

Anna Xymena Wieczorek

MIGRATION AND (IM)MOBILITY

Biographical Experiences of Polish Migrants
in Germany and Canada



[transcript] Culture and Social Practice

Anna Xymena Wiczorek
Migration and (Im)Mobility

Culture and Social Practice

Für meine Eltern Georg und Marianna Wieczorek

Anna Xymena Wieczorek (Dr. phil.), born in 1985, obtained her PhD in sociology within the International Research Training Group “Diversity: Mediating Difference in Transcultural Spaces” at the University of Trier. Her research project included several stays abroad at the collaborating Université de Montréal as well as in Toronto and Berlin for field activities. Her research interests are migration, mobility and transnational studies as well as cultural, diversity and gender studies.

ANNA XYMENA WIECZOREK

Migration and (Im)Mobility

Biographical Experiences of Polish Migrants in Germany and Canada

[transcript]

Diese Studie ist eine aktualisierte Fassung der Arbeit: »Patterns of (Im)Mobility: Revisiting Migration through Biographical Experiences in Germany and Canada«, die im Jahr 2016 am Fachbereich IV der Universität Trier als Dissertationsschrift angenommen wurde.

An electronic version of this book is freely available, thanks to the support of libraries working with Knowledge Unlatched. KU is a collaborative initiative designed to make high quality books Open Access for the public good. The Open Access ISBN for this book is 978-3-8394-4251-7. More information about the initiative and links to the Open Access version can be found at www.knowledgeteunlatched.org.



Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (BY-NC-ND) which means that the text may be used for non-commercial purposes, provided credit is given to the author. For details go to <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

To create an adaptation, translation, or derivative of the original work and for commercial use, further permission is required and can be obtained by contacting rights@transcript-publishing.com

Creative Commons license terms for re-use do not apply to any content (such as graphs, figures, photos, excerpts, etc.) not original to the Open Access publication and further permission may be required from the rights holder. The obligation to research and clear permission lies solely with the party re-using the material.

© 2018 transcript Verlag, Bielefeld

Cover layout: Maria Arndt, Bielefeld

Cover illustration: Toronto, Canada / 2015 / copyright by Anna Xymena Wiczorek

Copy-editing: Alexia Moyer

Typeset: Anna Xymena Wiczorek

Printed by Majuskel Medienproduktion GmbH, Wetzlar

Print-ISBN 978-3-8376-4251-3

PDF-ISBN 978-3-8394-4251-7

<https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839442517>

Printed on permanent acid-free text paper.

Contents

List of Tables, Figures, and Abbreviations | 9

Acknowledgements | 11

Introduction: How We Think of Migration and Mobility | 13

PART I: A PROPOSITION: EXAMINING MIGRANTS' MOBILITIES THROUGH BIOGRAPHIES

1 From "Classical" and "New" Approaches in Migration Studies to the "Mobilities Perspective" on Migration | 27

1.1 "Classical" Approaches in Migration Studies | 28

Assimilation | 28

Integration | 31

Multiculturalism | 36

What happens in the Country of Arrival? | 39

1.2 "New" Approaches in Migration Studies | 41

(Migrant) Transnationalism | 42

Diaspora | 47

Cosmopolitanism | 48

What happens in the Country of Arrival, in the Country of Origin, and/or in other Destinations? | 52

1.3 Mobility Studies as a New Research Perspective on Migration | 54

The "Mobilities Paradigm" | 54

Conceptualizing (Im)Mobility | 57

The Relation of Migration Studies and Mobility Studies | 61

2 (Im)Mobile Individuals: Studying Their Biographies | 67

- 2.1 Approaching the Field: Methodology, Methods,
and Sampling Strategies | 68
 - Accessing Mobilities through Biographical Research | 68
 - Autobiographical Interviewing | 72
 - Research Design and Sampling Strategies | 74
- 2.2 Leaving the Field: Sample, Narratives,
and the Construction of a Typology | 78
 - Characteristics of the Sample | 78
 - Analyzing Biographical Narratives | 80
 - Constructing an Empirically Grounded Typology | 81

PART II: PATTERNS OF (IM)MOBILITY: READING LIVES AND INTERPRETING BIOGRAPHICAL NARRATIVES

Excursus on the Country of Origin: Poland | 89

A Note on my Respondents' Life Stories | 99

3 Immobility: The Immobile Pattern of Mobility | 101

- 3.1 Anja: "The One Who Talks about Multiculturalism
but Practices Assimilation" | 102
 - Sense of (no) Belonging? Aversive Discourses
and Dark Imaginaries of Poland | 103
 - Assimilationist Behaviour in a Multicultural Context | 107
 - Antagonisms and Aversive Mobility | 111
- 3.2 Sandra: "The One Who Teaches Her Parents
How to Speak German" | 113
 - When Kids Educate their Parents: Collective Integration through
Reversed Family Roles | 114
 - About Successful and Unsuccessful Integration: The Effect
of the Social Milieu | 118
 - Reintroducing the Polish Language after
Successful Integration? | 123
 - Cultural Ambiguity in a Settled Life | 127
- 3.3 Janusz, Part I: "The One Who Speaks Polish Worse than
His Brother" | 134
 - Two Educational Models in a Bi-Ethnic Family | 134
 - Marginalizing "Polishness" | 138
- 3.4 Immobility: Incorporation, Aversion, and Sedentariness | 140

4 Transmobility: The Transnational Pattern of Mobility | 145

- 4.1 Janusz, Part II: “The One Who Speaks Polish Better than His Brother” | 146
 - New Language, New Possibilities | 146
 - Transnationalising Relationships | 151
 - The Mobile Search for a Profession | 154
 - Cultural Irritations under the Condition of Mobility | 159
 - Self-Acknowledgement through Language Acquirement | 163
- 4.2 Oscar: “The One Who Could be Anything in a Weird Way” | 165
 - Aristocratic Nobility and Diasporic Mobility | 166
 - A Limited Scope of Montreal: Growing up within the Polish Community | 169
 - Broadening the Scope: Experiencing Montreal’s Diversity | 174
 - From Canada’s Heterogeneity to Poland’s Homogeneity | 181
 - The Simplicity of European Mobility | 187
 - Looking Back and Looking Ahead | 190
- 4.3 Malinka, Part I: “The One Who Wants to Emigrate” | 193
 - Transnational “Motherhood” Reversed: Living a Transnational “Childhood” | 194
 - Between Regret and Integration | 199
 - Perceiving “Origin” in a Transnational Context | 202
 - Immigration or Mobility? | 203
- 4.4 Transmobility: Cross-Border Ties and Bi-or Multilocal Mobility | 213

5 Cosmobility: The Cosmopolitan Pattern of Mobility | 219

- 5.1 Malinka, Part II: “The One Who Does Not Want to Emigrate” | 220
 - Mobility as a Strategy for Disappearing | 220
 - Studying, Commuting, Going Abroad, and Travelling | 224
 - Slowing Down: From Hypermobility back to Sedentariness? | 230
- 5.2 Francis: “The One Who Just Does Not Live in the Same Place” | 236
 - Roots of Mobility in an Aristocratic Diaspora | 237
 - Transnationality under the Condition of Mobility | 241
 - “Polishness” and the Construction of Social Class | 246
 - A Sporty Souvenir from Kenya | 247
 - New Possibilities in a New Place | 250
 - Contextual Self-Understanding and Travelling Origins | 252
- 5.3 Cosmobility: Open Mobility and the “Homing-Effect” | 254

PART III: MAKING SENSE OF MOVEMENTS: TOWARDS A “MOBILITIES PERSPECTIVE” IN MIGRATION STUDIES

6 Revisiting Migration through the Patterns of (Im)Mobility | 261

- 6.1 Reading Migration between Experiences and Theories | 262
 - Mobility as an Element of the Past: Sedentary
Social Advancement and Assimilation | 262
 - Mobility as Bi-Locality: Mobile Paths of Integration
and (Migrant) Transnationalism | 269
 - Mobility as a Way of Life: Mobile Engagement
with the World and Cosmopolitanism | 275
- 6.2 The Spatial, Temporal, and Social Dimensions of (Im)Mobility | 282
 - Modalities of the Three Dimensions | 282
 - The Analytical Circle of Sociological Dimensions | 285
- 6.3 The Continuity of (Im)Mobility | 287
 - Reassessing Migration Theories | 287
 - The Contribution of the Study to Current Scholarly Debates | 290

Conclusion: How to *Rethink* Migration and Mobility | 293

References | 297

List of Tables, Figures, and Abbreviations

TABLES

Table 1: Types of Social Integration of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities | 32

Table 2: Acculturation Strategies | 34

Table 3: In-Depth Analyses of Life Stories | 85

Table 4: Characteristics of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility | 281

FIGURES

Figure 1: Result 1: Spatial and Temporal Dimensions
of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility | 283

Figure 2: Result 2: Social Dimensions of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility | 284

Figure 3: Result 3: The Analytical Circle of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility | 286

Figure 4: Reassessing Migration Theories According to
the Continuum of (Im)Mobility | 289

ABBREVIATIONS USED

- a.o.: amongst others
- A/N: author’s note
- ch.: chapter

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank the interviewees of this study—the young adults of Polish heritage in Montreal, Toronto, and Berlin—for sharing their amazing stories with me and for making my stay in each of these places unforgettable. The study would have not been possible without them.

I would like to express my gratitude to the International Research Training Group (IRTG): “Diversity—Mediating Difference in Transcultural Spaces” for making their support available in a number of ways: providing an inspiring scholarly environment in Trier, Saarbrücken, and in Montreal as well as giving me scientific and financial freedom.

I am deeply grateful to my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Martin Endreß (University of Trier) and Prof. Dr. Barbara Thériault (Université de Montréal). I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Endreß for his open mind, his patience, and his most valuable comments, which were of enormous help to me. His colloquia offered a welcoming platform to present my drafts and to learn from the experiences of others. I would like to thank all the participants for their feedback, especially Dr. Gabriel Stefan Nicolae, Dr. Benjamin Rampp, and Andreas Zerver. I would not have missed the stimulating discussions for the world. I owe my deepest appreciation and thanks to Prof. Thériault for her enriching and thought-provoking comments on my work, as well as her continuous support and motivation. Her guidance helped me throughout the time of research and writing of this thesis. She also welcomed me many times at the Université de Montréal and provided me with sought-after office space at the Department of Sociology during my stays abroad. I always very much appreciated her hospitality. I could not have imagined having better supervisors.

In addition to my supervisors, I am greatly indebted to Prof. Dr. Ursula Lehmkuhl (University of Trier) and Prof. Dr. Ludger Pries (Ruhr-University Bochum). I have profoundly benefited from Prof. Lehmkuhl’s immense knowledge and support, which had a significant influence on this project. I especially appre-

ciated her guidance and illuminating feedback when working with me on a meanwhile published book chapter. I would also like to express my special thanks to Prof. Pries, whose door at his Chair of Sociology/ Organization, Migration, Participation has been always open to me. Both his constructive comments on my research and his warm encouragement in times of hardship have been priceless. My gratitude is extended to Prof. Dr. Luin Goldring (York University, Toronto) and Prof. Dr. Paul Morris (Université de Saint Boniface, Winnipeg) for encouraging and eye-opening discussions.

I share the credit of my work with my colleagues and fellow Ph.D.-students: Sophie Schram, Rahab Njeri, Dave Poitras, Christoph Laugs and all the others, whom I thank for lively discussions, for our intensive workshops in Otzenhausen, and for all the fun we have had in the last four years in both Germany and Canada. I am particularly grateful for the assistance given by Dr. Lutz Schowalter, Dr. Gisela Minn, and Stefan Dixius at the University of Trier. I would also like to thank my editor, Dr. Alexia Moyer, who has done excellent work.

It is a pleasure to thank Séverine, Markus, and Dorota for their friendship and for the refreshing distractions from the academic world. My greatest gratitude goes to my family: my brother and my parents for their unconditional encouragement and for always being there, no matter what. This thesis would have remained a dream had it not been for my parents' support: that is why I dedicate it to them. Finally, I owe a big thank you to Florian, who has not only been an amazing help as a critical reader of the manuscript, but also a wonderful companion along the way. Thank you for your love and for making me so happy.

Introduction: How We Think of Migration and Mobility

The ways in which we, as individuals, understand migration and mobility have deep implications for societies and politics as well as for institutions and everyday practices. This book deals with them in the form of a sociological study. At its core is the duality of migration and mobility, and a possible way to overcome it. My interest in this topic developed while I engaged in fieldwork in the autumn and winter of 2013/14. I left Germany and travelled to Canada to do the first part of my fieldwork, consisting of narrative interviews with people of Polish heritage, which I then continued in Germany in a second pass. During my stay in Toronto, I met Caroline, a thirty-year-old woman, in a café downtown in February 2014.¹ Interviewing her, I learned that she had emigrated from Lodz to Toronto with her parents when she was seven years old. She talked a lot about the circumstances that brought her family to Toronto and about her own experiences in the city. Retrospectively, I see her biographical experience of being a “migrant” of Polish heritage in Canada as corresponding to one typical *pattern of (im)mobility* I was to outline in this study. While I did not quite know then what it would turn out to be about, something Caroline said struck me because—I can say now as I write this introduction—it captured the problem I was to tackle:

“I don’t think I would ever leave Canada. I really like living here. Well, maybe for a year. My parents brought me here, and I cannot imagine leaving them here, do you know what I mean? I don’t think I can be a *second-time immigrant*. I’ve already immigrated once. I went through that.” (Caroline, born 1986 in Lodz, my emphasis)

1 I have changed all of my respondents’ names in order to guarantee their anonymity.

In this quote, Caroline conveys a lot about her understanding of migration and mobility. She makes two important points for what was about to become my research object.

First, she sees a causality between leaving Canada for good and thus becoming a *second-time immigrant* somewhere else. It seems as though Caroline's biographical experience of having "already immigrated once" was a painful one, one demanding sacrifices on her and on her parents' parts, one ought not to be repeated. After immigration, the family had to face several challenges, particularly at the beginning of their settlement in Toronto. Caroline remembers that she attended grade two without any knowledge of English. She was then put into an English as a second language class (ESL) where she got intensive English language lessons specially designed for non-native speakers. Despite being a "quick student to learn English," it was not until grade six that she felt comfortable speaking it. Before becoming fluent in English, she remembers having been picked on and even beaten up by "a bunch of schoolgirls" in the schoolyard. These childhood experiences, she stresses, are neither easy to understand nor to deal with. While she eventually mastered the English language, her parents still face discrimination due to their language mistakes, Caroline tells me. She clearly sees a "pressure towards immigration in Canada," even if it is—in her opinion—not like in Europe, but still "people here are prejudiced towards groups that don't assimilate." Caroline's unwillingness to become a *second-time immigrant* is likely linked to the pressure im/migrants face in their destination countries.

Second, while Caroline clearly refuses to (re-)emigrate, she does not exclude the possibility of a temporary stay abroad. It seems as though the pressure to which Caroline refers is less pronounced when it comes to those geographical movements other than what is widely known as "im/migration," the kind practiced by, for instance, highly-skilled mobile professionals, expats, or exchange students. Apart from the fact that these are highly skilled workers, and thus enjoy a different social position in the scale of global inequality than lower-skilled migrant workers, the main difference is the assumption that from the outset the relocation of their life center is not permanent, but temporary. Not only does Caroline emphasize the possibility of leaving Canada after initial migration for a restricted period of time, she in fact did so, completing a master's degree in The Netherlands. Apparently, she does not perceive studying in The Netherlands as a "migration" that would have made her a second-time immigrant. What she refers to is yet another fundamental aspect of social life in a globalized world: mobility. While both migration and mobility evoke different meanings they, in reality, are not so incompatible, as Caroline's life-path suggests.

In general, politicians and the media, as well as various scholarly works in the field of migration studies, define migration as Caroline does. Migration is often equated with permanent or long-term settlement in a “country of arrival” while mobility is understood rather as temporary. “Migrants” are often conceived of as being sedentary after an initial migration. Migration, it seems, requires leaving behind beloved people and places and building a new life in a foreign place. Also, this life should, if possible, be socially accepted by the new society, a social phenomenon widely known as “integration.” Integration as a term has been instrumentalized and politicized whenever the public discourse focuses on migrants. By now, migration and integration are inextricably linked with one another as concepts. Migrants are supposed to integrate into the society of “the country of arrival,” to participate in state’s institutions, particularly in its labour market as well as in its cultural and social life. It is a comprehensible ideal most often only addressed towards migrants and not towards non-migrants, even if the latter are not well integrated into the state’s institutions. Such discourses create the impression that integration is just an issue for migrants and (re)produce differences between “migrants” and “non-migrants” that lead to an institutionalized pattern of inequality. The second-time immigrant to whom Caroline refers in the quote is a person who needs to go through the migration and integration processes twice; each time s/he must start from scratch meeting various expectations in different geographical and national contexts. Caroline does not want to repeat this process once more. As we see, her example hints at specific discourses and theoretical positions on migration and mobility in interplay with biographical experiences of individuals who are commonly labelled as “migrants.” This is the issue I am about to tackle in this book.

Why it Poses an Issue and How We Can Tackle it in a Sociological Study

Human geographical movements have generated strong scholarly interest; they are reflected in the dynamic interdisciplinary field of migration studies and the growing field of mobility studies. Whereas both research fields and their agendas acknowledge that the nature of migration and mobility is complex and multifaceted, they nevertheless represent separate scholarly traditions. Mobility studies constitute a relatively young “research paradigm” (Sheller/Urry 2006, Hannam et al. 2006, Urry 2007) while migration studies have a much longer scholarly tradition. For almost one hundred years, migration studies scholars have established many different approaches and schools of thought. These approaches are now often distinguished as being either “classical” or “new.” In addition to the strong impact of theories of incorporation (like assimilation, integration, multi-

culturalism) of the “classical” approaches; the transnational understanding of migration as one of the “new” approaches has gained popularity over the past 25 years. In its criticism of “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer/Glick Schiller 2002) and development of new research designs going beyond the national realm, the transnational approach shapes today’s research on migration in the social sciences and the humanities. Transnational migration studies explore recurrent migrants’ border-crossing activities keeping up ties with relatives in their country of origin, thus connecting both their country of arrival and of origin and thereby constructing new social fields or spaces (Faist 2010b; Glick Schiller et al. 1992, Portes et al. 1999, Pries 2008; o.a.).

Unlike migration studies, which focus on international movements seen as a permanent or long-term change of residence, mobility studies adopt a broader approach, one encompassing multiple flows and channels. Stephen Greenblatt argues in his *Mobility Studies Manifesto*:

“The physical, infrastructural, and institutional conditions of movement—the available routes; the maps; the vehicles; the relative speed; the controls and costs; the limits on what can be transported; the authorizations required; the inns, relay stations and transfer points; the travel facilitators—are all serious objects of analysis. [...] *mobility studies should shed light on hidden as well as conspicuous movements* of peoples, objects, images, texts, and ideas.” (2009: 250)

Migration studies remain crucial to the field of mobilities research (Hannam et al. 2006: 10). Indeed, the two scientific agendas overlap (Sheller 2011:1), as has been recognized by the more recent scholarship challenging the established methodological, conceptual, and empirical dualism of mobility and migration (Dahinden 2016, Findlay et al. 2015, Kesselring 2006, King 2002, King/Ruiz-Gelices 2003, Nowicka 2007b, Rogers 2007, Schrooten et al. 2015, Willis 2010). We observe an increasing use of the term *mobility* in the study and portrayal of migration; indeed, there is a discursive shift away from migration towards—the arguably less politicized term—mobility, used by, for example, the European Commission and other international bodies such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM 2008) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 2009) (King et al. 2016: 8). As I have already indicated, migration implies that migrants will remain in the “country of arrival” for a long period of time, perhaps for good. Mobility, however, signals that people may not stay put, but move on, either to their home country or onward to another one. The concept thus emphasizes relatively new forms of movements, such as long-distance

commuting, extended business visits, student exchanges, seasonal and circular migration, which blur the distinction between migration and mobility (ibid.: 9).

While mobile orientations and practices are increasingly empirically observed in research on migration, the migrants' receiving societies continue to discursively frame migration as a one-way street, often as a "threat" calling for integration, control, and the maintenance of national identity (Faist 2013, Schrooten et al. 2015, King et al. 2016, Bigo 2002). As Schrooten and his colleagues (2015) point out, the negative connotation of migration is—particularly in the European context—omnipresent in the media as well as in policy-making. With the exception of the "highly-skilled," those who are—to use Faist's (2013) expression—"wanted and welcome," national authorities encourage the internal mobility of their citizens while discouraging newcomers to enter the territory. One example is the "long summer of migration" (Hess et al. 2016) or the events, pejoratively labelled as "refugee crisis," which started in the summer of 2015 when millions of refugees fled war and terror in Syria and Afghanistan and entered Europe. As a reaction, the European Commission proposed the introduction of an emergency relocation quota system and an EU-wide resettlement scheme, obliging each country to resettle a certain number of refugees according to its capacities. Many European states raised objections to this proposal. The objections were based on the perception of incoming refugees as an extra burden and on the conviction that they would stay forever. The refugees were seen as a danger to these countries' citizens who would "have to 'share' some of their benefits with new participants to their society." (Schrooten et al. 2015: 2) Refugees were thus portrayed as a potential threat to the welfare state and to the cultural integrity and security of the destination countries (ibid.). Popular media and right-wing political parties reinforce this image, a phenomenon to be found across all EU-member states, and more recently in the USA, where the populist billionaire Donald Trump won the elections and just became the 45th president of the United States. But one thing remains largely forgotten: in reality, not all "migrants" stay put.

