary people interpret legal authority through local meanings and social relationships. For migrants and diaspora communities, legal consciousness may be shaped by experiences with immigration offices, schools, employers, police, landlords, courts, and welfare institutions. These encounters teach individuals whether law is protective, distant, threatening, negotiable, or inaccessible. Menjívar and Abrego (2012) introduced the concept of legal violence to describe how immigration law can produce suffering through uncertainty, surveillance, family separation, restricted mobility, and blocked opportunities. Although diaspora communities differ widely in status and history, this concept highlights how law may shape identity not only through rights but also through vulnerability.

Culture is equally central to legal identity formation. Cultural identity is not static; Hall (1990) described it as a process of becoming as much as being. Diaspora subjects often construct identity through memory, rupture, translation, and hybridity. Bhabha (1994) introduced the idea of the “third space” to describe cultural negotiation beyond binary categories of origin and destination. In legal identity formation, this hybridity may appear when individuals combine inherited norms, host-country legal expectations, religious obligations, family honor, gender norms, and institutional requirements. Legal identity is thus not simply imposed by the state; it is interpreted through cultural repertoires and moral worlds.

Despite extensive scholarship on migration, citizenship, diaspora, and belonging, there remains a need for qualitative research that examines how diaspora members themselves narrate legal identity formation in specific urban contexts. Tehran provides a significant setting for such inquiry because it hosts diverse migrant and diaspora populations with varied histories of movement, cultural proximity, economic participation, and legal status. Studying diaspora communities in Tehran can illuminate how legal identity is formed in a context where cultural familiarity and legal uncertainty may coexist. Some groups may share linguistic, religious, or regional affinities with Iranian society, while still experiencing administrative barriers, social othering, or limited recognition.

Accordingly, this study explores how members of diaspora communities in Tehran construct legal identity through culture, recognition, and belonging. Rather than treating legal identity as a fixed administrative category, the study approaches it as a lived, narrated, and relational process. The central research question is: How do members of diaspora communities in Tehran experience and interpret the formation of legal identity in relation to cultural continuity, institutional recognition, and social belonging? By focusing on participants’ lived experiences, the study contributes to socio-legal studies, migration research, and cultural sociology by showing how law becomes meaningful in everyday life and how legal identity emerges at the intersection of documents, memories, institutions, and relationships.

Methods and Materials

This study employed a qualitative exploratory design using semi-structured interviews. A qualitative approach was selected because the aim was to understand the meanings, narratives, and lived experiences through which diaspora members construct legal identity. The study population consisted of adult members of diaspora communities residing in Tehran. Participants were eligible if they were at least 18 years old, had lived in Tehran for at least one year, self-identified as belonging to a diaspora or migrant-background community, and were willing to discuss experiences related to legal status, cultural belonging, recognition, and institutional encounters.

A total of 24 participants were recruited through purposive and snowball sampling. Initial participants were identified through community networks, cultural associations, educational contacts, and informal referrals. To ensure diversity, the sampling process considered gender, age, length of residence, country or community of origin, educational background, occupational status, and legal status. Recruitment continued until theoretical saturation was achieved. Saturation was reached after 21 interviews, when no substantially new codes or categories emerged; three additional interviews were conducted to confirm the stability and adequacy of the thematic structure, consistent with qualitative saturation principles (Guest et al., 2006).

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted in Tehran. The interview guide included open-ended questions about participants' migration histories, legal documentation, experiences with public institutions, cultural identity, family and community expectations, feelings of belonging, perceived discrimination or recognition, and strategies for navigating legal and social uncertainty. Sample interview questions included: "What does legal identity mean to you?", "How have documents or legal status affected your sense of belonging?", "Can you describe an experience in which you felt recognized or not recognized by an institution?", and "How do culture and family history shape the way you understand your place in society?"

Interviews lasted between 45 and 80 minutes. They were conducted in a private and comfortable location chosen by the participants or through secure online communication when face-to-face meetings were not possible. All interviews were audio-recorded with informed consent and transcribed verbatim. Participants were assured that participation was voluntary, that they could withdraw at any time, and that their identities would remain confidential. Pseudonyms were used in transcripts and reports.