While certain public figures, e.g., (media) reporters and politicians, contribute to the negative construction of migration, the academic discourse in migration studies also underpins these developments. In the past, migration scholars have questioned the negative image and stereotyping of "migrants;" yet, they have done so without challenging the "sedentarism of migration," thus contributing to the negative construction of migration. Janine Dahinden examines, from a critical perspective, a-priori naturalizing categorizations used in research on migration and integration (2016). To take national units as the lens of social science analysis for granted, or in other words the critique of "methodological na-

tionalism,” she argues, suggests that migration studies are inherently linked to the logic of the modern nation-state and its corresponding institutional and categorical effects while being blind to this entanglement (ibid.: 3). The formation of modern nation-states went hand in hand with the development of an institutional state-migration apparatus differentiating migrants from citizens and institutionalizing these differences. There are, for instance, state structures that regulate the border-crossing movements in terms of border controls, visa regimes, and migration- and integration laws, which create the label “migration” and other migration-related categories. As Dahinden points out, the migration-related categories, however, can only make sense within the very same logic:

“The category of ‘foreigner,’ for example, only makes sense within a nation-state logic, namely in dialectic with the term ‘citizen;’ the label ‘migrants’ solely acquires significance in relation to ‘non-migrants.’ And the category ‘people with a migration background’ can only be thought of in relation to a supposedly natural multi-generational rootedness within a national territory.” (2016: 3)

The category of “persons with a migration background” (*Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund*), is common in German-speaking countries; it illustrates the boundary work done by naturalizing categorizations as many people who fall under this category are often citizens of the state in which they reside, but are nonetheless excluded from the national imagined community (Elrick/Schwartzmann 2015, Dahinden 2016). Germany, for instance, facilitated the resettlement of people with German ancestry from the Soviet Union on the basis of the *ius sanguinis* principle after World War II, and many so-called ethnic Germans (*Aussiedler*) were given the right to enter the states’ territory. Even with citizenship, ethnic Germans are still “othered”—this is a good example of how to create categorizations *ad absurdum*. What is more, migrants from Turkey—even in the second or third generation—had little chance to naturalize in Germany until the year 2000. With the introduction of the category of “persons with a migration background” in the Mikrozensus survey in 2005—a comprehensive statistical census in Germany—the number of people considered as having a migration background in Germany doubled (Pries 2015b: 36) and with it the number of those likely to be excluded from the national imagined community. These categories are not only used by statisticians, but they affect people’s everyday lives. With the emergence of nation-states and the migration apparatus, Dahinden argues, a powerful normalization discourse of migration-related differences developed, rendering these categories particularly powerful in everyday life. This discourse essentializes categories, making them appear “natural” while

individuals incorporate these ideas during socialization: “migrants are always [understood] in contrast to non-migrants and the ‘ethnic, cultural self’ [is] considered to be fundamentally (culturally) different.” (ibid.: 4) Migration studies came into being exactly within this context. The difference between migration and non-migration is the *raison d’être* of migration research. As a result, migration studies are the product of the institutionalized migration apparatus and also an important producer of a worldview according to which migration-related differences are predominant. Dahinden rightly questions the category of “migration” *per se* and pleads for the “de-migranticization” of research on migration and integration. This study endorses this plea.

Thus, migration is both an interesting social phenomenon to investigate and, also, a discourse that needs to be challenged—and mobility studies is a good way to do so. On the one hand, scholars in this field do not tire of emphasizing the dialectical relationship between mobility and immobility, as mobility only exists through immobility and vice versa (Urry 2003, Hannam et al. 2006, Adey 2006), implying that favouring one “state” over the other is pointless. On the other hand, mobility studies help to make sense of migration phenomena through a critical reflection on taken-for-granted migration-related categories. Such an approach may even lead to a break with some aspects anchored within the normalized migration apparatus. Adopting approaches from migration studies and taking into account research perspectives from mobility studies, I introduce a new analytical concept in this book, the “mobilities perspective,” to uncover the plurality and broad spectrum of geographical movements that individuals experience as significant biographical constellations of (im)mobility. With it, I aim to bring the constructivist approach of mobility studies into the field of migration studies. The “mobilities perspective” acknowledges the fact that individuals actively create and give meaning to their geographical movements. Methodologically based on biographical research (the life story approach), the “mobilities perspective” aims to reimagine experiences of (im)mobility in the lives of those individuals labelled as “migrants” by examining how they narrate and construct their (im)mobility experiences as meaningful occurrences in their life course. Such a shift in perspective opens up ways, I argue, of understanding even those (im)mobility constellations that neither fit into the “classical” nor into the “new” approaches in migration studies.

Drawing on biographical narrations, I propose another reading of individual trajectories by examining whether and how individuals constitute mobility or immobility experiences. In order to do so, I explore the lives of those who are embedded in migratory and transnational contexts but whose biographies are often characterized by geographical movements and mobility experiences that go

beyond the traditional categories of migration. More precisely, my aim is to examine why and how “migrants” go immobile or mobile and with what consequences: how (im)mobility comes into being, how (im)mobility is itself in movement and transition, and how other realms of social life come into being through (im)mobility. Further, in deploying the “mobilities perspective,” I question the linear and binary logics on which many migration conceptualizations are built. As I indicated above, we must not forget that migration is a highly politicized and controversial topic. Whenever I can, I draw parallels between theoretical approaches and empirical insights to political developments throughout the book. In order to moderate and deconstruct migration-related statements that have become highly politicized, we need to be aware of the “politicization of migration” and recall it whenever relevant in our works.

What's at the Core

The core of the book consists of the *patterns of (im)mobility: immobility, trans-mobility, and cosmobility*. The patterns of (im)mobility are a typology and are the main result of this study—the work of analyzing and interpreting the biographical material I have gathered during my fieldwork. The present study is, first and foremost, an empirical investigation, in which I focus on the diversity of (im)mobility experiences in the lives of those who are usually referred to as “migrants” or as “persons with a migration background.” Although I chose one particular migrant group as the sample of this study—young adults of Polish heritage like Caroline—I am very aware of the fact that it is a heterogeneous group whose members have emigrated at different points of time, under different conditions, with different motivations, to different destinations. For the latter, however, I have also restricted the places of destination and thus the places of my fieldwork to Germany (Berlin) and Canada (Montreal, Toronto). I chose these countries because their migration regimes cannot be more different: Germany follows an assimilationist migration and integration policy while Canada is known for its policy of multiculturalism, but in both countries the share of people of Polish heritage is relatively high. In Germany, there are about sixteen million “persons with a migration background” within a total population of approximately eighty-one million. Persons of Polish heritage make up ten per cent of all “persons with a migration background,” of whom about hundred thousand live in Berlin (Mikrozensus 2015). Canada is widely known for the ethnically diverse composition of its population of approximately thirty-five million. Persons of Polish ethnic origin have surpassed the one million mark according to the most up-to-date Canadian census (Statistics Canada 2017, see also 2013). Estimates

suggest that there are approximately fifty thousand ethnic Poles in Montreal and approximately two hundred fifteen thousand in Toronto (*ibid.*).

There has been already much research done on the migration of Poles into Germany. The transnational approach proved to be particularly fruitful in this regard (Glorius/Friedrich 2006, Glorius 2013, Nowicka 2007b and 2013, Palenga-Möllnbeck 2005 and 2013, Miera 2001 and 2008, a.o.). In the Canadian context, however, research on the so-called “Polish-Canadians” is less widespread in migration studies than the research of Poles in Germany.² Selecting two countries, and three metropolitan cities as centers of the empirical investigation means that the life courses of my respondents differ due to the contextual conditions they face, which, in turn, has an impact on their (im)mobility experiences. Certainly, the question as to whether potential differences result from the diverging migration policies in both countries is particularly relevant. I will tackle this question by opening up comparative perspectives through contextualization within the interpretative discussion of selected life stories, rather than providing a “classical country-comparison.” In a Weberian sense, I understand the patterns of (im)mobility as a result, and at the same time as a means, of revisiting migration; something that I am to demonstrate in this book. Empirically, the patterns confirm that so-called “migrants” are often sedentary after initial migration, while they also emphasize that domestic and multiple international mobility experiences are empirically observable and relevant, though they cannot be grasped by current statistics because, as Cyrus argues, statistics cannot represent the mobile conditions since they follow a different logic (2000: 89), a sedentary one, I would add. Thus, statistics can only remain incomplete, although in reality migration and mobility are not mutually exclusive. The patterns of (im)mobility call attention to the deficit in the current scholarship as I underline in my literature review, when I deal with “classical” approaches such as assimilation, integration, multiculturalism as well as with the “new” approaches of transnationalism, diaspora, and cosmopolitanism in migration studies and, more importantly, when I relate them to the field of mobility studies. Similarly, the patterns highlight certain notions of (im)mobility that are implied in the established migration approaches and how they correspond to the empirical reality of (im)mobility in migratory contexts, enabling me to draw theoretical conclusions

2 There is a Canadian-Polish research institute in Toronto that collects and preserves documents concerning the life and work of Polish immigrants to Canada, eventually creating a source base for research; but, then again, comprehensive research on this group is rather hard to find. For further information, see the website of the research institute: <http://www.canadianpolishinstitute.org>

from the empirical study. The main contribution of this study, however, is to combine migration- and mobility studies with one another, and subsequently to reduce the methodological, conceptual, and empirical dualism of mobility and migration in order to ultimately make a step forward towards “de-migranticizing migration research.” (Dahinden 2016)

Structure of the Book

This book is about the experiences of my respondents, like those of Caroline, which I translated into a sociological study. The book consists of three distinctive parts: I will review the relevant literatures, concepts, and the methodology and methods I used in PART I before I present the *patterns of (im)mobility* at the heart of this book in three interpretative chapters in PART II and in one results chapter in PART III.

In *chapter one*, I discuss the state of the art of research in migration and mobility studies. I review both literatures and highlight their difficult relationship to policy-making. The literature review of migration studies consists of mainly two theoretical strands: selected “classical” approaches (ch. 1.1), and selected “new” ones (ch. 1.2). I will then review the main contributions to the field of mobility studies, and, most importantly, I set out to explicate what the “mobilities perspective” on migration entails (ch. 1.3). The *second chapter* presents the methodology I draw upon. I elaborate on how I approached my field (ch. 2.1), introducing the methodology of biographical research and the method of autobiographical interviewing. I explain what kind of data this approach is able to create and how I can grasp the mobilities of individuals through their biographies. After having finished fieldwork, I examine the characteristics of the sample and I point out how I am to construct an “ideal-typical” typology of the *three patterns of (im)mobility* and which life stories I have chosen to share in this book (ch. 2.2). I see both chapters as the conceptual and methodological framework to reconstruct the *patterns of (im)mobility*.

Chapters three, four, and five are the core of this book. In these chapters, I present the interpretation of selected biographical narratives and the results I draw from it. Beforehand, I insert a short *excursus*, discussing the role of Poland as a typical “emigration country” and delineating the Polish immigration into the two destinations of Germany and Canada. For a sociological study, dealing with (im)mobility in the context of Polish migration, it is essential to understand the specific relations between Poland and Canada, on the one hand, and Poland and Germany, on the other. These different histories continue to frame the contemporary social realities of Polish migrations to Germany and Canada. In my readings of my respondents’ life stories, however, I examine important biographical con-

stellations and their *post hoc* reflections, which I relate to the theoretical approaches I have highlighted in my literature review. The interpretations of selected life stories—those of Anja, Sandra, Janusz, Oscar, Malinka, and Francis—serve to illustrate each of the three patterns: the pattern of immobility (ch. 3), the pattern of transmobility (ch. 4), and the pattern of cosmobiity (ch. 5).

Chapter six deals with the patterns as results, which—from a sociological perspective—are not random. First, I demonstrate how I can utilize the patterns of (im)mobility to revisit migration by proposing a new reading of the theories in the field (ch. 6.1). Second, I discuss the empirical results more broadly in terms of their temporal, spatial, and social dimensions (ch. 6.2). Third, I reflect on the study's theoretical contribution, emphasizing how different mobilities are treated within migration literatures, and I highlight the fruitfulness of the “mobilities perspective” and its bearing on migration (ch. 6.3).

I conclude the book with a plea to rethink migration and mobility on the basis of what taken-for-granted assumptions of migration research my study challenges and on the political implications it evokes.

Part I:
A Proposition: Examining Migrants'
Mobilities through Biographies

1 From “Classical” and “New” Approaches in Migration Studies to the “Mobilities Perspective” on Migration

Migration is a highly politicized and controversial topic and it is often dealt with in public debates (Castles 2008, Favel 2014, Bommers 2003). While academic scholars form a different kind of readership and produce a different body of work than policy-makers, nearly all current thinking on migration is bound up with the reproduction of nation-states and nation-society-centered reasoning (Favell 2014: 70-74). (National) Politics clearly influence research on migration, especially in the case of politics-focused works as “the final analysis has very little to say about immigrants themselves, if rather a lot about how elites view, debate, and understand the question.” (ibid.: 99) Politicization, as Bommers notes, always implies a problematization as “migration only becomes a problem when viewed in terms of politics.” (2012a: 27) Therefore, we cannot make a clear distinction between normative scholarly or normative political statements (ibid. 2003: 54). Neither would we know whether studies, promoting a specific understanding of migration, are “policy relevant” or rather “policy driven” (Castles 2008: 6), and how results are or will be interpreted in light of political interests. Such politicization of migration research urges us to reflect about the relationship between academic knowledge production and policy, because it powerfully illustrates the essential dilemma in migration studies, fueled by scholars’ increasing dependence in this field on research commissioned to address short-term policy concerns of governments and international agencies (ibid.). I believe that we need to consider this dilemma in academic work, and that is why I will address it throughout the book.

If migration is not a new phenomenon, today, more than ever, it is considered a structural feature of most industrial countries. As increasing globalization, capitalistic demands for certain kinds of labour, and the desire of individuals to

migrate to improve their life chances persist, migration is likely to continue to be an important phenomenon in the future (Massey et al. 1993, Pries 2001a, King 2012). It is no surprise that it has been long (almost a century) and widely studied in the academic world. Migration studies is an interdisciplinary field, one including scholars from various academic disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, history, geography, economics, political science, demography, and legal studies. The nature of migration is complex and multi-faceted and it underlies ongoing processes of social change, and migration scholars observe and theorize these developments. In their famous review of migration theories, Massey et al. noted that there is “no single, coherent theory [...], only a fragmented set of theories.” (1993: 432) Indeed, constructing one “universal” theory seems like an (over)ambitious project. Twenty years after the essay by Massey and his colleagues, scholars are still nowhere near a general theory of migration, if such a thing is possible. In spite of their fragmented character, migration studies are most often divided into “classical” and “new” approaches.

1.1 “CLASSICAL” APPROACHES IN MIGRATION STUDIES

The “classical” approaches focus on the reasons for and causes of migration as well as on processes of migrants’ incorporation into the country of arrival (Mau 2010, De Haas 2008, Pries 2001a, Apitzsch/Siouti 2007, Lutz 2004, Castles 2008). To this day, theories of assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism—as part of the “classical” approaches—have been very influential in migration research. They all focus on migrants crossing international borders and entering a new country: a societal and cultural sphere that is differently organized than that which they have lived in before. The common scholarly interest lies in the question of how the migrants deal with this change over time and how they impact the established societal structures in the country of arrival.

Assimilation

The concept originated during an era of rapid industrialization, urbanization, and a wave of mass immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Rumbaut 2015: 83). Before assimilation became a familiar term in public policy debates about immigration, what became known as the Chicago school of sociology popularized it in the 1920s and 1930s (Park and Burgess 1969 [1921], Park 1930 and 1950,

Srole 1945, Warner/Srole 1945, see also Favell 2014). Until recently, scholars in the United States have used the term assimilation more often than European scholars. Reviewing this American debate is important. It was the first sociological formulation dealing with (one form of) mobility, touching on the question of citizens and foreigners in clearly defined (nation-)states, a phenomenon we know as “immigration.” There is an extensive body of literature examining assimilation theoretically and empirically. I will, however, only focus on Gordon’s “classical” formulation and Portes and Zhou’s more recent reformulation, thus distinguishing linear and segmented notions.

Linear and Segmented Assimilation

Gordon’s work (1964) is perhaps the most important theoretical formulation: it was acknowledged, reviewed, and further developed in almost all further scholarship. In his study, *Assimilation in American Life*, he asks the seemingly simple—though highly sociological—question: “What happens when people meet?” (ibid.: 60) He identifies displacement of an aboriginal population and immigration as the decisive types of the American experience that constitute the setting for these meetings. “Assimilation” accordingly describes the process and the result of such meetings.¹ Gordon’s main contribution are his “assimilation variables” (or stages), which constitute the process (ibid. 71). The first stage is that immigrants change their cultural patterns, including language and religious beliefs, to be more like those of the host society. This is the stage of *cultural assimilation* or “acculturation.” The second step is when immigrants enter the structure of the host society, which they achieve when they participate in societal groups and institutions and thus engage in various relationships with non-immigrants in the sense of *structural assimilation*. The third stage is that of intermarrying, also known as “amalgamation,” understood as *marital assimilation*. Immigrants are at the stage of *identificational assimilation*, the fourth step, when they develop a sense of the host society’s peoplehood. As a fifth step, immigrants reach the point where they do not encounter prejudiced attitudes any more, and are thus in the stage of attitude *receptional assimilation*. The sixth step is that they do not encounter discriminatory behaviour any more, a stage Gor-

1 Gordon sees the need for a term that would denote the standard to which the immigrants’ relative degree of adjustment can be measured. Drawing on Fishman (1961), he argues that the cultural patterns of middle-class, white Protestant groups of Anglo-Saxon origins (WASP), “whose domination dates from colonial times and whose cultural domination in the United States has never been seriously threatened” (Gordon 1964: 73, original emphasis) best describes this standard.

don labels *behavioural receptional assimilation*. The last and seventh stage is reached when issues involving value and power conflicts do not arise any more in public or civic life: civic assimilation. It is likely that cultural assimilation is the first process to occur when a minority group arrives, even when none of the other stages follow. But, if a minority group is spatially segregated, as the indigenous peoples of America, the acculturation process proceeds only very slowly. It can also be delayed by an “unusually marked discrimination” which African-Americans in the United States face(d).² If “*once structural assimilation has occurred [...] all of the other types of assimilation will naturally follow*” (1964: 81, emphasis in original), accordingly structural assimilation is the “keystone of the arch of assimilation.”

If the concept of assimilation became prominent from the 1960s on-wards, it underwent a systematic reevaluation with the beginning of a new era of mass immigration into the United States in the 1990s. It reemerged within contemporary scholarship, which sought a conceptual repertoire for investigating similarities and differences between “old” and “new” immigration (Rumbaut 2015: 87f, Kivisto 2001: 570).³ Most influentially, this was done by Portes and Zhou (1993) who introduced the notion of “segmented assimilation.”⁴ Drawing on empirical observations of the second generation of “new” immigrants, they postulate that the process of assimilation becomes segmented and features several distinct forms of adaptation: first, a growing acculturation and parallel integration into the white middle class; second, a permanent poverty and assimilation into the underclass; and third, a rapid economic advancement while deliberately preserving the values of the immigrant community (1993: 82). “Segmented assimilation” differs from the classical framework insofar as it highlights the “absorption” of immigrant groups by different segments of American society, ranging from middle-class suburbs to impoverished neighbourhoods. To assimilate and become an “American” may be mainly an advantage for immigrants entering the realm of the middle-class. When they enter the bottom of the social hierarchy,

-
- 2 Gordon uses the terms “negroes” and “American Indians” (1964: 75,78) which I distance myself from by replacing them with African-Americans and Indigenous Peoples of America.
 - 3 The new immigrants were not predominantly white anymore and faced a different economic situation of an “hourglass economy,” describing the disappearance of intermediate opportunities, and leaving a gap between low wage menial jobs and high-tech or professional occupations that require college degrees (Portes/Zhou 1993: 76f).
 - 4 For other works making the case for the ongoing significance of assimilation theory, see Alba/Nee 1997, Zhou 1997, Joppke/Morawska 2003, Brubaker 2003, a.o.

the forces of assimilation stem from the underprivileged segments and can result in distinct disadvantages, displayed by both the mainstream society and the ethnic community. As American society offers different possibilities to different immigrant groups, the process of assimilation is segmented accordingly. How it proceeds depends upon the financial capital of the migrant family, the social conditions they left behind, the context that receives them as well as cultural features like values, family relations, and social ties (ibid.: 999).

Pondering Critiques

Gordon's work on assimilation was not received without criticism. It was mainly criticized for constructing a linear process, whose goal is the complete absorption of immigrant groups into a WASP "core culture," not acknowledging other outcomes of the process "when people meet." The theory is not only normative and teleological, but it also suggests that it is only the immigrants' responsibility to adapt, making it a one-sided process. As Gordon underlines, his typology was meant to be a neutral ideal-typical classification; yet, it is often equated with the conservative idea that immigrants must conform to the norms and values of the white majority in order to be accepted.⁵ Notwithstanding Gordon's intentions, his essentializing understanding of culture as a homogenous unit in the process of acculturation, the first stage of assimilation, must be challenged (Amelina 2008: 10). The alternative framework of "segmented assimilation" modified some of the central aspects of critique, albeit perpetuating the same functionalist assumption that it is the immigrant's obligation, duty or debt to adjust to the norms and rules of the country of arrival. Pries uses the German expression of *Bringschuld* (2015a: 14), effectively underlining the notion of normativity. For several migration scholars, the notion of assimilation thus remains "ill-suited" (Rumbaut 2015: 86) and even "harmful." (Prodolliet 2003: 25)

Integration

The discussion about assimilation as an academic concept was received quite differently in Europe than in the United States. American scholars commonly used and still use it, while integration is the more popular concept in European immigration countries (Favell 2014: 65, Wessendorf 2013: 6f). It is a "two-way process which also involves social and cultural transformations in the majority society." (Wessendorf 2013: 7; see also Banton 2001, Pries 2003) In this section,

5 Some scholars argue that his theory has been misinterpreted (Favell 2014, Rumbaut 2015).

I address the works of the German sociologist Hartmut Esser (1980, 2001a, 2001b, 2003, 2009, 2010) and the Canadian cross-cultural psychologist John W. Berry (1997, 2005, 2009, 2010 et.al., 2011) because they conceptualize integration as going beyond assimilation as the only theoretical outcome: they distinguish different patterns of immigrants’ relation to the host society within the processes of integration.

An Assimilationist View on Integration

Esser’s work is well known in the German and European scholarly context. His “course model” (*Verlaufsmodel*) constructs the typical paths of migrants’ integration into either the society of origin and/or the ethnic community or into the society of arrival (1980: 209; 2001a: 20f; 2001b: 19, 2010: 145). Accordingly, he discerns four kinds of integration possibilities (table 1).