Data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis following the six-phase approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. NVivo software was used to organize the transcripts, manage codes, retrieve coded segments, compare patterns across participants, and develop thematic categories. The analysis was both inductive and interpretive: initial codes were generated from participants' narratives, while later interpretation was informed by concepts from diaspora studies, recognition theory, legal consciousness, and belonging.

To enhance trustworthiness, several strategies were applied. Credibility was supported through member checking with selected participants, peer debriefing, and repeated reading of transcripts. Dependability was strengthened through documentation of analytic decisions and maintenance of an audit trail. Confirmability was addressed by reflexive memo-writing to identify assumptions and reduce interpretive bias. Transferability was enhanced through thick description of the research context, participants, and categories, following qualitative trustworthiness criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The study was also designed in alignment with the principles of qualitative interview reporting reflected in COREQ guidance (Tong et al., 2007).

Findings

The participants included 24 adult members of diaspora communities residing in Tehran. Of these, 13 participants were women (54.2%) and 11 were men (45.8%). Participants' ages ranged from 19 to 58 years, with the largest age group being 25–34 years ($n = 9$, 37.5%), followed by 35–44 years ($n = 7$, 29.2%), 18–24 years ($n = 4$, 16.7%), 45–54 years ($n = 3$, 12.5%), and 55 years or older ($n = 1$, 4.2%). In terms of community background, 14 participants identified as Afghan diaspora members (58.3%), 4 as Iraqi diaspora members (16.7%), 3 as Syrian diaspora members (12.5%), and 3 as belonging to other regional diaspora backgrounds, including Azerbaijani, Pakistani, and Tajik communities (12.5%). Regarding length of residence in Tehran, 5 participants had lived in the city for 1–5 years (20.8%), 8 for 6–10 years (33.3%), and 11 for more than 10 years (45.8%). Educational levels varied: 6 participants had completed secondary education (25.0%), 10 held undergraduate degrees

or were university students (41.7%), and 8 held postgraduate degrees or professional qualifications (33.3%). Participants' occupational status included students ($n = 5$, 20.8%), self-employed workers ($n = 6$, 25.0%), employees in private-sector jobs ($n = 7$, 29.2%), homemakers ($n = 3$, 12.5%), and unemployed or irregularly employed individuals ($n = 3$, 12.5%).

The first category showed that participants understood legal identity as a negotiated and unstable status rather than a simple administrative label. For many participants, identity documents, residence permits, educational records, work permissions, and registration numbers functioned as practical symbols of existence. Participants repeatedly described documents as tools that made them "visible" to institutions, but they also emphasized that visibility did not always mean dignity or security. One participant stated, "When I have the paper, I feel I exist in the system; when it expires, I feel I disappear again." Another explained, "My name is the same, my family is the same, but every office asks for another document. It is like my identity must be proven again and again." These narratives show that legal identity was not experienced as fixed recognition but as a continuous process of verification. Participants with insecure or temporary status described anxiety around renewal, employment, travel, and access to education. Even those with more stable documents noted that legal status did not automatically remove social suspicion. Thus, legal identity emerged as a fragile form of recognition, dependent on bureaucratic procedures and institutional interpretation.

The second category concerned the role of cultural memory in shaping legal identity. Participants did not define themselves only through legal status; they also referred to family history, language, food, religious practices, community rituals, and memories of homeland. For second-generation or long-term residents, identity was especially hybrid. They often felt culturally connected to Iran while also maintaining emotional attachment to ancestral origins. One young participant said, "I grew up in Tehran, I speak like my classmates, but at home my grandmother tells stories that make me feel I belong somewhere else too." Another participant explained, "My legal status says one thing, my accent says another thing, and my family history says something else." These accounts indicate that diaspora legal identity is layered and culturally mediated. Participants often translated between different normative worlds: family expectations, host-society rules, community traditions, and state requirements. Cultural continuity provided stability and meaning, but it could also create tension when younger participants sought social integration while older family members emphasized preservation of origin-based identity. Legal identity was therefore shaped by a hybrid sense of self that combined inherited belonging with everyday adaptation.