Table 1: Types of Social Integration of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities

		social integration into the society of arrival	
social integration into the society of origin/ eth- nic community	yes	multiple integration	segmentation
	no	assimilation	marginalization

Source: Esser 2001a: 21, own translation from German original

Multiple integration describes the social integration of actors into both societies—of origin or ethnic community and of arrival. Segmentation is characterized by an inclusion into the society of origin or ethnic community and an exclusion of spheres in the society of arrival. Assimilation is the integration into the society of arrival and a giving up of integration into ethnic contexts. And marginalization describes the expulsion out of both societal contexts (2001a: 21). Since marginalization and segmentation do not promote a participation in the country of arrival, only two possibilities remain for migrants’ social integration:

multiple integration and assimilation. Multiple integration requires a simultaneous social integration in several—socially and culturally—different realms. It manifests itself in multilingualism, a mixture of social circles and a bi- or multiple identity construction, which Esser evaluates as empirically rare:

“Multiple integration is often desired, however, theoretically it is hardly realistic and empirically, it is very rarely the case. [...] Why [it] is so rare, is easy to explain: it requires a degree of learning and interaction activities and, in particular, occasions that remain closed for most people—and even more so for the usual (labour-) migrants, who face significant restrictions on the organization of their everyday life. This type of ‘multicultural’ social integration would be possible at best for the children of diplomats or for academics [...]” (Esser 2001b: 20f)⁶

Therefore—Esser reasons—social integration into the society of arrival is actually only possible in the form of assimilation (ibid., 2001a: 22, 2003: 20). Theoretically, it does not need to be a one-sided process, but empirically there is “such a thing as a *standard* to which migrants must orient themselves almost ‘one-sidedly.’” 2001b: 23, original emphasis)⁷ This standard results from nation-states that would distribute social positions through their dominant institutions (“*Leit-Institutionen*”), which, in turn, follow a dominant culture (“*Leit-Kultur*”) (ibid.: 28, 2010: 149f). Esser argues that a successful social integration of immigrants requires cultural adaptation so as to avoid ethnic stratification, that is the systematic co-variation of ethnic variables (such as culture, religion) with certain structural variables (such as education, profession, income), resulting in ethnic hierarchies (2001b: 36, 2001a: 26, 2010: 146). As this would be the case in multicultural societies, he sees no (political) alternative to assimilation (Esser 2001b: 66, 2001a: 29).

Esser’s integration theory has met with much criticism. For him, the integration goal is clearly assimilation and thus the points of critique stated above also

6 “Die Mehrfachintegration ist zwar ein oft gewünschter, theoretisch jedoch kaum realistischer und auch empirisch ein sehr seltener Fall. [...] Warum sie so selten ist, lässt sich leicht erklären: Sie erfordert ein Ausmaß an Lern- und Interaktionsaktivitäten und, vor allem, an Gelegenheiten dazu, dass den meisten Menschen verschlossen ist—und das erst recht bei den üblichen (Arbeits-)Migranten mit ihren deutlichen Restriktionen der Alltagsgestaltung. Dieser Typ der ‘multikulturellen’ Sozialintegration käme allenfalls für Diplomatenkinder oder Akademiker in Frage [...]”

7 “[T]atsächlich so etwas wie einen *Standard*, an dem sich die Migranten nahezu ‘einseitig’ zu orientieren haben.”

apply. Particularly, his usage of the notion of “dominant culture” needs to be questioned; he posits that the immigrants’ conventional cultural knowledge is an obstacle for processes of structural assimilation, equating cultural borders with the borders of a nation-state (Amelina 2008: 12, Pries 2003: 32). Additionally, he does not consider both the psychological and mental states of immigrants as well as external impacts, such as nation-state policies, that are likely to function as barriers. His “theorem of irreconcilability” (Geißler 2004: 294) of multiple integration cannot be confirmed in view of the Canadian example of multiculturalism. It is an improper generalization.

A Multicultural View on Integration

Situated in the field of cross-cultural psychology, Berry is interested in the question of what happens to those individuals who have developed in one cultural context and attempt to live in a new one. He argues that all cultural groups “must deal with the issue of how to acculturate” (1997: 9), which implies two central choices. First, they can choose cultural maintenance, implying reflection on the extent to which their cultural identity and maintenance is important. Second, they can choose contact and participation, tackling the question about the extent of their becoming involved in other cultural groups, or remaining primarily among themselves. Berry generates a conceptual framework that posits four acculturation strategies (table 2).

Table 2: Acculturation Strategies

		ISSUE 1	
		is it considered to be of value to maintain one’s identity and characteristics?	
		yes ↔ no	
ISSUE 2	yes ↕ no	integration	assimilation
is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with larger society?		separation/ segregation	marginalization

Source: Berry 1997: 10, slightly modified representation of the original table

When individuals do not maintain their cultural characteristics and seek relationships with other cultures of the society, the strategy is “assimilation.” It involves culture shedding; the unlearning of (certain) previous cultural patterns. When, in contrast, the individuals value their cultural characteristics and do not wish to interact with others, then “separation” is the strategy. It involves a rejection of the dominant culture, which is likely to be reciprocated. When cultural groups are interested in both maintaining their culture while interacting with other groups, the strategy is “integration.” Yet, it can only be pursued when the dominant groups are open and have an inclusive attitude towards cultural diversity, as in societies that are explicitly multicultural. When individuals have little interest in or possibility for cultural maintenance and for establishing relationships with other groups, it is “marginalization,” but people rarely choose it as a strategy, rather they become marginalized due to a combination of forced assimilation and forced exclusion (1997: 9ff, 2005: 704f, 2009: 366, 2011: 2.6).

Berry sees parallels between the acculturation strategies and the national policies of different countries. However, the preferences for acculturation strategies vary—for both cultural groups and national policies—depending on the context and time period. Berry proposes to generally consider two societal contexts when studying acculturation; the society of origin and the society of settlement, where most political action can be taken in the latter. For that, he promotes multiculturalism and pluralism in public education, social legislation, and institutional change as he advocates for integration as a mutual accommodation, implying costs on both sides:

“[...] to the dominant society in changing school curricula and health services; to the acculturation group in shedding some aspects of their culture that are valued but not adaptive.” (Berry 1997: 27)

The political management of diversity depends therefore on both the acceptance of it as a cultural (or empirical) fact, and the mutual willingness to change. Berry assumes that there is no cultural group to remain unchanged as “acculturation is a two-way interaction, resulting in actions and reactions to the contact situations.” (2009: 365)

As so often occurs in academic discourse, Berry’s acculturation strategies were criticized by fellow scholars in the field. Most importantly, they question whether the acculturation strategies are real strategies intentionally put forward by the individuals themselves (Cresswell 2009, Waldrum 2009) and they criticize classifying individuals as high or low on the receiving-culture acquisition and on the heritage-culture maintenance scales, using *a priori* values. The criti-

cisms suggest that not all of Berry's strategies may exist in a given sample and that various samples may contain subtypes (Rudmin 2003).⁸ In sum, Esser and Berry conceptualize the same process, but they come to exact opposite theoretical, empirical, and political conclusions.

Multiculturalism

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s in the United States signaled a shift from the paradigm of assimilation to multiculturalism. Without a doubt, multicultural positions criticize and are resistant to the imperatives of assimilation (Goldberg 1994: 3-6). The policies were first introduced in Canada and Australia in the 1970s, and in several liberal democracies soon after, such as Great Britain, The Netherlands, and Sweden. However, Canada often serves as the prime example as it is there where, "multiculturalism has always been at its strongest." (Crowder 2013: 2) The origin of Canadian multiculturalism, however, was rather unintended. The "quiet revolution" of the 1960s resulted in increased self-expression on the part of the Canadian province of Quebec. In order to address the "Quebec question," the federal government set up a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in which public hearings were held. Some of these were made by non-British and non-French cultural groups and many statements in these hearings challenged the conventional national assimilation model of Anglo and Franco conformity. In 1971, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau reversed the bicultural recommendations of the Commission (but notably not the bilingual) and declared multiculturalism as the official state policy (Ley 2010: 191). Most of the well-known theories of multiculturalism have been formulated by political scientists and/or philosophers in response to the implementation of the official policies. Though there is a great body of literature on multiculturalism, I restrict my review to the works of the Canadian political philosopher, Will Kymlicka (1989, 1995, 2002, 2010). He is widely acknowledged to be the leading theorist of multiculturalism.

The Political Philosophy of Liberal Multiculturalism

In his works, *Liberalism, Community, and Culture* (1989) and *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995), Kymlicka constructs a systematic case for multiculturalism based on a liberal approach to minority rights. For him, a just society needs to compensate people for the worst effects of undeserved disadvantage and since

8 For an in-depth discussion of the supposed shortcomings of Berry's work, see particularly Rudmin 2003, 2009.

the state compensates for undeserved *economic* disadvantage, it must also compensate for undeserved *cultural* disadvantage. It should accord positive recognition for minority cultural groups by implementing a more active policy, and accordingly, treat cultural groups differently. Kymlicka underlines that differential treatment of citizens is not always bad for it depends on the reasons —as in the case of the indigenous peoples in Canada:

“To give every Canadian equal citizenship rights without regard to race or ethnicity, given the vulnerability of aboriginal communities to the decisions of the non-aboriginal majority, does not seem to treat Indians and Inuit with equal respect. For it ignores a potentially devastating problem faced by aboriginal people but not by English-Canadians—the loss of cultural membership.” (1989: 151)

Here, he sets out that a differentiated treatment of indigenous peoples is not only desirable but indeed required in order for these minority groups to meet with respect and fairness (1989: 4). However, another of Kymlicka’s concerns is about liberty or the cultural conditions for freedom. He reasons that cultural membership is especially important in this regard as it provides humans with the necessary context for the freedom of choice (and the freedom to revise these choices). He assumes that, for most people, the culture in which they have been brought up matters most as people do not usually change their whole set of cultural affiliations. They may select amongst different aspects of culture, which in fact presupposes rather than denies the importance of their own culture (1989: 165ff). For that reason, it is likely that a modern society, which contains people affiliated with diverse cultures, needs to accommodate or encourage more than one culture (1995: 84-93). These goals are to be secured by the state as it has an obligation to guarantee the cultural conditions for this freedom, which is particularly relevant for indigenous groups: they are very disadvantaged in settler societies, not because of their choices, but because of the circumstances of colonization for which they are not responsible (1989: 186, 1995: 50).

In *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995), Kymlicka introduces a key distinction between two kinds of cultural minority. That is, “national” and “ethnic” minority. National minorities have been incorporated into the modern state by either conquest, colonization, or federation, but they have never relinquished their claims to a “societal culture” of their own, as in the case of indigenous peoples, national groups like the Québécois in Canada, or the Basques in Spain (Kymlicka 1995: 19, 79; 2002: 3ff, 2010: 101f). By contrast, ethnic minorities are immigrant groups, whose members have generally chosen to become part of a new society. They are encouraged to maintain some aspects of their ethnic par-

ticularity, but they also need to integrate into the dominant pattern, which they can do in their own way. Accordingly, national and ethnic minorities are entitled to different kinds of rights: the rights of national minorities are much stronger, while ethnic minorities have weaker ones. Kymlicka distinguishes three forms of group-specific rights. First, there are self-government rights to secure forms of political autonomy or territorial jurisdiction, granted to national minorities. Second, polyethnic rights for ethnic minorities, which are predominantly designed to assist in the integration of immigrants; and third, special representation rights, granting the representation of minority groups in political processes (1995: 27-32.). Obviously, Kymlicka promotes special cultural rights to specific kinds of minorities, running the risk of accepting illiberal, patriarchal, and harmful traditions. In that respect, he argues that the state is entitled to intervene in illiberal cultures in order to liberalize them: to protect the basic civil and political liberties of group members and to promote their capacity for personal autonomy. He sees liberalization as a matter of degree, and not as something essential to some cultures while not to others (1995: 94ff). This means encouraging a culture to change. It is

“[...] a deeply (and intentionally) transformative project, both for minorities and majorities. It demands that both dominant and historically subordinated groups engage in new practices, enter new relationships, and embrace new concepts and discourses, all of which profoundly transform people’s identities and practices.” (2012: 103)

Kymlicka’s theory of minority cultural rights has attracted a wide range of criticism. The distinction between claims of national minorities and those of immigrant minorities, for instance, is not transferable: while it clarifies the stakes in multinational cases where both groups are present, it fails where these groups are not at the center of the political or legal dilemmas. The question of post-slavery African-Americans in the United States is an example. Here, Kymlicka’s distinction does not fit as African-Americans were neither a national minority nor a voluntary immigrant group (Favell 2014: 24f). Many critics take issue with the question of how to deal with minorities that follow illiberal social practices, or as Favell phrases it: “Should a tolerant society tolerate the intolerant?” (2014: 13) Some critics believe that Kymlicka treats illiberal groups too restrictively (Kukathas 1992), while others claim that he concedes too much to such groups, and so allowing them to mistreat their own members (Barry 2002, Okin 1999). Okin asks the relevant question whether multiculturalism is bad for women, and answers it with an unqualified “yes.” She argues that multiculturalism as the accommodation of cultural minorities reinforces patriarchal traditions because

most of the groups that are to be accommodated “have as one of their principle aims the control of women by men.” (Okin 1999: 13) Group leaders of minority groups are therefore more likely to be men, and “under such conditions, group rights are potentially, and in many cases actually, antifeminist” (ibid.) because the (sexual) servitude of women and other severe harm done to women by men of their own cultural groups is presented as synonymous with cultural traditions (ibid.: 16).

What happens in the Country of Arrival?

Approaches of assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism are not always clearly distinguishable from one another, but each approach contains conceptual particularities which are based on different epistemological stances, philosophical positions and, not least, empirical results. Most obviously, they differ in the conceptualized *outcomes*. While assimilation clearly demands a one-sided effort on behalf of immigrants in order to (culturally) adjust to the society of the country of arrival; multiculturalism rather gives national and ethnic minorities positive recognition in public policy and public institutions. Integration, however, remains ambiguous. As we have seen, Esser (2001a, 2003) conceptualizes integration as assimilationist, while Berry (1997, 2005, 2011) conceptualizes integration as a “mutual accommodation,” which is more likely to work in a multicultural social environment. In addition, Kymlicka (2010, 2012), asserts that integration is indeed an essential part of multicultural policies. Hence, integration may be both assimilationist or multiculturalist.

It is important to note that assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism are not only theories of migrants’ incorporation, but (were) also agendas of policy-making in Europe and North America. While some European countries such as Germany, Switzerland, and Austria completely prohibited permanent settlement and family reunion, only accepting temporary migration (as “guest workers” mostly) in the early stages of post-1945 migration, settler societies like the USA, Canada, and Australia, and also other European countries rather correspond(ed) with assimilationist models of policy-making, reaching from the period of post-1945 up to the 1970s.⁹ Back then, both policy models shared the belief that cultural pluralism is not a desirable goal for the processes of nation-state building. From the 1960s onwards, this belief was challenged as it was obvious that immigrants were not necessarily becoming culturally assimilated, partly due to dis-

9 Politically, assimilation was not only used in the context of immigration, but also in times of colonization (Rumbaut 2015).

criminary practices and racism which lead to spatial segregation and social exclusion. The formation of ethnic communities and the emergence of cultures of resistance compelled these countries to face an enduring cultural diversity and it led to the introduction of multiculturalist models of policy-making. Those European countries that followed exclusionary models of policy-making, however, had to realize that the migrants expected to remain temporal “guest workers” stayed on, yet some countries became aware of or accepted this development as part of the social reality only later. Germany, for instance, refused the self-description as an “immigration country”—regardless of the clear empirical facts—up until the 1990s. Albeit this late realization, most European immigration countries, such as Germany, Switzerland, France, Italy, Denmark; meanwhile also the United Kingdom, Sweden, and The Netherlands, and to a certain degree also the United States follow integrationalist models of policy-making, which are—as I see it—neither as liberal as multiculturalist models, nor as assimilationist as the theory suggests (Castles 2008, Vertovec/Wessendorf 2010, Kymlicka 2010, Pries 2003, Crowder 2013, Goldberg 1994, Triadafilopoulos 2012, Joppke/Morawska 2003, Bommes 2012a).

I argue that using assimilation as an analytical concept in migration studies is problematic as it, first, casts a country’s factual citizens into the role of successful or unsuccessful assimilated “migrants” over generations. It seems as if assimilation triggers a competition, or as FitzGerald puts it “a sort of ethnic Olympic Games in which national or racial groups are entities moving through time that spar with each other.” (2014: 131) This is, for instance, the case when assimilation is studied for the “second generation,” turning *ius soli* national citizens back into “migrants.” It reminds us of the European case, as for instance, in Germany. Germany has a long tradition of *ius sanguinis*, although it has also restrictedly acted upon the *ius soli* principle since 2000, yet Germany partly turns factual non-migrants into “persons with a migration background” regardless of their nationality or citizenship. *When does a migrant become a non-migrant, then?* The notion of migration becomes problematic, especially when reified over generations and investigated through the lens of assimilation. The concept appropriates the “sedentary bias” in migration research, which is the “unquestioned assumption that migration is a bad thing” (Castles 2010: 1568) as it constructs migrants as “deficit-beings” (Thränhardt 2005, Shinozaki 2008) who need to change their ways of being. Second, if we examine these ideas from another perspective, assimilation as a concept is likely to nurture the politicization of migration research. In fact, Castles points out that the “assimilation turn” has helped to justify changes in national policies either by integration contracts or citizenship tests

in several European countries (2010: 1572). Here, the question whether such research is “policy-relevant” or “policy-driven” becomes blurry again.

Political positions on migration often appear entrenched and the politicization of migration research is evidently strongest with regard to the approaches discussed because the question of how to accommodate immigrants is an issue of genuine interest for nation-states and multinational countries, which increasingly have to deal with it. Assimilation and integration take the nation-state-society for granted as the exclusive context of migrants’ incorporation (Favell 2014: 66f, Pries 2003: 30)—and evidently so does multiculturalism for the multinational state. The approaches reproduce a unitary vision of the modern (multi-)national state. If we would not take a state and a society as the unchallenged backdrop of these conceptualizations, the question of: “Who or what is integrating whom with what?” is not so easy to answer (Favell 2014: 75). Integration can thus simply not be measured until a representative control group of the national population has been specified and power hierarchies resulting from that are mirrored in the research of integration issues.¹⁰

From a sociological perspective, the approaches of assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism thus give answers to the following question: *What happens in the country of arrival*, once individuals have migrated, to them and the society they have entered? Migration theory gives us mainly two answers: first assimilation (or: assimilationist integration), suggesting that it is the migrants’ task to—structurally and culturally—incorporate into the host society; and second multiculturalism (or: multicultural integration), suggesting a mutual accommodation as a responsibility of both the migrants as well as the host society, wherein cultural heterogeneity of the population is appreciated.

1.2 “NEW” APPROACHES IN MIGRATION STUDIES

The so-called “new” approaches resulted out of great shifts and enhancements in migration studies. They are further developments of “classical” perspectives, aiming to capture new (or newly recognized) dynamics of migration. They include the “intermediate,” that is the activities, relations, and social spaces between or beyond the country of origin and the country of arrival. Despite several other approaches that constitute the “new”; I will focus on (migrant) transnation-

10 Favell offers a state-of-the art review of European research on integration, especially on commissioned studies on integration policy and survey and census-based works (2014: ch. 5).

alism, diaspora, and cosmopolitanism. I choose them, particularly because they all are meant to transcend the nation-state model and reconcile cross-border activities with experiences of “cultural otherness.”

(Migrant) Transnationalism

In the 1990s, scholars announced a “transnational turn” in the field of migration studies: The term “transnationalism” entered the lexicon and gained remarkable foothold. I understand it as a specific research perspective, which indicates increasing cross-border interactions of institutions, organizations, social groups, and individuals. These interactions feature various shapes of duration, continuity, and intensity, and they range beyond at least two nation-states, thereby creating new social formations (e.g., relationships, networks, communities, fields, and spaces). Referring to a variety of phenomena, transnationalism requires empirical research and theorization on various scales and levels of abstraction. By now, the transnational approach commonly shapes empirical and theoretical research not only in migration studies, but across all disciplines of social sciences and humanities. I will introduce some of the key theoretical, empirical, and methodological discussions in this section, dividing the review into “classical” and “new” scholarship so as to outline the ongoing developments in this research field.

Classical Transnationalism

The transnational perspective initially took hold in social anthropology and later, sociology. The pioneering work of Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc (1992, 1994) discussed the distinctive features of migration in the context of a new influx of immigrants from economically less developed countries to the most advanced industrial nations of a capitalist world system (Dahinden 2009, Faist 2011, Kivisto 2001, Østergaard-Nielsen 2012, Pries 2001a). The immigrants did not break off all social relations and cultural ties to their homelands. Unlike the credo of assimilation theory, Glick Schiller et. al., rather see that

“[...] a new kind of migrating population is emerging, composed of those whose networks, activities and patterns of life encompass both their home and host societies. Their lives cut across national boundaries and bring two societies into a single social field.” (1992: 1)

They make two initial points: one is historical and the other is theoretical. Compared to earlier immigration, they posit that there is something qualitatively dif-

ferent about the immigrants they examined.¹¹ More importantly, the authors offer a rationale for a new analytical framework by introducing the two terms of “transnationalism” and “transmigrants.” The former is “the process by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement,” while the latter are the “immigrants who build such social fields.” (1995: 1) Grasping the dialectical interplay between homeland concern and realities in the host country, they were particularly interested in the impact this interplay has on immigrants, e.g., on their identity constructions, which contest static categories of difference (Glick Schiller et al. 1992: 8-29, Basch et al. 1994: 30-34, *ibid.*: 1995: 49ff).

The transnational perspective on migration stresses the emergence of new social formations such as fields or spaces. Cross-border practices embedded in *transnational social fields* are dependent of networks and positions of individuals and institutions. Transnational relations within such fields can evolve into *transnational communities* (Levitt 2001b), which engage in transnational activities: including migrants and non-migrants alike, by *ways of being* and *ways of belonging* (Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004). While ways of being describe individuals who are embedded in transnational relations of the field without identifying with that field, ways of belonging refer to practices that demonstrate a conscious connection to a particular group (*ibid.*: 11). Some scholars prefer the notion of fields, and others prefer spaces. The most sustained and theoretically ambitious works concerning the latter notion have been—as I believe—advanced by the political scientist Thomas Faist (2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2010b, 2011, a.o.) and the sociologist Ludger Pries (1996, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2005, 2010, 2015b a.o.). Faist considers the migratory system as a boundary-breaking process which penetrates two or more nation-states and becomes part of a singular transnational social space. It expands as technological possibilities grow and mobility steadily increases. Central to his argument is the degree of formalization, which brings him to differentiate four types of transnational social spaces:¹² a low degree of formalization applies to networks, such as *diffusion* and *issue networks*, while a high degree of formalization targets institutions, such as *small kinship groups* as

11 In the aftermath, it has often been stated that the historical argument is incorrect as transnational phenomena are not historically new, so that correctives were needed and taken.