The third category reflected participants' experiences of recognition and misrecognition in encounters with institutions. Schools, universities, employers, municipal offices, banks, clinics, and administrative agencies played an important role in shaping how participants understood their legal worth. Positive experiences of respectful treatment strengthened participants' sense of dignity and inclusion. For example, one participant recalled, "At university, one professor never treated me as foreign. He told me, 'Your work is what matters.' That changed how I saw myself." However, many participants also described experiences in which institutions reduced them to nationality, legal status, accent, or documentation problems. One participant stated, "Sometimes before I speak, they look at my card and decide what kind of person I am." Another reported, "The problem is not only the law; it is the way people use the law to make you feel lower." Such experiences demonstrate that misrecognition was not limited to formal exclusion. It also occurred through tone, delay, suspicion, and unequal interpretation of rules. Participants were particularly sensitive to situations in which their qualifications, work experience, or personal histories were ignored because of their diaspora background. Institutional recognition therefore functioned as a central mechanism through which legal identity was either strengthened or damaged.

The fourth category showed that belonging was experienced as conditional, situational, and relational. Participants often distinguished between living in Tehran and belonging to Tehran. Some felt attached to neighborhoods, schools, workplaces, and friendships, yet still sensed that their membership could be questioned. One participant said, "I know the streets better than

many people, but still someone can ask me, ‘When will you go back?’” Another noted, “Belonging is not only where you live. It is when people stop asking you to explain why you are here.” Participants described belonging as shaped by daily interactions, such as being invited to social events, being trusted by employers, being accepted by neighbors, or being allowed to participate in community decisions. However, belonging was also interrupted by reminders of difference, including jokes, stereotypes, legal restrictions, or uncertainty about the future. For several participants, legal recognition without social acceptance felt incomplete. They emphasized that documents could permit residence but could not guarantee emotional security. This category suggests that legal identity formation depends not only on formal status but also on the extent to which individuals are allowed to imagine a future within the society.

Discussion

The present study explored legal identity formation among diaspora communities in Tehran through the interconnected dimensions of culture, recognition, and belonging. The findings indicate that legal identity is not experienced merely as a formal category assigned by the state. Rather, it is continuously produced through bureaucratic encounters, cultural memories, social interactions, institutional recognition, and affective attachments. Participants’ accounts revealed four main categories: legal identity as negotiated status, cultural memory and hybrid self-identification, institutional recognition and misrecognition, and belonging as conditional membership. Together, these categories show that diaspora legal identity is both juridical and relational. It is juridical because documents, permits, and institutional rules shape access to rights and resources; it is relational because identity becomes meaningful through recognition by others.

The first category, legal identity as negotiated status, supports socio-legal scholarship emphasizing that law is experienced in everyday life rather than only through formal legal institutions. Participants described legal identity as something that had to be repeatedly proven through documents, renewals, and administrative procedures. This aligns with Ewick and Silbey’s (1998) argument that legal consciousness is embedded in ordinary narratives and practices. For participants, law appeared through school registration, employment eligibility, residence renewal, banking access, and institutional verification. Their accounts also resonate with Merry’s (1990) view that people interpret legality through local encounters and social meanings. Legal identity was not merely a question of “having” documents; it involved how documents were interpreted, whether they produced security, and whether they protected participants from arbitrary treatment. The anxiety associated with expiring permits and repeated verification also reflects Menjivar and Abrego’s (2012) concept of legal violence, in which immigration law produces vulnerability through uncertainty, restriction, and symbolic subordination.

The second category, cultural memory and hybrid self-identification, demonstrates that diaspora legal identity is shaped by cultural narratives as much as by formal status. Participants described themselves through language, family history, rituals, and memories of homeland, while also expressing attachment to Tehran as a lived urban space. This supports Hall’s (1990) argument that cultural identity is not fixed but formed through history, memory, and becoming. The findings also align with Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity, as participants often occupied an intermediate position between origin-based identity and host-society belonging. For younger participants and long-term residents, legal identity was especially hybrid: they had grown up within Iranian social institutions but continued to be marked by familial and community histories of displacement or migration. This finding is also consistent with Levitt and Glick Schiller’s (2004) theory of transnational social fields, which suggests that migrants and diaspora communities live within overlapping networks that connect origin and destination societies. Legal identity, in this sense, is shaped by simultaneous attachments rather than by a single national frame.

The third category, institutional recognition and misrecognition, highlights the importance of recognition in the formation of legal selfhood. Participants’ experiences with universities, employers, administrative offices, and service providers shaped how they evaluated their dignity, legitimacy, and place in society. Positive recognition strengthened self-confidence and

inclusion, whereas misrecognition produced shame, anger, or withdrawal. This finding strongly aligns with Honneth's (1995) recognition theory, which argues that self-respect depends on being recognized as a rights-bearing person. When participants were treated primarily as "foreign," "temporary," or "problematic," their legal identity was damaged even if they possessed valid documents. Fraser's (2000) critique is also relevant because recognition cannot be separated from institutional access and material opportunity. Participants did not seek symbolic respect alone; they also wanted fair treatment in education, employment, documentation, and public services. Therefore, the findings suggest that legal identity formation requires both respectful interaction and structurally fair access to institutions.

The fourth category, belonging as conditional membership, shows that legal status and belonging are related but not identical. Participants distinguished between residence and belonging, emphasizing that one may live in a city for many years without being accepted as a full member of social life. This finding is consistent with Yuval-Davis's (2006) distinction between belonging and the politics of belonging. Belonging involves emotional attachment and feeling at home, while the politics of belonging concerns the boundaries through which societies define insiders and outsiders. Participants' narratives showed that these boundaries were activated through everyday questions such as "Where are you really from?" or "When will you return?" Such questions positioned diaspora members as temporary even when their lives were deeply rooted in Tehran. This finding also supports Bloemraad's (2006) argument that incorporation depends not only on individual adaptation but also on institutional and societal contexts that encourage or limit membership.

Overall, the findings contribute to migration and socio-legal studies by showing that legal identity formation among diaspora communities is a dynamic and multidimensional process. Formal legal status provides an important foundation for security, but it does not fully determine identity or belonging. Participants interpreted law through cultural narratives, institutional encounters, and social recognition. This supports broader scholarship on citizenship and postnational membership, which argues that membership in contemporary societies is increasingly complex and cannot be reduced to nationality alone (Marshall, 1950; Soysal, 1994). However, the findings also show that postnational rights remain incomplete when social acceptance and institutional recognition are unstable. Diaspora members may participate in economic, educational, and cultural life while still being treated as partial members.

The study also highlights the importance of urban context. Tehran was not simply a location where participants resided; it was a site of identity formation. Participants developed attachments to neighborhoods, schools, universities, workplaces, and social networks. These urban attachments sometimes challenged formal exclusion by producing everyday forms of belonging. At the same time, the city also exposed participants to administrative barriers, stereotypes, and social comparison. This dual role of the city suggests that diaspora legal identity is produced through both opportunity and constraint. Urban life can create spaces of integration and recognition, but it can also intensify visibility, competition, and boundary-making.

Another important implication concerns intergenerational identity. Younger participants often described themselves as culturally and socially embedded in Tehran, while older participants emphasized memory, displacement, and continuity with the country of origin. This does not indicate a simple generational divide, but it suggests different modes of legal identity formation. For first-generation participants, legal identity was often connected to survival, documentation, work, and protection. For second-generation or long-term residents, it was more closely connected to recognition, future planning, education, and social acceptance. This distinction supports diaspora scholarship that views identity as historically situated and internally diverse rather than homogeneous (Brubaker, 2005; Cohen, 2008).

The findings also suggest that legal identity formation should be understood as a moral process. Participants did not discuss law only in technical terms. They connected law with respect, humiliation, trust, fear, hope, and dignity. This moral language indicates that legal identity involves judgments about whether institutions see individuals as fully human, socially valuable,

and deserving of a future. Recognition theory is therefore particularly useful for interpreting the results because it connects legal status with self-respect and social esteem (Honneth, 1995). When participants were recognized by teachers, employers, or officials, they experienced law as a possible pathway to belonging. When they were misrecognized, they experienced law as a boundary that reproduced outsider status.