12 In his well-known monograph *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces* (2000b), Faist distinguished only three types of social spaces (ch. 7: 195-241). In the course of his ongoing work, he complemented this typology.

well as *communities and organizations* (2000a: 202-206, 2000b: 195f, 2006: 4, 2011: 27f). In Pries' model, *transnational social spaces* form one ideal type amongst others.¹³ They are a combination of both relational social spaces and relational geographic spaces. Essentially, he identifies three *ideal-types* of social spaces as relevant for transnational studies: *everyday life*, *organizations*, and *institutions*, in which *everyday life* represents the micro-level, while *organizations* represent the meso-level, and *institutions* represent the macro-level (2015b: 41ff, 2010: 15, 2005: 172f, 2008: 88-95, 2001: 4ff). Both models go beyond the migrant experience as they include the border-crossing activities of, for instance, larger social configurations like organizations. I believe that Pries' theoretical framework is almost a general social theory rather than a theory on migration as it takes into account a diversity of social phenomena, not only transnational or migratory ones. Faist, however, focuses more on the variety within the transnational social space. Both works contribute in their own way to disentangling the superposition between state, territory, and culture/sociality.

The most important (theoretical) advancement of classical transnationalism is the well-known critique of mainstream, nation-stated social sciences. Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller (2002) designated *methodological nationalism* to describe the taking for granted of national units as the lens of social science analysis in which the nation-stated order of the world shapes immigration:

"[...] nation-state building processes have fundamentally shaped the ways in which immigration has been perceived and received. [...] [*M*]ethodological nationalism [is] the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world." (Wimmer/Glick Schiller 2002: 301f)

Social sciences tend to equate society with boundaries of a nation-state, which implies that belongings and practices enacted across state boundaries are extraordinary. While nation-states are still extremely important; social life, however, is not confined by their boundaries. There is a general agreement amongst transnational scholars to challenge and overcome methodological nationalism as it impairs the exposure of transnational phenomena (Basch et al. 1994, Faist 2000, Wimmer/Glick Schiller 2002, Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004, Vertovec 2004,

13 In the broader context of his theoretical work, Pries approaches transnationalism as one of seven ideal types of the "internationalisation of sociality." (*Internationalisierung der Vergesellschaftung*) For further reading about his definition of transnationalism and the six remaining ideal types of the internationalisation of sociality, see Pries 2008.

Pries 2008, Østergaard-Nielsen 2012). Notwithstanding, one of the most severe criticisms is that transnational studies are themselves stuck in exactly what they try to oppose; and thus, not able to overcome the “methodological nationalism trap” since the nation-state still dominates in (comparative) studies. They have been criticized for using ethnic categories as the main variables to explore research outlines, thus looking through an ethnic lens and (sometimes) triggering naturalizing views on ethnicity (Østergaard-Nielsen 2012: 121, Faist 2010b: 23, Amelina/Faist 2012: 1710). To overcome this bias, Amelina and Faist (2012) propose to use *multi-sited ethnography* (Marcus 1995), the *mobile methods* approach (Büscher/Urry 2009), as well as the *self-reflexive* approach more often in empirical studies.¹⁴

New Transnationalism

Since the “transnational turn,” we better understand how migrants remain connected to their countries of origin and their countries of arrival, and sometimes even to other places. Recent literature gets into dialogue with spatial mobility. I perceive this mobility-occupied scholarship in transnational studies as “new” instead of “classic.”

Janine Dahinden, for instance, proposes to distinguish between “*transnationality based on sedentariness*” and “*transnationality based on mobility*” (2010: 20). She argues that her empirical findings about cabaret dancers in Switzerland (2009) do not fit into the “classical transnational paradigm.” She emphasizes the dynamics of the dancers’ circular mobility: in order to stay mobile, they need to “settle down” so as to establish networks that would provide them with relevant information about other places where they can work. For some, mobility is permanent and is used as a strategy; for others, the mobile *parcours* ends quickly (ibid.: 2009: 3).¹⁵ Based on the combination of *transnational mobility* (as the physical movement in transnational space) and *locality in the sending or/and the receiving country* (as being socially, economically, or politically anchored) Dahinden proposes four ideal types of transnational practices: (1) *localized diasporic transnational formations* characterized by low levels of transnational

14 Luin Goldring and Patricia Landolt (2014) present an impressive example of how they worked through challenges rooted in methodological nationalism during their research on Latin American incorporations and transnational engagements in Canada. In an honest and self-reflexive way, the authors recognized the limits of their original formulations and developed solutions *on the go* by reformulating conceptual categories and analytical themes.

15 For similar results, see Morokvasic 2003.

mobility and high levels of local anchorage in the receiving and low levels of local anchorage in the sending country, (2) *localized mobile transnational formations*, describing simultaneously high levels of mobility and high levels of local anchorage in receiving and sending countries, (3) *transnational mobiles*, describing individuals that are more or less permanently on the move with low levels of local anchorage in the receiving country, and (4) *transnational outsiders* characterized by low transnational mobility and a low degree of local anchorage (2010). Dahinden's typology is a prime example emphasizing the complex relations between migrants' transnational activities and mobilities. She reminds us that locality is as important as analyzing mobilities because migrants must touch down somewhere—or as Tissot vividly puts it “mobility is not floating in the sky; mobility needs anchors.” (2016: 7)

The works of Magdalena Nowicka also deal with mobility in the context of transnational studies, mostly examining “mobile transnational professionals” (2006a, 2006b, 2007a, 2008), who are highly-skilled people working for an international organization. They usually undertake several trips abroad per year that are no shorter than one or two weeks and no longer than four weeks. Additionally, her respondents often travel for holidays and leisure time, but also to visit their families in their countries of origin. Given these premises, mobile professionals cannot be understood as “typical migrants” (2006b: 98) and/or as “transnational migrants” because they are not necessarily bound by ties of family and kinship, and by categories such as race, ethnicity, language, and nationality. Unlike “migrants,” they are not expected to integrate as they are disembedded from the context of the nation-state through their embeddedness in the international organization (ibid.: 19f). Nowicka is interested in the individuals' strategies and actions so as to understand the construction of spatial relations within the context of extensive mobility (ibid.: 21). Her main findings suggest that “being present” and “being absent” are important, but not as absolute categories that are mutually exclusive. They rather indicate a gradual change in the quality of interactions, in which instruments of distant communication are not able to replace physical proximity as “one not only meets people, one meets places.” (Nowicka 2006b: 231) For mobile professionals, temporal aspects are significant, too. They are not so much bothered by the simultaneity of events, but more by time delays, temporal shifts and gaps between action and reaction, which influence social relationships, especially between partners. Space matters insofar as it reconstitutes how the mobile professionals socialize with others, but it does not matter in terms of belonging or identity (ibid.: ch.5: 227-242, see also 2007a, 2008). Nowicka's works indeed put mobility to the fore when dealing with transnational experiences and their consequences in the lives of individuals.

Diaspora

Like transnationalism, the term *diaspora* is extensively used throughout the social sciences and humanities. Both terms are often used interchangeably; in fact, many scholars understand a diaspora as a specific kind of a “transnational community.” But for quite a long time, the notion was not considered worthy of scholarly discussion about ethnic communities and immigrants as its meaning was very narrow, only applying to the exile of Jews from their historic homeland (Safran 1991: 83). It was not until the 1980s that the use proliferated and its meaning stretched to include migrants who maintain emotional and social ties with their homelands (Brubaker 2005). In this section, I will first delineate the definitions, meanings, and uses of the notion before presenting empirical results in the form of ideal types of a diaspora.

Definitions, Meanings, and Uses of Diaspora

By now, the use of the concept is ever-broadening. The expression “diaspora diaspora”—coined by Brubaker (2005)—draws attention to its overuse and extensive dispersion in semantic, conceptual, and disciplinary space. It warns of its becoming stretched “to the point of uselessness” and subsequently losing its ability to make distinctions (ibid.: 3). Safran (1991) proposes that it be applied to minority communities under the condition that the members (or their ancestors) have been dispersed from an original “center” to two or more foreign regions and that they maintain a collective myth of their homeland. The myth relates to the belief that the diasporas are not fully accepted by the host society; they feel strongly committed to their homeland and they often wish to return (1991: 83f). Diasporas, however, persist without a return, yet the myth remains an important means of solidifying ethnic consciousness and solidarity, often exploited for a variety of political and social purposes by the diasporas, their homelands, and their host societies (Safran 1991: 91f). Additionally, diasporas preserve their identity by resisting assimilation and as a consequence of exclusion. They also often engage in self-segregation. Such *boundary-maintenance* must persist over generations, and thus, distinctive communities are held together by active solidarity and dense social relationships, cutting across state boundaries and linking members of different states into a single “transnational community.” (Brubaker 2005) In this context, Vertovec (1997) elaborates on the “diaspora consciousness” and draws attention to the “awareness of multi-locality,” which stimulates the need to connect oneself with others, both “here and there” who share the same “roots and routes”—culminating into a kind of “collective memory.”

Ideal Types of Diaspora

Cohen (2008) presents an impressive and extensive account of “global diasporas.” He classifies historical examples as ideal types by highlighting their most important characteristics. Drawing on the experiences of Jews, Africans, and Armenians, the first type is that of the “victim diaspora.” Forcible dispersion is an important characteristic, yet Cohen acknowledges that many Jewish communities all over the world resulted rather from trade and financial networks, highlighting their nuanced experiences (2008: ch. 2: 21-36). Africans and Armenians both experienced a “break event” in their histories: Atlantic slavery in the case of Africans and the 1915-1916 genocide in the case of Armenians. These events lead to a wide dispersion and the construction of a collective memory and myth about their homelands (ibid.: ch. 3: 39-59). The second one is the “labour diaspora,” in which his central example is that of indentured Indian workers, who were deployed in British, Dutch, and French tropical plantations from the 1830s to the 1920s. The “imperial diaspora” is the third type. It draws upon the seventeenth-century emigration from Britain, in which most British emigrants sought new opportunities mostly in the United States, but also in countries of empire settlement such as New Zealand, Canada, Australia, Rhodesia, and South Africa. He further mentions the “trade diaspora,” based on the Chinese and the Lebanese, who were permitted to engage in commerce by the colonial regime (ibid.: 83-100). The last type, the “deterritorialized diaspora,” focuses on the history of Caribbean peoples, Sindhis, and Parsis, who have been multiply and forcibly dispersed and continue to migrate. The ideal types emphasize that the notion of diaspora neither refers to a single, endogamous, ethnic group with fixed origins and a uniform history, nor to a lifestyle cut off from fellow citizens in the places of settlement where political aspirations fully focus on the places of origin.

Cosmopolitanism

The view of cosmopolitanism is an old one. It is a major area of interest which has generated a good deal of scholarship by now. It is not a migration approach *per se*, yet it is analytically used in ever more scholarly work on migration. As with (migrant) transnationalism and diaspora, the concept draws attention to transformative processes resulting from border-spanning markets, networks, patterns of attachment, and new forms of governance. I will briefly sketch the main intellectual traditions of thinking and theorizing cosmopolitanism, accordingly differentiating between the (moral, political) idea of “cosmopolitanism as a world order” and “cosmopolitanism as a social practice” of individuals.

Cosmopolitanism as a (Moral) Idea of World Order

Cosmopolitanism is, first and foremost, a moral idea about a societal order of humanity. It has its roots in ancient Greek philosophical writings and was then further elaborated during the Enlightenment, most importantly by Kant (1795). As a philosophy, it means seeing humans as “citizens of the world.” Without a doubt, such a vision comes with an idea about a certain political order, which I will briefly explicate with reference to the modern works of Ulrich Beck (2000, 2005, with Sznaider 2006, 2008, a.o), who—most influentially—introduced cosmopolitanism to the field of social sciences.

In his social theory, Beck introduces the distinction between cosmopolitan philosophy and cosmopolitan sociology. His works mainly advance the idea of a “cosmopolitan sociology” (or, for that matter, social science) and focus on cosmopolitanism as a political project. World-wide globalization processes make it necessary to shift away from methodological nationalism toward a multi-perspectival methodological cosmopolitanism to grasp the multi-dimensional processes of change that have transformed the contemporary social world, Beck argues. Globalization is tantamount to a revolution having taken us from the “first age of modernity” to the “second age of modernity,” the latter underlying an epochal break that requires a paradigm shift in both social science and politics:

“[...] towards the end of the twentieth century the *condition humana* opens up anew—with fundamentally ambivalent contingencies, complexities, uncertainties and risks, which conceptually and empirically still have to be uncovered and understood. A new kind of capitalism, a new kind of economy, a new kind of global order, a new kind of politics and law, a new kind of society and personal life are in the making which both separately and in context are clearly distinct of earlier phases of social evolution.” (Beck 2000: 81)

These new conditions produce a tension of national sovereignty and human rights, bringing about a transition from a nation-state world order to a cosmopolitan world order. Accordingly, in the “first age of modernity” international law would precede human rights, while in the “second age of modernity” human rights would precede international law (ibid.: 82-85). Thus, Beck pleads for a separation of the state and the nation, not least as an answer to the world wars of the twentieth century. Instead, a cosmopolitan state would guarantee the co-existence of national identities through the principle of constitutional tolerance. It acknowledges both equality and difference: the “other” must be present, given voice and be heard, culturally as well as politically.

His cosmopolitan project would influence the relationship between migration and mobility. In the nation-stated perspective, migration and mobility are discrete: while movement within nation-states is called mobility, and perceived as desirable, movement between nation-states is called migration and perceived as undesirable. When staying in one place becomes less and less important due to the global and transnational transformations, Beck asks “[...] why should migrants remain migrants and not be welcomed as mobile?” (2000: 94) A deterritorialized society can break down established dichotomies, he argues. Admittedly, Beck concedes that his vision is not quite yet realistic as there is no desire for such political action.

Cosmopolitanism as a Social Practice

Scholars increasingly use cosmopolitanism when studying social processes of individuals who engage in cultural multiplicity, often in migratory contexts. So, cosmopolitanism describes a specific mode of engaging with the world so as to engage with the “other,” and thus be open to divergent cultural experiences. Such openness is largely acquired through experience, most importantly through travel. A cosmopolitan may even develop a habit of mind through which s/he can end up anywhere in the world and feel strange and familiar at the same time. As a practice or competence, cosmopolitanism is marked by a personal ability to make one’s way into other cultures by listening, observing, reflecting and maneuvering through their systems of meaning (Vertovec/Cohen 2002: 1-11, Iyer 1997).

In their edited volume, Nowicka and Rovisco (2009) see cosmopolitanism as *a mode of self-transformation*, which can occur when individuals engage “in concrete struggles to protect a common humanity and become more reflexive about their experiences of otherness.” (ibid.: 6) Self-transformation always implies a sense of self-scrutiny regarding both the ways of positively engaging with other cultures and the ways of potential commitment to the building of a more just world under conditions of uneven globalization. Therefore, individuals can *actually* become more cosmopolitan—reflexively and emotionally. Nowicka and Rovisco do not see cosmopolitanism necessarily as based on the transcendence of particularistic and parochial ties, but they rather see “actually existing cosmopolitanism” (Robbins 1998) in connection with cosmopolitan institutions (i.e., United Nations, and NGOs) because, on the one hand, cosmopolitan ideas are sometimes already ingrained in formal structures, and on the other, individuals deploy a set of cosmopolitan practices and outlooks to differing degrees in a variety of contexts.

There are several works examining how patterns of mobility shape cosmopolitanism; how it enables, but also how it constrains the cosmopolitan experience. Paul Kennedy (2009), for instance, examines sixty continental “skilled-middle class migrants” from fourteen European countries that settled in Manchester. He traces back their “cosmopolitan career trajectories” and their different personal quests by exploring how they develop social relationships and personal networks both with other non-British nationals as well as locals. His respondents face difficulties gaining entry into local networks, so that many of them engage in social relationships with other foreigners, yet through incidents of encounters with both foreigners and locals, they eventually find paths into the local society. They become more cosmopolitan by going abroad as they become exposed to a multitude of experiences involving engagements with cultural others, which would have been less possible otherwise. Nowicka and Kaweh (2009b) examine cosmopolitanism as a mode of personal interaction with culturally different “others” in foreign geographical contexts as well. They focus on mobile professionals who work for the United Nations (UN). Their main results suggest that the physical presence of individuals alone is not sufficient to develop “real-world cosmopolitanism” (Beck 2004: 133), but that it requires a constant effort to overcome one’s emotional distance from “the other.” The organizational context of the UN enhances the self-understanding of the professionals as “citizen of the world,” while their narratives contrast between world-openness and the everyday practices of UN professionals abroad, triggering moments of openness and closure towards “the others.”

Literatures on this issue mostly focus on the extensive mobility of individuals (Nowicka and Rovisco 2009a: 7) and thus many criticize cosmopolitanism as being a preoccupation of an elite as only they are able to afford (extensive) travel. The above-mentioned studies, however, emphasize that the movements of people across national borders do not foster cosmopolitan self-transformation of the individuals *per se* and that conditions for positive interaction with others are not created *a priori*. Though “actually existing cosmopolitanism” (Robbins 1998) is often developed in mobile transnational contexts, it goes too far stating that it is an essential quality of mobile people. There are other works that emphasize the cosmopolitan practices of individuals without requiring them to be mobile. Römhild (2010), for instance, observed practices of cosmopolitan solidarity of migrants and non-migrants in ethnically diverse settings.

What happens in the Country of Arrival, in the Country of Origin, and/or in other Destinations?

As we have seen, the “new” approaches differ from the “classical” ones in that they conceptualize social reality beyond the borders of one nation-state, i.e., they differ in their spatial reach. These literatures emphasize that migration is no longer only assumed to be a singular spatial and temporal act of displacement of humans. The transnational approach, in particular, highlights the fact that decisions to migrate and re-migrate are not necessarily irrevocable and irreversible, but living transnational lives may become a strategy to ensure survival and betterment, shaping the lives of many (Pries 2001a: 32; Faist 2011: 27 and 2006: 3).

The political impact of these approaches is—comparably—limited, albeit they discuss phenomena that are embedded within bordered political processes. (Migrant) transnationalism influences institutions and policies in the countries of origin and residence, and is influenced by them (Goldring et al. 2003, Østergaard-Nielsen 2012). Some emigration countries, for instance, have shifted towards “global nation policies,” which are characterized by the extension of dual citizenships to emigrant populations or in granting them external voting rights (Smith 1997). Another set of policies aims to maximize the migrants’ economic contribution to their homelands by facilitating channel remittances¹⁶ through policy programs on local and regional development (Goldring 2002, Goldring et al. 2003; Faist 2011). While (migrant) transnationalism provides some governments with new options for economic, social, and political ties with nationals abroad, the receiving countries play a role in the extent to which they tolerate the cross-border activities of migrants. Some regard transnational activities as hindering integration (e.g., Denmark), and others support the transnational engagement of migrants (e.g., Spain) (Østergaard-Nielsen 2009, 2011 and 2012). Generally, the political influence of migrants’ transnationalism is more pronounced in peripherally-positioned countries of origin, where it is accompanied by policies and administrative measures, yet it always depends on the political clout of emigrant organizations, the processes of democratization in the countries of origin, bilateral relations between the two countries and the impact of global rights regimes (Levitt/Del la Dehesa 2003, Goldring et al. 2003). Receiving states engage rather

16 There has been much work done in transnational studies regarding remittances: Goldring, for instance, differentiates between individual and collective economic remittances (2004). Levitt introduced the notion of social remittances (2001a) and—drawing on Goldring (2004)—further elaborated on individual and collective social remittances (with Lamba-Nieves 2011).

less in setting up policies promoting (migrant) transnationalism as can be seen in the lack of tolerance for dual citizenship or in the withdrawal of funding for migrant associations in some countries. As a term, transnationalism is not officially used for policy-agendas, but we need to keep in mind its importance as it “pose[s] a challenge to national regulation, especially in the field of migration control.” (Castles 2004: 2012) In the case of cosmopolitanism, the imagined or desired “cosmopolitan world order” which implies a “cosmopolitan citizenship” does not exist in empirical (political) reality, but some nation-state-transcending structures do: foremost examples are the United Nations and the European Union. Diaspora, however, is probably the most politicized concept out of the three, and yet none of these concepts has such an impact on the agendas of policy-making as have the notions of assimilation, integration, or multiculturalism. In fact, the “dilemma of migration studies” is there at its strongest.

Most (political) hegemony, however, lies behind the concept of assimilation: symptomatic of that is the discussion about the relationship between assimilation and transnationalism. Pioneering contributions in transnational studies challenged that “the incorporation of immigrants takes place in the container of the respective nation-state in which immigrants settle for longer periods of time” (Faist 2011: 30); rather assimilation and transnationalism were seen as contrasting and antithetical modes of incorporation (Glick Schiller et al. 1992: 16), while other scholars usually view transnationalism as a temporary phenomenon that will eventually pass in favour of assimilation (Alba/Nee 1997, Esser 2003, Joppke/Morawska 2003). Debates evolved into a dispute between “assimilationists” and “transnationalists” about temporality (Bommes 2012c). Meanwhile, most transnational scholars concur that integrating into the society of arrival and maintaining ties to the society of origin does not need to be mutually exclusive (Morawska 2003, Levitt 2003, Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004). The notion of “simultaneity” (Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004) clarifies that neither assimilationist nor transnational practices are fixed, but change over time. Their relationship is one of simultaneity of connection, which implies different combinations of different forms of incorporation with different forms of transnationalism. Such an understanding takes into account contextual conditions and goes beyond assimilation as the only analytically viable way of conceptualizing migrants’ incorporation. Besides, King reminds us that the biggest value of transnational studies in reformulating migration theory is exactly that it questions the linear, no-return model, by placing a big question mark over the extensive body of literature about assimilation (2012: 25). Most adequately, Wessendorf captures the heart of the discussion as follows: “[...] variations in transnationalism and integration [...] demon-

strate how difficult it is to fit individuals into sociological categories” (2013: 9)—that are often perceived as mutually exclusive, I would add.

To conclude, what the “new” approaches have in common is their refusal to conceptualize migration as a one-way street per se. From a sociological perspective, the “new” approaches not only give us answers to the question of *what happens (only) in the country of arrival, but also in the country of origin and/or in potential other destinations after initial migration*. Migration theory can give us as much as three answers: (migrant) transnationalism, diaspora, and cosmopolitanism; all of which imply a more extended understanding of migration than that of “immigration.”

1.3 MOBILITY STUDIES AS A NEW RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE ON MIGRATION

In the previous sections, I have delineated—what I believe are—the most influential theoretical approaches in research on migration. The review simultaneously demonstrates that geographical (im)mobility of those constructed as migrants (through the approaches and, of course, political representations) is often overlooked in migration literatures in general and, more specifically, in the sociology of migration. To that end, I take a closer look into the field of mobility studies to see what it can offer us for the study of migration. In this section, I will present the main contributions in “mobility studies,” which function throughout my work as my analytical perspective: the “mobilities perspective.” After having introduced the paradigm and its most crucial conceptualizations and methods, I will discuss the relationship between “migration studies” and “mobility studies” accounting for the gap affecting both literatures that my study aims to reduce.

The “Mobilities Paradigm”

Though mobility is not new, the “mobilities paradigm” (Sheller/Urry 2006, Hanam et al. 2006, Urry 2007) entered into academic discussions only a decade ago. It seeks to enhance the “mobilities turn” (Urry 2007) which would influence and include works from the fields of anthropology, cultural studies, geography, migration studies, science and technology studies, tourism and transport studies, and sociology.

The (Sociological) Beginning

It is surprising that the “mobilities turn” has had only “scant evidence [...] within the discipline of sociology itself” (Sheller 2014a: 45) as its beginnings can be traced back to this field exactly. Mobility studies have been greatly enhanced, maybe even launched by the works of the sociologist John Urry (1946-2016). We can find influential initial ideas that would later become more precisely linked to the “mobilities turn” in his book, *Sociology Beyond Societies* (2000) and in his agenda-setting article, “Mobile Sociology” ([2001] 2010), in which he develops a “post-societal” agenda for sociology; going beyond sociology’s notion of the “social as society.” (Urry [2001] 2010: 348) Urry also challenges the idea of mobility in sociology as “social mobility”: it is neither restricted to the territory of the nation-state society, nor does it only include the flows of humans. It rather consists of the relations between humans and objects, which cannot be grasped by the classical sociological debates on “agency vs. structure” or “methodological individualism vs. holism.” (Urry [2001] 2010: 357) Positing a relational basis for sociological theorizing that puts mobility at its center (Sheller 2014a: 45), Urry lucidly challenges the sedentarism of sociological thought.

Mimi Sheller, another sociologist and advocate of mobility studies, sees another main reason why the field of sociology has been resistant to the “mobilities turn”: notably, because Urry’s approach was often wrongly equated with theories of global fluidity and liquidity as, for example, formulated by Castles (1996) and Bauman (2000). The “mobilities turn” has been misunderstood by many scholars of sociology, history, and anthropology to carry too much of a normative thrust, implying that mobility is the most desirable state of being. For all that, Sheller sees mobility studies as an opportunity to re-unite in a transdisciplinary framework:

“The new transdisciplinary field of mobilities research effectively [...] brings together some of the more purely ‘social’ concerns of sociology (inequality, power, hierarchies) with ‘spatial’ concerns of geography (territory, borders, scale) and the ‘cultural’ concerns of anthropology and media studies (discourses, representation, schemas), while inflecting each with a relational ontology of the co-constitution of subjects, spaces, and meanings.” (2014a: 47)

Mobilities research assumes that the world is constituted by relations rather than entities, and therefore advocates for a relational ontology, meaning that to be in the world is consequently to be in the world of others; which is, however, not only a world of other humans but also of objects, materials, and artefacts. It is thus compatible with many disciplines.

The Paradigm

There are several programmatic key texts that declared the “mobilities paradigm.” (Sheller/Urry 2006, Urry 2007, Hannam et al. 2006, Sheller/Urry 2016) These contributions outline the emerging agenda within mobility studies, their main areas of concern, as well as their theoretical and methodological tools. Because the whole world seems to be on the move—asylum seekers, international students, terrorists, holidaymakers, business people, refugees, commuters, the early retired, young mobile professionals, prostitutes, and armed forces—the paradigm makes a case against the a-mobile and sedentarist preoccupations of social science research (Sheller/Urry 2006: 208, Urry 2007: 12). It is more than a simple assertion of the novelty of mobility:

“We do not insist on a new ‘grand narrative’ on mobility, fluidity, and liquidity. The new mobilities paradigm suggests a set of questions, theories, and methodologies rather than a totalizing and reductive description of the contemporary world.” (Sheller/Urry 2006: 210)

Evidently, it is a rather broader conceptual project, promoting a movement-driven social science (Urry 2007: 18) that is concerned with power because mobility is a resource to which not everyone has access: it is unequally distributed. The study of mobility likewise involves immobilities and highlights their dialectical relationship: mobility only exists through immobility and vice versa (Urry 2003: 138, Hannam et al. 2006: 2, Adey 2006: 86). Mobilities cannot be understood without the necessary spatial, infrastructural, and institutional moorings that configure and enable them. The relation of mobilities to associated immobilities or moorings is therefore at center stage. The “mobilities paradigm” equally interrogates the master narrative that links mobility with freedom because mobilities are rather shown to be controlled, tracked, governed, and often under surveillance (Sheller/Urry 2016: 3). Such frictions and turbulences of differential mobilities are suited to deal with the realm of migration, tourism, and travel, amongst others. Scholars in the field agree that migration studies are crucial to mobilities research, and I would add, vice versa. Not only does the latter offer studies of transnational migration and diaspora trenchant critiques of bounded and static categories of nation, ethnicity, citizenship, etc., but the relation between migration, tourism, transnationalism, return migration, and diasporas is crucial as it implies obligatory as well as voluntary forms of mobility, enabling complex connections of social or political obligation (Hannam et al. 2006: 10–14, Sheller 2014a: 48).

Conceptualizing (Im)Mobility

Empirical and theoretical works are increasing in the field of “mobility studies,” yet efforts to conceptualize (im)mobility are just beginning. The geographer Peter Adey (2006) advisably warns us that despite his own conviction that everything is mobile, the term mobility needs to be conceptualized to prevent blurriness and the construction of just another buzzword, because “if mobility is everything, then it is nothing.” (Adey 2006) He presents the argument for a relational politics of (im)mobility, stressing the differences between movements and, at the same time, their contingent relatedness. Adey sees movement not as a simple thing undertaken by a few, but rather as being present everywhere while being experienced in many different ways, gaining meaning through its “embeddedness within societies, culture, politics, histories.” (ibid.: 83) Mobilities are, like power, relational and this relatedness impacts upon what they mean and how they work (ibid.: 87).

Tim Cresswell (2006) adds a constructivist idea to Adey’s relational approach. Mobility is a “blank space” that is often used as an alternative to stability, place, and boundedness while it is, at the same time, celebrated as progress, freedom, and modernity and rejected as deviance, shiftlessness, and resistance (ibid.: 2). Introducing an interpretative framework, Cresswell articulates what mobility specifically means. He starts—as it were—right at the beginning, explaining that the basic signifier of mobility is to get from point A to point B. Mobility is thus a displacement, characterized by the act of moving between locations:

A-----B

He makes the point that the content of the line that links A to B remains unexplored in most literatures, especially so in the classic migration theory, in which the choice to move would be the result of push and pull factors, telling us something about A and B, while nothing about the line. Cresswell, however, thinks that the movements (the lines) are full of meaning, which produce and are produced by power. He introduces an analytical distinction between movement and mobility. The former is mobility abstracted from power: “movement is the general fact of displacement before the types, strategies, and social implications of that movement are considered.” (ibid.: 3) Mobility, hence, is a socially produced motion, which Cresswell understands through three relational moments. First, human mobility is a simple fact, an empirical reality that is analyzed by modelers, migration scholars, transport planners and so on. It is here that it is at its

most abstract, coming closest to pure motions. Second, there are ideas about mobility that are represented through different channels. Such representations of mobility capture and make sense of it through the production of meanings that are frequently ideological. Third, mobility is practiced, experienced, embodied: how we experience mobility influences the ways we give meaning to it. Equally, representations of mobility are based on ways in which mobility is practiced and embodied. Certainly, mobilities are products of history, signifying that the power relations and meanings change over time. They are at the mercy of social change as they gain meanings through relations. Cresswell, however, concedes that the social construction of mobility does not mean that mobility itself has somehow been invented and can be made to disappear (ibid.: 9-22). His conceptualization—as I see it—emphasizes the construction of (different) meanings of mobility, which is given through contexts and also through individuals, who give meaning to their own movements.

Canzler, Kaufmann, and Kesselring (2008) provide another conceptualization of mobility, proposing to define mobility as “a change of condition by targeting three dimensions: movements, networks, and motility.” (ibid.: 3) *Movements* strictly refer to a geographical dimension as they occur between an origin and one or several destinations. *Networks* are defined as the framework of movements, and technical networks, i.e., transportation, communications, are characterized by the quality of infrastructure, services and access to those services, while social networks are institutionalized relationships. *Motility*, however, is the capacity of an actor to move socially and spatially, reinforced by networks. It mirrors all forms of access obtainable both technologically and socially as well as the skills possessed to take advantage of this access. These dimensions deconstruct the synonymy between movement and mobility: (1) one can move without being mobile, (2) one can be mobile without moving, and (3) one can move and be mobile. As for (1) the movement in space does not change the state of the actor as it is in the case of the frequently travelling business person, who changes geographical spaces, but who is not necessarily in an environment that makes him or her socially mobile. For (2), the authors refer to heavy consumers of long-distance communication using internet, e-mails or skype, who then associate with different social universes. Point (3) makes the case for when crossing geographical spaces is accompanied by crossing social spaces, as it is well documented in sociological works. The conceptualization targets both the intention to be mobile (related to the concept of motility) and the potential of networks to the capabilities of actors. These networks, however, can be used potentially, yet not always factually. Mobility suggest capabilities that are unequally distributed. It assumes access to concerned spaces and money, and it addresses the aspira-

tions of the actors, which are not always focused on career goals. Thus, mobility both generates social inequality and is generated by it (Canzler et al. 2008: 5). I believe that this conceptualization is less constructivist than Cresswell's, but it is more concerned with the unequal access to mobility. Its strength is that it includes the concept of motility, which is—to my mind—crucial when examining mobility, particularly the mobility of humans.

Scholars in the field of mobility studies want to make sure that mobilities research does not only concern the “hyper-mobile” elite of global capitalism (Sheller 2014a: 48). The differences in capacities and potentials are usually analyzed via the concept of *motility*, defined as “how an individual or group takes possession of the realm of possibilities for mobility and builds on it to develop personal projects.” (Flamm/Kaufmann 2006: 168) It targets all factors of the potential to be mobile, whether these are physical capacities, aspirations, the accessibility to existing transportation and communication systems as well as acquired knowledge. Motility thus contains access (the conditions under which available options can be used), skills (required to use the options) and cognitive appropriation (the evaluation of the available options vis-a-vis one's project). It generally focuses on the logic of an actor's action, and the subsequent relations to structures and context (ibid.: 169). Other analytical concepts are Kaufmann et al's “mobility capital” (2004) and Urry's (related) notion of “network capital.” (2007) Mobility as capital can be mobilized and transformed into other types of capital, i.e., economic, cultural, and social capital (Bourdieu 1983). “Network capital” is the capacity to engender and sustain social relations with those people who are not necessarily proximate and it generates emotional, practical, and financial benefits. It also includes combinations of capacities to be mobile such as appropriate documents, money, and qualifications, social networks at-a-distance, physical capacities, location free information, access to communication devices and secure meeting places (ibid.: 197ff, Urry/Eliot 10f), ultimately making both concepts difficult to differentiate from one another.

Methodology, Mobile Methods, and the “Mobilities Perspective”

Certainly, a new “mobilities paradigm” not only requires theoretical frameworks and conceptual tools, but it also needs to propose methods. Scholars in this field are increasingly developing so-called “mobile methods” (Sheller/Urry 2006, Urry 2007, Büscher/Urry 2009) to approach the interlocking of mobility and immobility. These methods draw considerably on Marcus' proposal of a multi-sided ethnography (1995), encompassing the observation of people's movements, a “mobile ethnography” which involves being mobile while conducting participant observation or ethnographic research. This may include “being mo-

bile with others” and conducting interviews or focus groups afterward, video ethnography, but also following, shadowing, or sociological stalking (Büscher/Urry 2009: 104). Further “mobile methods” may be the analysis of “time-space diaries” in which the respondents would record what they were doing and where, and how they moved. Methods of “cyber-research” explore the imaginative and virtual mobilities of people via their websites, discussion groups, listserves or other multimedia methods. Examining “multiple transfer points” that are involved in “being mobile” but are “immobilised” such as cafés, waiting rooms, parks, hotels, airports, etc. may also be new empirical realms to be researched (Büscher/Urry 2009: 99, 105ff, Sheller 2011: 7).

While “mobile methods” are increasingly developed in empirical research, D’Andrea, Ciolfi, and Gray (2011) observed that these advancements have not been equally matched by efforts on the methodological front, not least because intellectual formulations of research practices often arise as an afterthought. Methodological positions have thus remained underdeveloped in this field (D’Andrea et al. 2011: 156). Targeting this lack, scholars have slowly begun to reflect on the analytical value of mobility studies when examining migration or other fields of interests. Salazar and Smart (2011) advocate the analysis of mobilities as socio-cultural constructs rather than as brute facts, because they see the danger that mobility studies might replicate one of the problems affecting the comparable field of transnationalism. The latter was criticized for “sampling on the dependent variable: paying most attention to those who maintained transnational social fields rather than assimilating into local cultures.” (Salazar/Smart 2011: 5) They subsequently propose to “take on” mobility while studying other processes and thus extending both the utility of the mobilities approach and insisting on attending to other dynamics that would not be considered if the focus is first and last on (im)mobility as such (ibid.: 7). After all, much work remains on the methodological level of mobility studies and Salazar and Smart (2011) give good advice as how to conduct research without falling into a methodological bias.

Accordingly, I use the “mobilities paradigm” as my analytical perspective to investigate migration and transnational phenomena in order to probe migration through the “mobilities perspective.” (Wieczorek 2016) Following Sheller, the mobilities paradigm is especially suitable as a new perspective on “old things”:

“The point is that mobilities research is not simply about a topic (e.g., things that move, or the governance of mobility regimes, or the idea of an increasingly mobile world), but is even more pointedly a new way of approaching social research, social theory, and social agency.” (Sheller 2014b: 13)

As a new way of approaching migration, the „mobilities perspective” promotes a relational and constructivist understanding of (im)mobility, acknowledging the various meanings we attach to it, as advanced by scholars in the field. Additionally, I argue that we conceive of it as processual because mobility and immobility are dialectic and symbiotic, meaning that either “state” is fixed, nor is one possible without the other. Mobilities are always in the making, re-making, and unmaking so that the condition continuously changes. Shifting to the “mobilities perspective” means understanding (im)mobility as *relational*, *constructed* through meanings, and *processual*. This, I believe, benefits the aim of the study: to shed light on and increase the scholarly awareness of how (im)mobility is constructed within migration phenomena, and what empirical, theoretical, and political implications it may have. This has not been done before, despite the very recent increase of a few (empirical) scholarly works, tentatively entering into dialogue with both mobility studies and migration studies.

The Relation of Migration Studies and Mobility Studies

While the advocates of the “mobilities paradigm” repeatedly state that migration phenomena are a potential object to study (im)mobility, migration scholars seem to be more cautious. Sheller, for instance, argues that the study of mobilities offers a “far more nuanced view of migration, border-crossing and various other kinds of travel including tourism [...]” (2014a: 51), but—truth to be told—there are relatively few studies on migration that draw upon the “mobilities turn.” A positive relationship between both research fields is not yet achieved as becomes clear in two (programmatic) accounts on this issue (Fortier 2014, Faist 2013). Anne-Marie Fortier, for instance, engages with the question of what migration scholarship can tell us about “mobile worlds.” (2014: 65) Even though both scholarly traditions have a common interest, there are differences in the research perspectives:

“For if mobilities research forces us to think about migration in relation to the ways in which ‘mobility’ has been variously established (institutionally, legally, technologically, materially, idealistically) as a universal condition if not a universal ‘right,’ migration studies force a reconsideration of the fluidity, accessibility and desirability of the assumed mobile world, as well as the conditions under which people are ‘mobile’ (or not).” (Fortier 2014: 65)

The juxtaposition in this statement is intensive: mobilities scholarship calls for an acknowledgement of “mobility” as a universal condition, while migration scholarship criticizes the notion, as well as its desirability. Fortier nevertheless proposes fields for fruitful collaboration like “citizenship studies” in which transnational scholarship could shed light on how individuals are constituted as “integrated” or “citizens,” but also under what conditions the same or other individuals might not be recognized as such, inviting though about normative notions of “good citizenship” and “worthy mobility.” The political scientist and transnational scholar Thomas Faist (2013) is more reluctant to endorse a potential cooperation. He examines mobility from the point of view of social inequalities and focuses on how the border-crossing movement comes to be defined as mobility. Both scholars criticize the normative implications of the terms “migration” and “mobility.” Within neoliberal economic and governance strategies, the mobility of the “highly-skilled” is supported while the mobility of the less skilled or less-moneyed (“immigrant”) is monitored and regulated (Fortier 2014: 70). Labour migrants are thus “wanted but not welcome,” while those called highly-skilled are “wanted and welcome.” (Faist 2013: 1642) Such a categorization nourishes—as Faist calls it—the transnational social question, which contains different evaluations of mobilities. Labour migrants are immigrants and need to integrate, while highly skilled are mobiles who do not face issues of integration. Their mobility is celebrated under a neo-liberalist banner:

“The discursive juxtaposition of category one vs category two in itself is an outcome of upholding and reproducing social inequalities on a national and global scale, in this case the social mechanism of hierarchization of migrants and highly-skilled mobiles. First, in public debates it seems as if mobility is a phenomenon of the market, which is regulated by Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’, that is, social order is emerging spontaneously out of aggregated individually rational acts. [...] Secondly, mobility supposedly reflects the necessities of global economic competition and suggests how spatial and social mobility act in tandem to the best of all involved, whereas migration is connoted with problematic outcomes with respect to the social integration of immigrants into national policies and national welfare states.” (Faist 2013: 1643)

In a neo-liberal world-order the public and political use of “mobility” is privileged to that of “migration.” Therefore, the concept of “mobility” reproduces hierarchization and further social inequalities, which makes an evaluation of “movement” as positive (as in the case of “mobility”) deeply problematic for Faist. Fortier, too, points to this problematization, which produces social images that concern the “social distribution of bad.” The term “migrant” is a way to des-

ignite someone as a threat to the core values of a country (Bigo 2002), and has no longer to do with the legal terminology of foreigners. She suggests adding “imaginaries and affect” to the conceptual toolkit of migration research within mobility studies (Fortier 2014: 70). Fortier, generally, welcomes the interrogation by migration research on the “mobile world” and points out that migration studies, especially transnational and diaspora studies, have a lot to offer the “mobilities paradigm,” but calls for a rethinking of prevalent classificatory schemes of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and generations. On the contrary, Faist concludes that “mobility” cannot be usefully employed in migration and transnational studies unless mobility scholars reflect critically about political assumptions of immobility and mobility or spatial mobility and social mobility (2013: 1644). I have to object to the fact that while he calls upon mobility scholars to analyze the boundary work that mobility does, he is doing boundary work against a cross-fertilization between migration and mobility studies. Whether the negative connotation of migration is more desirable than a positive connotation of mobility is debatable, because the politicized, negative connotation of “migration” may continue to worsen the social stereotypification and hierarchization—a development that both mobility and migration scholars wish to avoid, notwithstanding the disagreements.

Mobilities and Migrations

We have seen that the relationship between the two research agendas is a difficult one. There are, nevertheless, a few studies that employ the “mobilities turn” in their research on migration.¹⁷ There are certainly many works in the realm of migration that deal with the category of mobility, but do not necessarily inscribe themselves as part of a “new mobilities paradigm.” I will, however, focus on those that do.

One of the earliest contributions is Kesselring’s work (2006) on mobility pioneers: freelance journalists in Germany, with whom Kesselring conducted in-depth interviews. He conceptualized his empirical findings in three ideal types of “mobility management.” The first ideal type is that of “centered mobility management,” characterized by a strong relation between physical and social mobility. Individuals categorized under this type use movement in space—travel—to realize individual plans and projects. The second ideal type is “decentered mobility management,” demonstrating how physical and social mobility is uncoupled. It is rather (communication and information) technology driven, enabling

17 Some of them I have already mentioned in my discussion about the mobility in studies dealing with (migrant) transnationalism, diaspora, and cosmopolitanism (ch. 1.2).

individuals to decenter themselves in complex networks of mediated and face-to-face interactions. The last ideal type is that of “virtual mobility management,” in which spatial movement is not an essential part of the mobility practice. Complex virtual networks are substituted for physical presence and spatial mobility (ibid.: 270). Kesselring’s results show that there are new ways to be mobile and to realize social belonging without being bound to place. In a similar fashion, Elliott and Urry explore the *Mobile Lives* (2010) of some individuals, which they describe as the “global elite.” Based on in-depth interviews, the authors bring case studies into their analysis and discuss main issues of “mobile lives,” such as personal and professional networking, intimate relationships at-a-distance, as well as consumption and environmental impacts. This study emphasizes the changes in how people live their lives in contemporary times which are affected by and reflect (global) mobility. By the same token, it points out that living a mobile life is not always a “blessing.”

In addition, anthropological work convincingly demonstrates the importance of imagination in structuring (im)mobility in relation to migration (Salazar 2010). Based on long-term fieldwork in Tanzania, Noel Salazar analyses how imaginaries and social relations concerning mobility are materialized, enacted, and inculcated. Mobilities—whether across internal or international boundaries—are more than just mere movements as they are infused with cultural meaning, leading to a construction of “mobility imaginaries.” (2010: 55) Large parts of the Tanzanian population incorporate “mobility imaginaries,” especially of the “West,” despite the low rate of emigration. What is at stake here is merely the dream of migration (ibid.: 57ff). The study emphasizes the differences between border-crossing migration and mobility. Interpreted in this context, mobility is manifested in metacultural discourses and imaginaries. Even if only a few Tanzanians go “West,” the fantasy to migrate remains popular.

Above all, there are two very recent studies that deal with diverse mobility experiences in the context of migration. Joëlle Moret examines post-migration mobility practices by “former migrants from the country in which they have settled.” (2015: 1) These former migrants are first generation Somali women and men. Based on narrative and semi-structured interviews and drawing on transnational and mobility studies, she develops three ideal types of post-migration mobility practices: (1) the “star-shaped” mobility, (2) pendular movements, and (3) secondary movements (ibid.: 3). As for (1), Moret points out that geographical movements are practiced regularly, but always for short periods of time, departing from the place of residence to different locations. The ideal type (2) describes rather short-term geographical movements between two locations: the place of residence and another destination. In the case of (3), secondary move-

ments are characterized by on-going movements from one place of residence to another. Moret's main results show that the three ideal types are three ways through which social actors gain different forms of capital and exchange them in places where they are valued, most often ethnic environments in different places, which serve to improve the individual's social and economic conditions. Apart from Moret, Schrooten et al. (2015) have examined experiences that are marked by ongoing mobility and a variety of potential routes. Based on ethnographic work and interviews with Brazilians, who are currently residing in Belgium and the United Kingdom, the authors point out that the majority of their respondents have passed through other locations before arriving in their current places of residence, spending between one and five years working in foreign countries. For them, being mobile becomes a way of staying at home, because the focus to go abroad is to build up a better life "back home" eventually (ibid.: 13).