In practical terms, the study suggests that policies addressing diaspora communities should go beyond documentation. Secure legal status is essential, but it should be accompanied by culturally responsive institutions, anti-discrimination practices, accessible administrative procedures, and public narratives that acknowledge diaspora contributions. Legal identity formation is strengthened when institutions communicate consistency, transparency, and respect. Conversely, unclear procedures, repeated suspicion, and informal discrimination weaken trust in law and reduce the possibility of belonging. The findings therefore call for an integrated approach in which legal recognition, cultural inclusion, and social participation are treated as interconnected components of diaspora integration.

This study has several limitations. First, the sample was limited to 24 participants residing in Tehran, and the findings may not represent all diaspora communities in Iran or other urban contexts. Second, the study relied only on semi-structured interviews; therefore, it captured narrated experiences rather than direct observation of institutional encounters. Third, participants came from diverse diaspora backgrounds, and although this diversity enriched the findings, it also limited the possibility of providing a detailed analysis of each community separately. Fourth, legal identity is a sensitive topic, and some participants may have avoided discussing insecure status, discrimination, or institutional conflict in full detail. Finally, because the study was qualitative, the aim was depth of understanding rather than statistical generalization.

Future studies should compare legal identity formation across different cities and regions to examine how local institutional cultures shape diaspora belonging. Longitudinal research could explore how legal identity changes over time, especially across generations and during transitions such as education, employment, marriage, documentation renewal, or naturalization. Comparative studies between different diaspora groups would also help clarify how language, religion, ethnicity, class, gender, and migration history influence legal consciousness and recognition. Future research may also combine interviews with ethnographic observation in schools, workplaces, community organizations, and administrative offices to better understand how recognition and misrecognition occur in practice.

Practitioners and policymakers should recognize that legal identity is not only a matter of issuing documents but also a matter of dignity, clarity, and inclusion. Public institutions should provide transparent procedures, culturally sensitive communication, and staff training on respectful interaction with diaspora communities. Schools and universities can support belonging by acknowledging students' cultural backgrounds while ensuring equal access to educational opportunities. Community organizations can create spaces for legal literacy, intergenerational dialogue, and support for navigating administrative systems. Employers and service providers should avoid reducing individuals to nationality or documentation status and instead adopt practices that recognize skills, experience, and social contribution. Strengthening legal identity requires coordinated attention to rights, recognition, and everyday belonging.

Conclusion

This study examined legal identity formation among diaspora communities in Tehran and found that legal identity is constructed through the interaction of formal status, cultural memory, institutional recognition, and social belonging. Participants did not experience legal identity as a fixed administrative category; rather, they understood it as a continuous process of being documented, interpreted, accepted, questioned, and recognized. Legal documents were important because they provided access, visibility, and protection, but they did not automatically produce belonging. Cultural memory gave participants continuity and meaning, while institutional encounters shaped their sense of dignity and legitimacy. Belonging emerged as

conditional when social acceptance remained uncertain despite long-term residence or legal documentation. The study concludes that legal identity formation among diaspora communities must be understood as a socio-legal and cultural process. Policies and practices that aim to support diaspora communities should therefore combine secure legal recognition with social inclusion, institutional fairness, and respect for cultural plurality.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

- Anthias, F. (2008). Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: An intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations: Migration and Social Change*, 4(1), 5–20.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*. University of California Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brubaker, R. (2005). The “diaspora” diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141987042000289997>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Cohen, R. (2008). *Global diasporas: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1998). *The common place of law: Stories from everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 3, 107–120.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3317464>

- Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903>
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222–237). Lawrence & Wishart.
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts* (J. Anderson, Trans.). MIT Press.
- Levitt, P., & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 1002–1039. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00227.x>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge University Press.
- Menjívar, C., & Abrego, L. J. (2012). Legal violence: Immigration law and the lives of Central American immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(5), 1380–1421. <https://doi.org/10.1086/663575>
- Merry, S. E. (1990). *Getting justice and getting even: Legal consciousness among working-class Americans*. University of Chicago Press.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), 217–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014198799329468>
- Safran, W. (1991). Diasporas in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dsp.1991.0004>
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. University of Chicago Press.
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research: A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Routledge.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313220600769331>