This short review illustrates the existence of many different forms of movement. We have seen that first, mobility does not necessarily imply physical movement, and second, when physical movement is implied, it is diverse. Most importantly though, this review clearly shows the gap in the literature in both migration and mobility studies about how *geographical (im)mobility* is constructed within migration phenomena and what social implications it raises. While the reviewed studies "kick off" a discussion to fill this gap, they solely focus on geographical mobility, thereby leaving immobility often unexplored. However, my research has more of a focus on immobile as well as mobile practices in space and time. More specifically, I examine the life-courses of young adults of Polish heritage in Germany and Canada, and hence, the inherent mobility experiences that are situated in migration and transnational contexts. I believe that constructing an integrative perspective is indispensable for a fruitful study of migration and mobility phenomena and for creating a dialogue between these two scholarly fields.

2 (Im)Mobile Individuals: Studying Their Biographies

Examining geographical (im)mobility in migration contexts is the central concern of this book. Given the gap in the literature I have scrutinized in the chapter above, it is all the more important that I immerse myself in the “field.” In fact, fieldwork is crucial to my understanding of sociological work, more so as I aim to shed light on an issue that—up until now—has not been widely studied. I am especially interested in individuals’ “transnational biographies” (Apitzsch/Siouti 2007, Ruokonen-Engler 2012, Siouti 2013), and set out to explore the diversity of their (im)mobility experiences and to gain an in-depth understanding of how they lend meaning to them. Investigating migration phenomena through a “mobilities perspective,” I ask the following questions: *How (geographically) mobile or immobile are “migrants” after initial migration and what social implications does this (im)mobility raise?*

- Under which circumstances do various mobilities occur in migratory and transnational contexts?
- What biographical constellations are at play for their development, maintenance, or shifting in individual life courses?
- How is the (im)mobility “after migration” characterized?

The methodology and the data collection method I have chosen for this study qualify as qualitative and interpretative. I constantly reassessed my research questions, initial hypotheses and conceptualizations during the process of gathering, transcribing, and coding the data. My interest in how individuals, who are—in one way or another—embedded in migration and transnational contexts, experience (im)mobility in their lives came about during this very process. In this chapter, I explain how I carried out my research, what my sample looks like, and

how I analyzed the data, which results in an “ideal-typical” typology of *three patterns of (im)mobility*.

2.1 APPROACHING THE FIELD: METHODOLOGY, METHODS, AND SAMPLING STRATEGIES

The micro level of the individual is my point of departure in this study. The qualitative methods of social research I used emphasize a constructivist approach to understanding social phenomena, which refuses to see “social facts” (Durkheim [1895] 1984) as a given “objective truth” independent of human action and agency. It rather promotes the idea that social phenomena are constructed and can therefore be deconstructed, reconstructed, or generally modified. Statements and judgements of reality are socially relative and pertain to specific social contexts, which we need to analyze in order to understand their meanings. Such methodological considerations have a long tradition in sociological thinking as they can be traced back to the ideas of Max Weber (1949), Alfred Schütz ([1932] 2013), Peter Berger, and Thomas Luckmann ([1966] 1992), amongst others (Rosenthal 2014, Endreß 2005 and 2012, Castles 2012). Truth be told, there is a longstanding feud between positivists, who tend to use quantitative methods, and constructivists, who tend to use qualitative methods on epistemological grounds: “Positivists believe in objectivity and constructivists believe that there is no single truth in social phenomena.” (Castles 2012: 12) However, if we put emphasis on how individuals in diverse groups, communities, and societies construct social meanings of the social world they encounter and if we keep in mind the relativity and context-dependence of these meanings, qualitative and interpretative methods lend themselves well to research. That is why this study is framed by the methodology and methods of sociological biographical research.

Accessing Mobilities through Biographical Research

As social constructs, biographies are increasingly used to examine social reality in today’s sociology (Rosenthal 2004: 47). The beginnings of biographical research are ascribed to the publication of the monumental work, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* written by the Chicago sociologists Florian Znaniecki and William Isaac Thomas. They consider personal life stories to be “the perfect type of sociological material.” (Znaniecki/Thomas [1918-1923] 1958: 1832f) *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* did, in fact, inspire a boom of qualitative-empirical research based on a biographical approach. Mem-

bers of the Chicago School (such as Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess) further refined and developed this approach. The principles and methods of biographical research of the 1930s were rediscovered during the 1970s and 1980s. The German sociologists Fritz Schütze (1976, 1983, 1984), Werner Fuchs (1984), and Martin Kohli (with Bertraux 1984, 1985) contributed to programmatic and empirical research and helped to institutionalize the biographical approach in Germany. Since then, studying biographies has become an established method for a combined analysis of social and individual factors.

Methodologically, biographical research starts from the premise that current or previous social phenomena concerning individuals should be interpreted and analyzed in the overall context of their life stories (Rosenthal 2014: 176f), instructing us to reconstruct the genesis of the social phenomena. The actions of the individual are important in this context: knowing about both the actors' subjective perspective and the courses of action, by which we are able to grasp what they experienced, what meaning they confer to their actions at that time, what meaning they assign today, and in what biographically-constituted context they place their experiences (ibid.: 2004: 49). Therefore, biographical research "rests on a view of individuals as creators of meanings which form the basis of their everyday lives." (Roberts 2002: 6) It emphasizes the process structure of occurrences and life events, and for this study, (im)mobility experiences. Using the biographical approach enables us, as Pries has argued, to overcome:

"[...] the traditional dichotomy of 'subjective orientations of acting' and individual actions on the one hand and 'objective conditions of action' and structural constraints of action on the other one." (1997: 287, my translation)¹

It reveals both structural and individual elements at play in a life trajectory. Thus, we can reconstruct the phenomenon that interests us: how it emerged, how it developed, how it changed, and how it reproduces established structures.

Many (sociological) studies use this methodology to investigate phenomena of migration.² Already more than twenty years ago, Halfacree and Boyle (1993)

1 "[...] Die traditionelle Dichotomie von 'subjektiven Handlungsorientierungen' und individuellen Handlungen einerseits und 'objektiven Handlungsbedingungen' und strukturellen Handlungsbegrenzungen andererseits."

2 Besides empirical sociology, researchers have also worked with biographical and life course approaches in other disciplines, such as history (Lehmkuhl 2014, Panter et al. 2015, Thompson 2000, a.o.), educational sciences (Krüger/Marotzki 2006, a.o.), psychology (Bar-On 2004, Rosenwald/Ochberg 1992, Straub 1993) as well as transporta-

argued for an alternative conceptualization of migration: one, which would emphasize the situatedness of migration within everyday life. They advised abandoning the view of migration as a contemplative act, and described it instead as something related to an individual's past and predicted future; to use their own words: "[...] migration exists as a part of our past, our present and our future; as part of our biography." (ibid.: 337) Investigating migration through biographies provides us—according to the authors—with a deeper understanding of the phenomenon than those simple typologies or push-and pull frameworks often used to explain migration. In studying (migrant) transnationalism, however, ethnographic work is dominant. Despite a recent increase in transnational studies, in particular among German scholars (Apitsch/Siouti 2007, Fürstenau 2004, Frändberg 2008, Kempf 2012, Kühn 2012, Lutz 2000 and 2004, Palenga-Möllnbeck 2014, Pries 1997, Ruokonen-Engler 2012, Ruokonen-Engler/Siouti 2013, Siouti 2013, Tulder 2014), biographical research remains underused, yet a crucial advantage lies in its compatibility with the theoretical assumptions and research goals of transnational studies. It addresses both the context of the country of origin as well as the context of the country of arrival (and other given contexts, too) while considering an individual's insider perspective through, for example, *post-hoc* assessments of specific events. Using it to investigate mobility in migration and transnational contexts enables us—I argue—to reconstruct the development of individuals' (im)mobility with respect to other important events in their life courses.

Grasping Mobilities through Biographies

I see mobility as a social practice that is enacted (or not) by individuals during their life trajectories. The advocates of "mobility studies" have increasingly developed so-called "mobile methods" (ch. 1.3) and, in this context, Sheller (2011: 7) mentions the use of autobiographical narratives. However, empirical studies on mobilities that take into account a biographical approach barely exist—with a few exceptions in the way of travel behaviour studies (Lanzendorf 2003, Beige/Axhausen 2006, 2012, Rau/Sattler 2017), interregional migration and residential mobility (Fischer/Malmberg 2001, Coulter et al. 2016) as well as international and transnational migration (Frändberg 2008, Moret 2015, Wiczorek 2016).

Methodologically speaking, I argue that coming to understand (im)mobility through biographical research is not only possible, but desirable, for three rea-

tion and travel behaviour studies (Hägerstrand 1975, Lanzendorf 2003, Beige/Axhausen 2006).

sons. First, biographies are outcomes of certain processes of life; they are social constructs that individuals produce in the course of their lives. As such, they combine individual and structural elements. Using biographical research, we can reconstruct the experiences of (im)mobility, because they are inherent in peoples' biographies. Second, biographies as social constructs are not fixed to one geographical location, neither to one time period, nor to only one social phenomenon. The biography is always bound to its carrier: at any time, at any place, and on any occasion. No matter where, when, and what individuals do, their biography is always *en route* with them. Biographies are thus as mobile as the individuals—not less and not more than that. If the lives of individuals contain (border-crossing) mobilities, studying their biographies bears the exceptional potential to go beyond considering single nation-states as the unit of analysis, i.e., to overcome “methodological nationalism.” (Wimmer/Glick Schiller 2002) Biographical research, I argue, is a “mobile methodology” *per se*. Third, biographies are composed of three dimensions: the *temporal*, the *spatial*, and the *social* dimension.

The Temporal, Spatial, and Social Dimensions

These sociological dimensions, we need to understand, are inherent in both people's biographies and in (im)mobility dynamics. The latter are embedded in the biographies of my respondents as they, indeed, cut through them.

To that end, the temporal dimension of (im)mobility helps us to discover the duration and frequency of the geographical movements. Moreover, it not only enables us to spot relevant points of time in the individuals' trajectory in which mobility practices arise, but we can also trace back practices of (im)mobility to former generations, i.e., in the family histories of the individuals. The spatial dimension, in the same vein, allows us to track the geographical locations to which the mobility practices are directed. Last but not least, the social dimension of (im)mobility provides an analytical entry into the impact of these mobilities on individuals' sociality and how it manifests itself in the lives of my respondents—social relationships, family tie(s), belonging(s) and self-understandings. Conversely, the social dimension also helps us to understand and explain the emergence of (im)mobility in the first place. The temporal and spatial levels can give us information about duration, frequency, and direction of mobility practices, and they can simply be limited to a quantitative account. Examining the underlying social factors can provide us with insights about why a certain mobility duration, frequency or destination arose and not another one, and how the individuals lend meaning to their own practices of (im)mobility. Therefore, I argue that the temporal and the spatial dimensions are indispensable to examining practices of

(im)mobility, but they fall short where it comes to the experiences related to it. This is why I will pay particular attention to the social dimension.

Certainly, we can only analytically distinguish the temporal, spatial, and social dimensions, but they are of great help when we want to reconstruct the formation and development of (im)mobility. We need to be aware, however, that all three dimensions interact in a processual way in biographical trajectories, meaning that patterns of actions may change from one particular point in time to another. Biographical research allows us to grasp these actions and the social constructions and orientations that structure and frame them because anything happens at a *given time*, in a *given place*, and in a *given social constellation*. My respondents' retrospective interpretations and assessments of their social actions constitute *post hoc* narratives of (im)mobility experiences that shed light on their construction and meaning. A processual understanding of (im)mobility (ch. 1.3) opens up the possibility of going beyond commonly known migration categories so as to capture constellations and complexities which would otherwise go unnoticed—and thus promises to provide us with significant sociological insights. As such, biographical research responds to both the challenges that the literatures on mobility and migration pose and to the understanding of mobility as relational, constructed, and processual.

Autobiographical Interviewing

In biographical research, the method of data collection consists of narrative autobiographical interviewing. The narrative procedures I used draw on the work of Fritz Schütze, who elaborated them in methodology (Schütze 1976, 1984). He argues that “the structure of experiences reproduces itself in the structure of narration” (1976: 179), in which the individual selects *ad-hoc* the experiences, incidents, occurrences, and notions that are “biographically relevant”:

“[...] if we want to reconstruct what people experienced in the course of their lives and how these experiences constitute their current perspectives and action orientations, we must elicit the *processes of remembering* and their verbal translation into *narrations*.” (Rosenthal 2014: 155, my translation)³

3 “[...] Wenn wir rekonstruieren wollen, was Menschen im Laufe ihres Lebens erlebt haben, und wie dieses Erleben ihre gegenwärtigen Perspektiven und Handlungsorientierungen konstituiert, dann empfiehlt es sich, *Erinnerungsprozesse* und deren sprachliche Übersetzungen in *Erzählungen* hervorzurufen.”

Such a way of interviewing can be characterized as “open.” Indeed, most researchers who pursue this interviewing technique take into consideration the entire life story of the individual, independent of their research questions. In other words, they believe that when we first conduct interviews, we do not restrict ourselves to certain parts or specific biographical phases of the life course. Only after we take the entire life story’s *gestalt* into account, we are able to examine individual realms or phases of a life in the context of an individual’s entire biography (Schütze 1983, Rosenthal 2004). In order to elicit autobiographical *ad-hoc* narrations (*Stegreiferzählungen*, Schütze 1976), we require a specific interview scheme. Experts of the method recommend starting the interaction situation with a preliminary conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee before the actual interview, in which the interviewer presents his or her research interest in such a way that does not affect the results. Apart from confirming data anonymity, it is particularly important to introduce the method to the interviewee because autobiographical interviews strongly differ from other forms of interviews, most of which are characterized by a question-answer structure. The interview then begins with a broadly asked initial question that serves to stimulate a comprehensive narrative on the part of the individual. When the interviewee falls into a narrative mode, the interviewer is supposed to withhold verbal interruptions while signaling an interest in the narrative by nodding and using affirmative expressions. Usually, the interviewee marks the end of his or her narrative by using finalizing phrases. Following the main narrative comes the immanent and exmanent questioning phase. The former aims to elicit further narrative sequences by asking questions that follow up with what the interviewee has already brought up, while the latter aims at assuring that those issues not mentioned by the interviewee, but which seem relevant to the inquiry, will be addressed (Schütze 1983, Przyborski/Wohlrab-Sahr 2009, Rosenthal 2004, 2014).

Interviewing Young Adults of Polish Heritage in Germany and Canada

At the start of my fieldwork, I presented my research interests to potential interviewees by saying that I was interested in the immigrant lives of persons of Polish heritage. Obviously, I did not mention that my focus would be on their experiences of (im)mobility, thus avoiding undue influence and pushing their narratives into a thematic direction that would not have been theirs. Again, autobiographical interviewing aims at uncovering topics, themes, events, and incidents, which are biographically relevant to the interviewees, independent of the focus of the research. The advantage of the method is that I learned of the absence or existence of mobility experiences at the same time as they are both in-

herent to the trajectories of my respondents. I explained to my interviewees how I would proceed during the interview, so that they knew I would listen to them rather than posing one question after the other. In order to elicit a process of narration, my initial question went as follows:

“As you know, I’m interested in your life as a person of Polish heritage living in Canada/Germany. You can tell me about everything that comes to your mind. What is important to you, is important to me. Maybe you can start by telling me about your childhood. Where were you born?”

In most cases, the initial question stimulated and encouraged my respondents to fall into a narrative mode that provided me with a longer episode of a narrative sequence. Interviewing was not always easy, particularly because some would not respond to the initial question in an “ideal-typical” way, which may have been influenced by many different factors, such as interview location, sympathies between interviewee and interviewer, establishment of trust during the interaction, current moods and individual character traits. Fortunately, difficult interviews remained the exception as most of my respondents warmed up during the “uncommon” situation of being interviewed. The interviews I did lasted from approx. 45 minutes up to 3.5 hours.

Research Design and Sampling Strategies

I conducted the study in three investigation areas in two different countries: Montreal and Toronto, Canada and Berlin, Germany. I chose metropolitan cities as the target regions because they are often important hubs for migrants. There, migrants encounter more work possibilities, social diversity, anonymity, and dense migrant networks (which can facilitate the first phase of settlement) than in provincial towns or regions. Selecting large cities as investigation sites also creates a spatial-structural comparability within the research design. Generally, migrants currently living in these areas have come across very different contexts of arrival depending on their immigration phases. Such a constellation facilitates the comparison of structural impacts and frame conditions within the different contexts and generates differentiated analyses of their impact on the experiences of (im)mobility. A comparative research design thus enables us to grasp country-based specificities and differences between the regions, it acknowledges different frame conditions and social realities, and it sheds light on the heterogeneity of migration experiences.

Herméneutique-Croisée and the Sociological Field

Being of Polish heritage myself, I already had a basic “everyday knowledge” of this group in the German context. Deciding to start my fieldwork in Canada, I followed the comparative methodology of *herméneutique-croisée* (Lehmkuhl/McFalls 2012), which is based on the epistemological principle that the gaze of an outside observer, who is (at first) unfamiliar with the research context, will open up a new dimension that allows for an uncovering of hidden histories, as the researcher views his or her field of interest through the knowledge of another context. *Herméneutique croisée* is therefore a way to create multi-perspectivity. It may elicit the process of continuous interpretation and entanglement of different contexts, discourses, and social fields (ibid.). In a specific sociological sense, *herméneutique croisée* can facilitate the identification of social mechanisms, dynamics, or patterns when applied, for instance, during fieldwork. Sociologists then observe and examine their research interest in a specific context (e.g., through biographical interviewing or ethnographical work) from a certain country/context perspective that they take on (including all social, cultural, and national specificities) through the lens of the country/context perspective of the individual (who, most often, includes specificities of the context that s/he is embedded in, in narrative form). Applying *herméneutique croisée* thus implies a constant change in perspective that enables the researcher to broaden his or her own perspective to such an extent as to uncover phenomena that would not have otherwise appeared. Accordingly, it helps to establish a comprehensive knowledge of one social context through the other.

If I can easily have access to the life-worlds of people of Polish heritage through my own experiences, what I discovered in Canada—including contextual differences between francophone Quebec on the one hand and anglophone Ontario on the other—was new to me. It allowed me to uncover hidden themes I would not have been aware of beforehand and therefore might have not regarded as relevant for the interpretation of the biographies. These include, for instance, the issue of Polish schools in Canada and the fact that attending it influences social dimensions such as language, cultural negotiations, community life as well as the ethnic self-understanding of some of my Canadian-based interviewees. Returning to Germany for fieldwork with new insights in mind, I again discovered issues and differences I was previously unaware of, e.g., language being an important issue as well, but completely different in its biographical genesis in the life stories of my German-based interviewees.

Sampling Strategies

My field studies lasted about one year. I chose to do my first explorations in Montreal (Oct. 2013—Dec. 2013) and, after a few months, I moved on to Toronto (Dec. 2013—Feb. 2014). A few weeks later, I continued in Berlin (Apr. 2014—Aug. 2014). Multi-sided ethnography (Marcus 1995) and the “mobile methods” advanced by scholars in mobility studies imply the researcher’s geographical mobility as well as the respondents. My empirical research required geographical mobility on my part. I travelled to Canada, to Montreal and Toronto, returning to Germany, but leaving my city of residence in order to be in Berlin. For the sake of the study, I gained mobility experiences myself.

Entering the field and conducting interviews followed the logic of so-called “snowballing,” which is an established method for identifying and contacting the target population (Atkinson/Flint 2001, Noy 2008). Using a snowball sampling strategy offers practical advantages, particularly with regard to this study’s explorative aim as it can produce in-depth results relatively quickly (Atkinson/Flint 2001: 2). It is a technique for finding subjects based on the idea that “[o]ne subject gives the researcher the name of another subject, who in turn provides the name of the third, and so on.” (Vogt/Johnson 2015) This strategy relies on the help of identified respondents, providing the researcher with an expandable set of potential contacts. It thus takes advantage of the respondents’ social networks; it is “*essentially social* because it both uses and activates existing social networks.” (Noy 2008: 332) Not only is “snowballing” a social procedure, but it is also a repetitive process; it usually takes time before it evolves into the metaphorical “snowball” effect.

However, I tried to sample my target population in such a way as to limit the chance of constructing an (overly) biased data set. In so doing, I used various ways to search for people and to establish an entry into the field. I mainly used three recruitment techniques. First, I established contacts who would later become my gatekeepers (among them were often professors and other researchers). Second, I attended events organized by the Polish community. And third, I disseminated research inquiries on community websites, such as those of Polish organizations, cultural associations, student associations of higher educational institutions by way of the social media platform, *Facebook*. The latter recruitment technique was a particularly successful way of reaching my target population of young adults of Polish heritage. I focused on them as I desired to reach a diverse sample, including various “migrant generations” of Polish people abroad. Targeting young adults would most likely ensure the inclusion of different generations, especially those who are commonly referred to as the first generation, generation 1.5 (Rumbaut 2012), the second and—if possible—third generation. I did

not restrict the selection of interviewees to any other pre-fixed determinants, yet one limitation of my sampling strategy, however, lies in my inability to reach those young ethnic Poles who no longer see themselves as Polish.⁴

Lessons from the Field

As pleasant as I find fieldwork to be as part of the sociologist's task, it did not come without frustrations. First of all, it felt like an eternity until the snowball procedure started to turn into an avalanche. In each investigation area, I needed to lay the foundations for "snowballing" anew, a lengthy process that certainly tested my patience. But the most challenging part was yet to come. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, it was not until fieldwork that I developed an interest in experiences of (im)mobility within migration contexts. When I first started out, I was interested in the transnational activities of young adults of Polish heritage. Yet, asking my target group to tell me their life stories, I came across many narratives in which such tendencies seemed manifest, in others it was rather latent or absent, and in yet other narrations there seemed to be a deviation of what scholars classically refer to as (migrant) transnationalism (ch. 1.2). This was a challenging moment during which I simultaneously realized that my respondents' narratives included diverse mobilities. Here I was, faced with unexpected issues that I could not immediately make sense of. In a way, this corresponds to what Robert K. Merton has brought into discourse on the sociology of knowledge as serendipity, describing an "unexpected observation which bears upon theories not in question when the research has begun [...]" (Merton 1968: 158) At the end of the day, it caused me to question and modify my initial research questions, hypotheses, and conceptualizations so as not to run the risk of "sampling on the dependent variable;" a research practice that is often critically related to studies of (migrant) transnationalism (Salazaar/Smart 2011, Østergaard-Nielsen 2012). The lessons I have learned have to do with the need for flexibility on the side of the researcher. Flexibility, as Castles points out, implies:

"[...] 'adaptability': the willingness of the researcher to respond to the lessons of the field and to hear what respondents are saying by changing the research strategy. This may well involve concluding that the original research question was not the best one, or that the starting hypothesis was mistaken." (2012: 16)

4 I also tried to sample in non-ethnic *Facebook* groups, but had little success.

Unfortunately, the need for flexibility and reflexivity on the part of the researcher during the actual research process often remains unmentioned in published empirical studies.⁵ In fact, listening to what our respondents tell us and how it shakes our initial assumptions is to see “the research as a collaborative process between you and your respondents in bringing out a part of the social world.” (Shih 2012: 571) It is the strength of qualitative research and its most challenging part, bearing as many frustrations as joys.

2.2 LEAVING THE FIELD: SAMPLE, NARRATIVES, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TYPOLOGY

Flexibility and reflexivity during fieldwork engendered an open process of collecting and assessing my data in which I combined elements of “grounded theory” (Strauss/Corbin [1990] 1996) with elements of an inductive approach. I pursued the principle of theoretical sampling, which tends to enhance and contrast inductively generated hypotheses, categories, and concepts until a theoretical saturation is reached. I subsequently left the field when I did not come across new insights; i.e., when I believed I had reached a theoretical saturation as new aspects in terms of the relevant theoretical statements did not arise anymore from the interviews (Corbin/Strauss 1990: 419).

Characteristics of the Sample

While I will discuss six life stories in-depth in this book (ch. 3, 4, 5), I was able to interview 47 young adults of Polish heritage overall. They are between 20 and 43 years old: the average age is 26.9 years. The gender division varies to a small extent: I interviewed 26 females and 21 males.⁶ I could attain a balanced gender division in Canada (13f and 14m), while I had difficulties putting together a sample of male interviewees in Germany (13f and 7m). According to distinctions of “migrant generations” commonly used in migration studies, the majority of my interviewees belongs to the category of the “generation 1.5” (Rumbaut

5 An impressive exception in transnational studies is provided by Goldring and Landolt (2014). Shih (2012) also wrote a worthwhile contribution on this issue when studying the impact of race, ethnicity, and gender on the careers of Asian immigrant engineers in Silicon Valley.

6 I use the binary construction of gender due to reasons of sensitivity related to it. There is no intention to deny other possible gender constructions such as intersex, a.o.

2012), which describes “migrants,” who were born in one country, but came of age in another. Their experiences differ from both those who migrated later as (young) adults and of those who were already born in their parents’ country of arrival. Almost 50% of the sample belongs to the “generation 1.5” while the division between the first and second generation is balanced (each at about 25%). The question of generation, however, gives interesting insights into the comparative perspective: I sampled a very small number of interviewees who belong to the first migrant generation in Canada while 50% of my interviewees in Germany belong to it, and only two interviewees belong to the second generation. Arguably, we can explain these discrepancies with the differing emigration waves from Poland into both countries. There has not been a significant wave of Polish migration to Canada in the last two decades while Poland’s entry into the European Union triggered a wave of Polish immigration into Germany (excursus in part II), and significantly to Berlin. The “second generation” living in Germany may not perceive themselves as Polish (anymore) and thus did not respond to my research inquiry. In Canada, I observed that the ethnic heritage is socially more keenly valued than in Germany. The different immigration and integration policies in both countries seem to play a role here. Interestingly, we can observe cross-country differences in terms of citizenship, too: the clear majority of my Canadian-based interviewees has dual citizenship while only less than 50% of my German-based interviewees have dual citizenship. Arguably, the status of the “migrant generation” and the attainment of dual citizenship correlate. If the recent settlers (first generation) are not likely to have dual citizenship; the restrictive German nationality law may be another explanatory factor. If they do not need another citizenship for free movement as EU-citizens, they would do so for comprehensive access to social services and suffrage.⁷ Needless to say, this sample provides a basis for comparability and theoretical saturation, but not for representativeness.

A Privileged Sample

It is widely known that the more people are educated, the more likely they are to take part in scientific studies. My respondents confirm this trend. They are (relatively) highly educated: the vast majority have a (first) university degree (B.A. or diploma), a smaller portion attained a secondary one (M.A. or Ph.D.) and the

7 For more information on the German nationality law, see the homepage of the Federal Government Commissioner for Foreign Resident Affairs in Germany: <http://www.bundesauslaenderbeauftragte.de/einbuergierung>.

minority either graduated high school or attained the German *Abitur*.⁸ The sample is privileged in other aspects too. In terms of citizenship, they all enjoy a secured legal status, in terms of race/colour they are “white,” and in terms of their socio-economic status they belong to (lower, sometimes higher) middle-class milieus. Sampling such a privileged group happened not by intention; it is rather the result of the sampling strategies and the opportunity structures that I came across in the field. Studying this group, we need to be aware of their relatively privileged conditions, but we must not mistake them as being of the “elite.”

Analyzing Biographical Narratives

There are heterogeneous forms of living post-migratory lives and the objective of this book is to shed light on them. They consist of a variety of biographical constellations. From a sociological perspective, I am interested in which constellations lead to the development of specific types of experiences, i.e., the patterns of (im)mobility. If this is the case, I wonder what kinds of patterns emerge and which social dynamics underlie the mobilities in the lives of my respondents, and whether and how they may change over time. How we, as researchers, make sense of our biographical material strongly depends on how we analyze and interpret it. This section explains how I was to handle it.

In the first step, I reorganized the biographical interviews sequentially as a way to reconstruct the “life history” as opposed to the “life story” (Rosenthal 2004) in order to produce “biographical anamnesis” (Schmeiser 1994), which are chronological descriptions of the individuals’ life courses. It was advantageous in that I became more familiar with what happened in my respondents’ lives. At the same time, this step laid the foundation for “contrasting case comparisons” (*kontrastiver Fallvergleich*, Schütze 1983) and for constructing a typology once I had an overview of how my interviewees’ lives proceeded over the years. In a second step, I made a thematic analysis. I drew on the reconstructive approach of “grounded theory” (Strauss 1987, Glaser 1978, Corbin/Strauss 1990) and by way of open, axial, and selective coding I analyzed in various stages: I first identified relevant phenomena, and then labelled and later classified them (Strauss/Corbin [1990] 1996: 44ff). The stages helped to reveal a number of phenomena, such as various kinds of mobilities (e.g., commuting, travelling and holidaying, internal and international mobility) and (periods of) immobility as well as other central social dimensions such as educational/ professional conditions and aspirations,

8 The *Abitur* is the German school examination usually taken by the end of the 12th or 13th year and equivalent to the British A level or the American SAT exam.

language (e.g., lack, acquirement, and use), (reasons for) cultural negotiations, differing self-understandings, the shape of social and familial networks, and the structural conditions that likely influence the biographical dimension as well as the individuals *ex post* reflections of (current and past) situations and prospects for their future. I further classified the descriptive concepts into more abstract categories. In the last step, I compared them with each other and with the literature (Strauss/Corbin 1998: 188f, see also Nowicka 2013: 30f). The result of my analysis was to identify three main types—which would later become the *patterns of (im)mobility*.⁹ But there was more to it than that.

In view of the new insights, I returned to the individual to analyze some selected cases in-depth to reconstruct the experiences of (im)mobility within the respondents' life stories so that I could better compare them with one another as Schütze proposed with his notion of “contrasting case comparisons.” (*kontrastiver Fallvergleich*, 1983) I first started comparing one life story with another that contrasted only minimally, until I subsequently compared cases with a maximal contrast in view of detecting similarities and differences that are theoretically relevant (Schütze 1983: 287). Not only was I able to better compare single life stories, but also to test the types.

Constructing an Empirically Grounded Typology

Having described how I analyzed the biographical interviews, I will now go into more detail about the typology as such, i.e., the *patterns of (im)mobility*. I have constructed the patterns based on all life stories, not only the six that will be discussed in the second part of this book (ch. 3, 4 and 5). The patterns abstract certain post-migration (im)mobility practices, ultimately culminating into patterned experiences which came about after an initial migration, or the migration of earlier generations, in the lives of my respondents. If the patterns of (im)mobility include various mobility practices such as travelling, commuting, or what Greenblatt called “cultural mobility” (2009), my focus lies on (*temporary-restricted*) *internal or border-crossing relocations of one's life center in the physical sense* that evolved after “immigration.” Each pattern indicates a specific type of mobility experience based on similar geographical practices, albeit the individuals' lives and biographies sometimes greatly differ.

Methodologically, my respondents' biographies are the foundation upon which the typology is built. Hence, we need to be aware that they are *not* completed (yet). *Per se*, the biographies examined in this study are active ongoing

9 Given the high amount of data I collected, I used the analysis software ATLAS.ti.

processes, whose endings are open—as opposed to, let us say, a historian’s work with biographies. They are only complete after an individual passes away. For all that, the typology does not represent a snapshot at a given point in time of the individuals’ lives, but it is constructed upon the life courses of individuals—and that is certainly only possible up until the point in time when the interviews were done. As it were, the typology is to be understood through the lens of an incomplete life course. I therefore explicitly present the typology as open-ended and subject to revision, as—to use Crowder’s words—“an invitation to dialogue rather than a final word.” (2013: 35)

The *patterns of (im)mobility* can only be typologically and analytically distinguished as such in the biographical material I have gathered. This means, in other words, that no individual biography represents one type. The patterns are “ideal types”: each always indicating a mixture of biographical experiences that cut across various individual life stories rather than completely complying with one of them—as will be illustrated by the biographical narratives in the second part of the book. Methodologically speaking, it was one of the founding fathers of sociology, Max Weber (1864-1920), who developed the notion of the ideal type. As such, the patterns are theoretical constructions (*theoretische Gedanken-bilde*) that condense certain relationships and historical events—or biographical events for this study—into one systematic complex. The ideal type is not to be mistaken with a description of reality; yet, it aims to give a means of expression to such a description. Neither is it a hypothesis; yet, it offers guidance for the construction of hypotheses (Weber 1949: 88ff). Ideal types are central for interpretative sociology, and Weber instructs us on how to construct them:

“An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct (Gedankenbild). In its conceptual purity, this mental construct (Gedankenbild) cannot be found anywhere in reality. It is a utopia.” (Weber 1949: 90)

Many (non-sociologists) find it hard to understand that an ideal type never corresponds to empirical reality, but it merely represents an “idea” (*Gedanken-ausdruck*) of the social phenomenon under scrutiny. They are neither an image of reality, nor are they to be understood as ethical imperatives: they are “ideal” not in the normative sense, but in the strictly logical sense of the term (ibid.: 92). As such, ideal types are—as Weber emphasizes—“not ends but are means to the end of understanding phenomena [...]” (ibid.: 106); means to be “used as con-

ceptual instruments for comparison with and the measurement of reality,” for that “[they] are indispensable.” (ibid.: 97) As “tools” they serve to fulfill the sociologists’ heuristic purposes.

Once constructed, ideal types, are exceptionally suited for comparison with further empirical phenomena. Certainly, this comparison will reveal—at times more or less pronounced—shortcomings of the analytical construct, for, conversely, the exact purpose of ideal types is to show *what’s missing*. Then, the ideal types generate new insights and further developments of analytical constructions. Weber reminds us in one of his own constructed ideal types—the types of legitimate domination—to keep in mind that “the idea that the whole of concrete historical reality can be exhausted in the conceptual scheme [...] is far from the author’s thoughts as anything could be.” (Weber [1921] 1978: 216) I see similarities between Weber’s notion of ideal types and the *patterns of (im)mobility* in two ways mainly: (1) both are theoretical constructions and as such they cannot be found in empirical reality—even though they are based on empirical data—and, (2) both are not designed to capture the social phenomenon in its entirety, but rather to serve as “tools” for further investigations. Unlike Weber’s own work on ideal types, the patterns do not have historical validity as they are not grounded upon historical material.

Inspired by Weber’s methodology, the patterns of (im)mobility illustrate how experiences of (im)mobility can be constructed by the sociologist, yet, they differ on how individuals assess and evaluate their own experiences. For that matter, they express the *hiatus irrationalis*; the tension between notion and reality (Endreß 2012: 56). We had better be careful, however, not to underestimate the significant role that individuals play in the Weberian types as Thériault notes: “If individuals occupy a central place in the foundations of the program of Weber’s sociology, one finds them most often in his substantive writings in the guise of the ideal type [...]” (2013: 46) As in the case of *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* ([1904/1905] 2010), Weber presents one individual, Benjamin Franklin, who “contributes to the construction of the ideal type of the ‘spirit’ of capitalism.” (Thériault 2013: 46) So too did the respondents of my study: they shared their life stories with me and contributed to the construction of the patterns of (im)mobility. That is why I decided to place the life stories of some of my respondents at the center of this book.

One thing is for sure: whether and how mobility or immobility experiences emerge and what they mean depends on the biographical experiences the individuals have during their life course and on the contextual conditions, e.g., the structural constraints or possibilities they face in *certain places* at *certain points in time* in *certain social constellations*. Although often mentioned, the patterns of

(im)mobility are merely “nude types” for now: they are not completely (theoretically) conclusive yet because they have not been brought to life through my respondents’ stories. Sharing them will be the focus of the upcoming part, but I would like to make clear on which grounds I selected which stories to present first.

Selecting Life Stories

My respondents and their stories embody the patterns of (im)mobility and that is why it is important for me not to lose sight of them in my work. I could have presented the empirical analysis, for instance, in a thematic order, yet not only would I have felt that I neglected my respondents but also I was afraid to break through the logic of how I constructed the patterns in the first place, namely upon the logic of the life course. Sharing and examining the life stories of my respondents enables me to better work out the contextual effects, which play a crucial role in the emergence, maintenance, and shifting of the patterns of (im)mobility; as we will soon see. Such a presentation also facilitates the identification of both the individual and the structural factors, and of how the individuals coped with the constraints and possibilities they encountered. The geographical political, social, and cultural contexts are extremely important for the interpretation of the life stories, their inherent (im)mobility experiences, as well as for understanding the social practices and orientations of the respondents, i.e., their agency in the overall context of their life. Only when we contextualize the interviewees’ biographical experiences, can we attempt to understand and explain their (im)mobility practices and what they mean—not least because contextualization provides comparability: within and across the patterns.

Out of 47 autobiographical-narrative interviews, I have chosen to share and discuss six of them in-depth in this book. Analyzing the biographical material, particularly the evaluation stages of coding and the “contrasting case comparisons” have helped me to select the life stories I am to present. The selected life stories are, on the one hand, *typical representations* of the distinguished (im)mobility experiences, and on the other hand, they contain *contextual specificities*, which enable me to invoke a comparison that is context-bound according to my interpretative endeavour. That is the reason why I chose to share the following life stories in this book (table 3).

Table 3: In-Depth Analyses of Life Stories

<i>Names (changed)</i>	<i>Country/ City</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Gen- der</i>	<i>Citizen- ship</i>	<i>Highest Degree</i>	<i>Profes- sion</i>
Anja	Canada (Toronto)	38	f	dual (Canadian/ Polish)	B.A. choreography	choreo- grapher
Sandra	Germany (Berlin)	31	f	dual (German/ Polish)	secondary education	parale- gal
Janusz	Germany (Berlin)	33	m	German	M.A. history	Ph.D. student
Oscar	Canada (Montreal)	29	m	dual (Canadian/ Polish)	M.A. cinematog- raphy	cinema- togra- pher
Malinka	Germany (Berlin)	34	f	dual (German/ Polish)	Diploma in psychology	job seeking
Francis	Canada (Toronto)	25	m	dual (Canadian/ Polish)	B.A. finances	realtor

Source: Own elaboration

The life stories are all *typical* for the mobilities they represent, and *specific* to the contexts in which they arose. However, we must not mistakenly try to find all characteristics of one type in one life story. Types may only be found in combining some of them. As becomes obvious in table 3, I have sought to preserve a balance in terms of gender and “countries of arrival.” For the purpose of readability, I present the interpretations of my respondents’ biographical narratives in three empirical chapters that, taken together, form the second part of the book. The chapters reflect the *patterns of (im)mobility*: *immobility* (ch. 3), *transmobility* (ch. 4), and *cosmobility* (ch. 5). By focusing on the individuals and their life stories, I hope to arouse the readers’ interest in getting to know more about some of the “flesh-and-blood individuals lurking behind these formal constructs” (Thériault 2013: 48) as it has always been my interest.

I have fully transcribed the interviews; all the following quotes are taken from these transcripts and are provided with line numbers. Of course, I changed the names of my respondents in order to keep their anonymity and the promise I have given them; indeed, some of my respondents would not have participated in my study had I not assured them anonymity. As this study integrates two countries in three regional contexts, the interviews were conducted in two different languages: English and German. In addition, many interviewees used Polish expressions during the interviews, as well as French expressions, particularly those respondents who are based in Montreal. Some of the interviewees therefore included references in four different languages in their narratives. Working with different languages when doing fieldwork is a challenge that we need to be aware of when we study migration and mobility phenomena. I have decided to translate the quotes of the interviews I have conducted in German into English for the sake of readability. I include, however, the original German quotes in footnotes as I have used the original transcripts as the basis of my interpretation of the material. If we take a look at the original German quotes, we will notice that they are in High German, even though many people living in Berlin speak the Berlin dialect. The individuals I have interviewed, however, spoke—without exception—in High German. It can be a result of a bias, induced through my presence and my use of High German, i.e., it is not unlikely that the interviewees have linguistically adapted to me. Generally, we need to be aware that this kind of intercultural research requires a huge workload and it demands a high degree of reflection, not least because the researcher not only translates from language to language but also from one culture to another.¹⁰

10 For more detailed methodological reflections about the ‘limits of understanding’ when doing intercultural research, see Mijić 2013.

Part II:
Patterns of (Im)Mobility: Reading Lives
and Interpreting
Biographical Narratives

Excursus on the Country of Origin: Poland

Poland—when appearing on European maps as a sovereign state—has long been and continues to be a country of emigration. Despite a recent influx of immigrants from East European and Asian countries, most significantly Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Vietnam (Iglicka 2001: 21, Kaluza/Mack 2010: 72), it is widely seen as an ethnically homogeneous country and society (Alscher 2008: 5). Because of its geographical location between Eastern and Western Europe, it increasingly serves as a transit country for migrants. Contrary to the assumption that Poland would become a “country of immigration” as a result of its EU membership (Iglicka 2001, Alscher 2008), it remains—in light of its current political atmosphere—a net emigration country, with an excess of people leaving the country as opposed to entering it. In the long history of Poland’s emigration, the most important countries for settlement were Germany, the United States, and Canada (Iglicka 2001: 12, Więckowski 2008: 266, Alscher 2008: 1f) and I gathered the empirical data for this study in two of them: Germany and Canada. Generally, the Polish diaspora (the so-called *Polonia*) is estimated between 15 and 18 million people worldwide (Meister 1992, Alscher 2008).

There was a time in history when Poland disappeared from the European map. After the neighbouring powers of the Russian Kingdom, the Kingdom of Prussia, and Habsburg Austria partitioned the country (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) three times in the eighteenth century, they ended the existence of the state, eliminating the sovereign crown of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania for the next 123 years. Uprisings during the nineteenth century failed and thus Poland as a state was not “reborn” until the end of World War I.¹ Until the late twentieth century, emigration took place in waves, but also in continual yearly movements, and was most often politically motivated. The end of World

1 For a historical account of Polish national movements in Prussia as a response to the policy of Germanisation, see Loew 2014: ch. 2: 31-119.

War II and the subsequent shifting of Poland's borders westwards resulted in mass displacement and forced settlement (Alscher 2008: 1). Communism, especially during the uprisings of 1956 and 1968, as well as the imposition of martial law and the ban on *Solidarność* in December 1981, triggered further waves of mass emigration out of Poland.² Last but not least, Poland's entry into the European Union in 2004 triggered another emigration wave—mainly for economic reasons—most notably into the UK, Ireland as well as Sweden (Kaluza/Mack 2010: 72). EU membership gives Polish nationals the right of free movement within the EU member states, Switzerland and Norway under the *Schengen* agreement. In fact, nearly 2 million people have left the country since then (ibid., Więckowski 2008: 266, Vargas-Silva 2012: 5). This significant recent increase of mobility is also visible in social and economic changes within Poland itself (ibid.: 261).

In the following sections, I will focus on two crucial destinations of Polish immigration: Germany and Canada. In so doing, I mainly refer to historical works; yet, there are surprisingly few works that *comprehensively* examine these two migration histories. There is, in fact, one exception: historian Peter Oliver Loew's history of Polish migration into Germany (2014), within which he expresses surprise that this kind of work has not been done before:

"A history of Poles in Germany has not been written to date. There are individual investigations of Masurians or the Ruhrpoles, Polish princesses and circulating cleaning ladies, but a more sustained investigation is still missing. This is perhaps due to problems with methodology, because both terms 'Germany' and 'Poland' are blurry and elusive, and one can also have quite heated debates about the term 'minority.'" (ibid.: 11, my translation)³

Loew sees three reasons for the lack of such crucial work. First, Polish (speaking) people living and having lived in Germany have not always considered themselves to be Polish, but as subjects of the Prussian King or as Germans. There have always been differences between the subjective belonging of Polish-

2 The "Solidarność Movement" was a union founded by Lech Wałęsa in 1980 in Gdansk which triggered the democratisation process in Poland.

3 "Eine Geschichte der Polen in Deutschland ist bis heute nicht geschrieben worden. Es gibt Einzeluntersuchungen zu Masuren oder Ruhrpolen, polnischen Prinzessinnen und pendelnden Putzfrauen, aber eine Gesamtdarstellung fehlt bislang. Vielleicht liegt dies an den methodischen Problemen. Denn sowohl der Begriff 'Deutschland' als auch der Begriff 'Polen' sind unscharf und schwer zu fassen, und auch über das Wort 'Minderheit' kann man sich trefflich streiten."

speaking persons—that they should be called Poles on the basis of linguistic, historic, or racial criteria. Second, Poles got into Germany in different ways. Some became German citizens through border demarcation as in the 1793 partition. They have also entered Germany through processes of migration such as rural-urban migration, flight, and displacement. In fact, both ways are intrinsically intertwined with the history of Polish migration to Germany:

“In many cases, [Poles] did not need to come ‘to’ Germany when they migrated, because they already lived within Prussia or on the border of the Reich [...]” (Loew 2014: 12, my translation).⁴

Third, the history of Poles in Germany is not only the history of Polish Catholics, but also of Polish Jews (ibid.: 11-14). We should thus be aware that Polish migration history to Germany is a history of wars, which makes the case between Poland and Germany unique and complex. In fact, German-Polish relations contain a difficult history that reaches back a few centuries: in Upper Silesia, for example, German-Polish bilingualism and cultural hybridity has existed there since the nineteenth century (Loew 2014: 64). For a contemporary sociological study, it is crucial to understand these long and multi-faceted historical relations.

The (Im)Migration of Borders and Humans: Polish Immigration to Germany

To start my historical overview, I focus on the migration wave which arose during industrialization, when the demand for labour in Germany grew, particularly in the industrial centers and in agriculture. From 1860 until 1914, 3.5 million people from the eastern provinces of Prussia migrated to the West of the kingdom, including many hundred thousands of Poles, most of whom came to the Prussian provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia. It was there where coal mines and steel mills developed rapidly. Most of the Poles settled around the river Ruhr; well-known as “Ruhrpoles” (*Ruhrpolen*). Estimated at about 460.000 in number, most of them settled in Recklinghausen, Herne, and Gelsenkirchen. Often half of the mines’ workforce were Polish workers and the prevailing unofficial “underground” language (*unter Tage*) was Polish (Loew 2014: 78ff, Kaluza 2002: 399, Pallaske 2001a: 10f). The Ruhrpoles lived in distinct neighbourhoods

4 “Vielfach mussten sie selbst dann, wenn sie migrierten, gar nicht ‘nach’ Deutschland kommen da sie als Polen bereits innerhalb Preußens bzw. der Reichsgrenzen lebten [...]”

where they were mostly among themselves. This eventually led to the formation of Polish associations (worker associations, singing clubs, gymnastics clubs, and so on). In fact, Polish associations experienced a boom at that time, with 875 clubs and 80.000 members and the city of Bochum became the organizational center. After 1899, however, the government reacted with increasing policies of Germanization, which, in turn, triggered nationalist movements on the part of Poles working in the mines (ibid.: 83f). Some scholars also point to the significance of Polish migration to Berlin at that time (Loew 2014: 89-94, Pallaske 2001a: 11, Meister 1992). Not only workers, but also noble Polish families were attracted by the dynamic metropolis. It is estimated that 100.000 Poles settled there. That being said, the Polish (internal) mass migration of the nineteenth and early twentieth century was predominantly a proletarian one. In Berlin, they did not live—unlike in the Ruhr valley—in enclosed workers' housing estates, but all over the city, which led to their cultural assimilation. There were significantly less associations than in the Ruhr valley (Loew 2014: 91f).

After the outbreak of World War I, several hundred thousand Poles became Prussian prisoners of war. Until the end of the war, about 500.000 “foreign Poles” were recruited and forced to work in the Prussian kingdom (ibid.: 117f). However, after the end of World War I, many Poles returned to the new Polish national territory; and those who did not were long adapted to German society. The Versailles Treaty of June 1919 granted Poland much of the historical province of Greater Poland, and many Germans who had settled there earlier left the area (ibid.: 119-123). Yet,

“[...] because of the strong mixing between the German and the Polish population, it was impossible to clearly separate them by a demarcation, so that large minorities continued to live on both sides of the border.” (Loew 2014: 123, my translation)⁵

After the borders of both countries were ultimately drawn in mid-1922, the non-aggression pact between Germany and Poland of 1934 brought about only a temporal relaxation. The outbreak of World War II marked the most tragic chapter in the long history of Poles in Germany, as Loew writes:

5 “[...] Da es aufgrund der starken Vermischung von deutscher und polnischer Bevölkerung aber unmöglich war, sie durch eine Grenzziehung klar voneinander zu trennen, blieben auf beiden Seiten der Grenze größere Minderheiten bestehen.”

“Since the Third Reich annexed large parts of the eastern neighbouring country, millions of Poles became disenfranchised residents of a criminal state—if they were not expelled, deported or murdered beforehand.” (2014: 163, my translation)⁶

While one million Christian Poles from the annexed regions were sent to forced labour, some two or three million of the Jewish population in Poland was largely exterminated during the Holocaust, along with millions of other European Jews. Besides, tens of thousands of (non-Jewish) Polish people were killed by the Nazi Regime. They were mostly members of the intelligentsia: politicians, priests, teachers, members of liberal professions. Other Poles, categorized as “non-Germanizable” (*nicht-eindeutschungsfähig*) were systematically deported; others were “re-Germanized” (*wiedereingedeutscht*) based on the famous German People’s List (*Deutsche Volksliste*) to be recruited for the army while Polish children were taken away from their parents to be Germanized (Loew 2014: 165-173).

The end of the cruel war, however, did not mean the end of Polish presence in Germany: “In the decades to come, people from Poland almost constantly migrated into both German states—displaced persons, ethnic Germans, asylum seekers, workers and intellectuals.” (ibid.: 192)⁷ Immediately after World War II, there were many displaced persons: forced labourers, freed inmates from the concentration camps, prisoners of war, soldiers of the Allied armies, among them were approximately 1.7 million Polish people. Some returned to Poland based on the so-called “repatriation” process while some remained in Germany because they either had no one to return to or Communist Poland did not appear as a good political alternative for them. Others moved on, for instance, to Canada (ibid.: 194-197, Ruchniewicz 2001: 64). After the war, Germans were expelled from Upper Silesia and other former eastern territories. The Polish government considered the Polish-speaking population as “autochthones.” While they all officially became Polish citizens, “[i]n reality, both the Polish authorities

6 “Da das Dritte Reich große Teile des östlichen Nachbarlandes annektierte, wurden Millionen von Polen, bevor sie teilweise vertrieben, verschleppt oder ermordet wurden, zu entrechteten Einwohnern eines verbrecherischen Staates.”

7 “Fast pausenlos wanderten in den Jahrzehnten danach Menschen aus Polen in die beiden Deutschen Staaten—Vertriebene, Aussiedler und Asylbewerber, Arbeiter und Intellektuelle.”

and the Polish population, who settled in these regions, did not regard the ‘autochthones’ as ‘fully-fledged’ Poles.” (Kaluza 2002: 701, my translation)⁸

The re-introduction of citizenship in West Germany based on the principle of *ius sanguinis* (blood descent) and the category of the German “belonging to the people” (*Volkszugehörigkeit*) was a reaction to the post-war situation, aimed at maintaining access to German citizenship for German refugees from Poland and other Eastern European countries. Ethnic Germans were defined as “members of the people” (*Volkszugehörige*) affected by a “fate of expulsion” (*Vertreibungsschicksal*) as a consequence of the Third Reich and the war, so that laws were enacted in 1953 and in 1955 that categorized ethnic Germans as *Volkszugehörige*, even if they lived outside the borders of the territory of the 1937 German state. This way, the government secured access to German citizenship for ethnic Germans (Bommes 2012b: 45f). Mistrust and discrimination against German minorities in Poland triggered the first migration wave of ethnic Germans into Germany in 1956 and 1957, among them were many people with a “double identity” and who were taught both languages. After this wave, immigration from Poland into Germany decreased up until the end of the 1960s.

In the early 1970s, when Poland’s government allowed trips abroad for individuals, immigration to Germany increased again. Furthermore, the Polish-German agreement of 1970 and 1975 about family reunification, the existing practice of recognizing Polish nationals as ethnic Germans and the worsening economic situation in Poland lead to a mass immigration: between the 1980s and the 1990s, approximately one million Polish nationals settled in Germany (Kaluza 2002: 101). In view of these high numbers and a subsequent rise of xenophobia in Germany, the German state promptly reacted by introducing control measures. A newly introduced legal status of “late resettler” (*Spätaussiedler*) restricted access to persons born before 1. January 1993. Persons falling under this category needed to prove that they had either been affected by expulsion themselves or were descendants of such families. Since then, few have managed to obtain *Spätaussiedler* status, thus a large number of Polish people immigrated as “foreigners,” i.e., refugees. However, both streams implied a heavy reduction of their social rights in Germany (Bommes 2012b: 50).

The year 1989 marked an important turning point in the migratory movements not only between Poland and Germany, but also for the East-West migration in general. Most of the migrants of the 1980s from Poland ultimately settled

8 “In Wirklichkeit betrachteten sowohl die polnischen Behörden als auch die polnische Bevölkerung, die sich in diesen Regionen niedergelassen hatte, die ‘Autochthonen’ als nicht ‘vollwertige Polen.’”

in Germany as far as they were (legally) able to (Pallaske 2001b: 124). Since the 1990s, however, legal migration options were limited to internationally agreed upon, temporary work programs, so that migrants to Germany became contract and seasonal workers, continually changing their residence between Poland and Germany. This form of migration is known as so-called “circular migration” (*Pendelmigration*, Morokvasic 1994, Cyrus 1994, Miera 1997, Palenga-Möllennebeck 2014). The German turnaround (*die Wende*) seemed impossible until 1989, so that leaving the country was not associated with the possibility of return. The structural conditions responsible for these motivations changed completely in the 1990s, when the transformation and democratization process of Poland started, the economy took an upward turn and the borders simultaneously opened (Kaluza 2002: 702, Pallaske 2001b: 125).

The last migration wave—up until today—is politically linked to the EU-enlargement. As the opening up of the labour market for Poles and other inhabitants of East-Central Europe loomed large, a heated debate about the (feared) influx of people came about in Germany. It was mainly the underprivileged and their interest groups who feared losing jobs to low-skilled migrant workers. These fears existed particularly in the structurally weak regions in Eastern Germany: there, at the border between two states (a border with one of the largest wealth gaps across Europe) political actors wanted to make capital out of this specific socio-economic situation. Right-wing parties, such as the NPD (*National Democratic Party of Germany*), repeatedly tried—and not without success—to win votes with anti-Polish slogans. This was the background for the German government to negotiate restrictions on establishment (*Niederlassungsbeschränkungen*) for Polish people, valid for seven years from May 2004 until May 2011 (Loew 2014: 234, Kaluza/Mack 2010: 72, Alscher 2008: 2). The restriction had a crucial effect: countries like the UK, Ireland, and Sweden became popular destinations of the migratory movements of Poles. However, the restriction period passed and, as the annual report of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (*Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge*) of 2014 indicates, Polish people also used the possibility of free movement into Germany: the migration balance indicates 73.060 Polish people, which is the second biggest group (after Romanians) to come to Germany under the regulations of Schengen (Schmidt/Grimmeiß 2015: 11). Poland’s poor economic situation is behind this migration wave. When Poland entered the EU, unemployment was high: 20% of the population was unemployed in 2004. This situation was worse for young adults under 25 years. There the unemployment rate lay at 25%. Still today, when people find jobs, their incomes are low. In some literatures, these young people are referred to as belonging to the so-called “generation nothing”: quite

well-educated young people, who cannot access the labour market or whose material claims do not match the social reality in Poland. In order not to be materially dependent on their parents, young adults widely chose the possibility of migration (Kaluza/Mack 2010: 72).

Many scholars state that people of Polish heritage in Germany are thought to be “invisible,” despite their large numbers (Loew 2014; Kaluza/Mack 2010, Pallaske 2001a, a.o.). Because many of them were granted German citizenship quickly, they were thus able to integrate into the labour market and adopt the language and culture; a means of protection against the majority populations’ negative attitude toward them. Ethnic Germans in particular were faced with a big pressure to assimilate due to their admission of belonging to the German people; the very precondition for their legal status. Therefore, it is not surprising that a “Polish community” is weakly developed in Germany. In fact—as Pallaske writes—there are no Polish organizations that can be considered an effective interest group (2001b: 133). Neither is there a considerable territorial concentration of Poles, nor a considerable number of Polish restaurants, bars, grocery stores, or sport clubs. According to Kaluza, one can find “Poles recognizable as Poles in Germany only in Polish mass, held in many Catholic Churches.” (2002: 708, my translation)⁹ Nevertheless, we can find people, whose language, identity, or heritage is Polish, in each federal state, and certainly, without exception, in all German cities (Loew 2014: 235). The migration waves of the 1980s until the 1990s and beyond significantly frame the historical and political context of this study. These migration waves are, in turn, an outcome of those past historical events that I have delineated in this section.

A Piece of the Multicultural Mosaic: Polish Immigration to Canada

It is widely known that Canada is multicultural. In fact, over 200 ethno-cultural groups settled all over the country, including many people of Polish origin. Polish settlement in Canada has a long history, though data and literatures are rare and often outdated. Historians were able to trace the presence of Poles in Canada back to at least 200 years (Kogler 1968). Dominik Marcz is reputed to be the first Polish immigrant to what is now called Canada. After he travelled to Montreal in 1752 as a fur merchant, he subsequently decided to settle there. However, it was not until the mid-nineteenth century that Canada experienced a marked influx of immigrants arriving from Poland (Library and Archives Canada 2015).

9 “Erkennbar werden Polen als Polen in Deutschland nur bei polnischen Gottesdiensten, die in vielen katholischen Kirchen gehalten werden.”

Most literatures on Polish immigration to Canada recognize three distinctive immigration waves (Kogler 1968, Avery/Fedorowicz 1982); yet, “newer” editions point to the importance of another wave, namely the Polish immigration to Canada during Communist times (Makowski 1987).

The first wave of Polish immigration to Canada began in the mid-nineteenth century and peaked just before 1914. It largely consisted of impoverished peasants, so-called Kashubes from northern Poland (Zurakowska 1991). Various steamship and railway companies recruited these immigrants and many of them settled in the town of Wilno, Ontario, which is now recognized as the oldest Polish settlement (Kogler 1968, Makowski 1987, Avery/Fedorowicz 1982). World War I interrupted this immigration wave. The second one, however, occurred after World War I, when Poland had to face many challenges, such as political confrontation, a ministerial crisis and an assassination. The government was therefore more disposed toward continuing emigration. It was at that time that the Canadian railway and labour-intensive sectors, including various corporations, demanded cheap European labour. The Canadian government temporarily removed immigration restrictions and consequently many Polish emigrants entered Canada. Again, the Great Depression and the outbreak of World War II interrupted the second immigration wave, but the next one was to follow soon after. Scholars situate the third wave of Polish immigration to Canada during and after World War II. This wave consisted mostly of military men, professionals, and the intelligentsia (Avery/Fedorowicz 1982, Makowski 1987, Zurakowska 1991). While their motives to immigrate into Canada were primarily political, Canada’s military efforts created a manpower shortage in industrial and agricultural sectors, which promoted a more favourable climate for the entry of refugees from Poland. In the aftermath of World War II, Canada admitted entry for family reunifications as well as to a number of displaced persons. As already indicated, the country also recorded an increase in Polish immigration during the economic difficulties and political tensions of Communist Poland (Avery/Fedorowicz 1982: 13). In response to the martial law imposed by the military junta in Poland in 1981, the Canadian government allowed Poles to enter Canada as refugees. Those who entered were rather young and well-educated (Makowski 1987: 271). The third wave of Polish immigration, during and after World War II as well as the increased immigration during Communist Poland frame the context of this study as most of the Canadian-based interviewees or their parents and grandparents entered Canada under these specific historical conditions. Therefore, the present chapter serves as the historical and political background for the biographical narratives of my respondents and their interpretation

We have seen that the relationship between Poland and Canada is fundamentally different from the relationship between Poland and Germany. Although Canada's admission of Polish immigrants has also been politically motivated, policy has primarily been economically driven. While we can say that the immigration of Polish people to Canada is the result of a rather typical market-driven migration policy, immigration into Germany is far more complex as a result of various geo-political, economic and compensational factors. The crucial difference is—and this is the reason why the section on Canada is relatively short—that Canada was and is not geo-politically involved with Poland—unlike Germany, whose history of having Polish people within the territory characterizes its citizenship policies. These different histories still frame the social realities for Polish immigrants in today's world, as we are about to see in the upcoming chapters.

A Note on my Respondents' Life Stories

In this part of the book, I share some of my respondents' life stories by presenting my interpretations of the biographical narratives of Anja, Sandra, Janusz, Oscar, Malinka, and Francis. They are ordered not according to the cities/countries in which they live but toward upward mobilities, depicting the life stories of less mobile respondents first and continuing with the more mobile ones. Such a way of sequencing simultaneously indicates minimal and maximal contrasts both within and across the patterns. Generally, the aim of the analysis is twofold. First, I set out to illustrate the *diversity of geographical movements* of respondents: the young adults commonly referred to as "migrants." I focus on how these movements emerge in their life courses and how they lend meaning to them. Second, I aim to point out the *shifting of mobility patterns* throughout life courses. Since biographical constellations, motivations, and the meanings that the individuals confer on their mobilities may change over time, so can the (im)mobility practices change in the course of individuals' lives. There are always phases of immobility, even for individuals who are highly mobile, thus illustrating the dialectic of immobility and mobility (Urry 2007, Hannam et al. 2006, Adey 2006).

Analyzing my respondents' life stories means interpreting their narratives. How my respondents narrate their lives sheds light on how they confer meaning to their experiences of (im)mobility. Thus, I am looking to detect the discourses they provide me with. What are the discourses that reflect the experience in the type of immobility after migration? What are the discourses that reflect more mobile experiences as the patterns of transmobility and cosmobility suggest? How do respondents give meaning to their own lives, particularly with respect to their mobilities? I will address all these questions in chapters 3, 4, and 5. But before going into an in-depth analysis, I will outline the principle underlying my interpretations. I ordered the analyses according to the flow of life, which I see as the anchor of my reading of these life stories, meaning that my explorations of

them most often follows a life chronology (and not the narration chronology) for the simple reason that we can better understand how (im)mobility experiences develop, how they are maintained, or how they shift over time. I interpret and subsequently present the life stories by examining important biographical constellations in interplay with theoretical (and political) positions in migration studies. I refer to various approaches and I use them as analytical potential by intertwining etic and emic perspectives (Pike 1967, Harris 1976, a.o.) in my readings of the life stories. My interpretations of the life courses are also entangled with elements of my respondents' post hoc reflections, in which significant life phases are organized according to themes. We shall see that there are various themes that run through all the life stories and substantially account for various experiences of post-migration (im)mobility. Then again, there are other themes that stand out only in individual biographies. In each case, it is crucial to contextualize the biographical experiences, which I will work out in form of vignettes. They arise out of the life stories themselves and only make sense within the particular story. Contextualization in form of vignettes constitutes one part of the interpretation as they not only serve to deepen our understanding of the individual story, but they also open up comparative perspectives—within and across the patterns. As such, my study provides less a “traditional country-comparison” than a comparison through contextualization taking into account the life circumstances, practices and experiences, own reflections and interpretations of the individuals, used where they are deemed necessary in the analysis. Scholars in the field of mobility studies call for contextualization because (im)mobility entails different meanings in different contexts. (Im)mobility as a social phenomenon is constructed and needs to be interpreted through the meaning the individuals give to their own movements, but also through meanings that are generated and normalized through and in specific contexts (Adey 2006, Cresswell 2006).

3 Immobility:

The Immobile Pattern of Mobility

The three narratives I will analyze in this section serve as illustrations of the social phenomenon of the pattern of immobility. I understand immobility as sedentariness after migration. The life stories will instruct us as to the ways in which individuals are immobile during their life courses and will inform us of those biographical constellations and experiences that led to this immobility. As for any kind of social phenomenon, the post-migration experiences of immobility are not homogeneous. In my respondents' stories immobility appears in various forms. I will analyze the narratives of Anja, Sandra and Janusz. In doing so, I will provide various interpretations of these stories, which all tell us something about the construction of immobility experiences in their post-migratory lives.

We shall see what kinds of discourses dominate their narratives and the kinds of sociological insights they provide. The discourses and experiences, inherent in my respondents' narratives, can only be adequately understood when we contextualize them. Anja's case includes the typical features of living a sedentary life after migration, yet it is at the same time exceptional for the way she negotiates her heritage and host cultures, and this can only be understood in the Canadian context of Toronto. Sandra's life story is absolutely typical for the German context; it is therefore all the more important to analyze her narrative in-depth as many other life stories are certainly similar (yet not the same)—even if her biography includes particularities that, again, we could not make sense of if we had not taken the German context into consideration. The last case to be discussed in this chapter is (one part) of the life story of Janusz. His life story is important because his mobility practices change over time, making him shift from one pattern to another and thus analyzing his life story sheds light on two mobility practices.

As a result, we will see what significant role the context plays: the respondents incorporate the national discourses of their (host) countries with its subse-

quent stances on immigration policies. By the same token, we will learn which *limitations* can come into being from these *nationally tainted discourses*.

3.1 ANJA: “THE ONE WHO TALKS ABOUT MULTICULTURALISM BUT PRACTICES ASSIMILATION”

Anja lives and works in Toronto, and she had strong reservations about doing an interview with me. I got in contact with her through my gatekeeper who first got me in touch with Anja’s father. Her father invited me to a dance performance in which his daughter was professionally involved. His idea was to introduce us first, so that she could get to know me and see if she would agree to be interviewed for my study. Anja asked me about my study and my motivations; more specifically, she was interested in what I would be trying to prove, what my results would be. Surprised by such a bold question, I answered honestly that I would not be able to say as I did not know yet where my research would guide me. She was not happy with this answer and had already had negative experiences with journalists writing about her. It was then that it occurred to me that she might not be an unknown figure in her profession. I do, of course, understand these concerns, yet I could not help but point out that the work of a sociologist significantly differs from that of a journalist. I explained to her about the concept of autobiographical interviews, the kind of interviews I conduct for my study, emphasizing the fact that what she was willing to give me was up to her. Moreover, I pointed out that I follow strict ethical standards that oblige me to protect the privacy of my interviewees. I would, however, understand if she was not feeling comfortable and would respect her decision to decline the interview if need be. She proposed to keep in touch with me via e-mail.

After I got in touch with her a few days later, she expressed concern about how I planned to use my data. She asked me if I would provide an agreement letter that outlined in advance the questions I would be asking. She also wanted assurance of “a process that deals with interpretation of facts in the event of public use of name/image.” (Mail from Anja/ 22 January, 2014) Again, I reassured her—this time in writing—that the data I gathered would be kept anonymous. It would neither be given to third parties, nor would there be public use of her name, her image, or her voice; but that “if I needed to quote something from the interview, the quotation would appear in writing and under a changed name.” (Mail to Anja/ 23 January, 2014) She did not get back to me for a while. Annoyed and yet still curious, I wondered if it was worth the effort. However, I de-

cided to approach her one last time to arrange an interview. This time she agreed. I interviewed her on 28 January, 2014 in a café in downtown Toronto. The interview lasted one hour and seventeen minutes. Anja was thirty-eight years old when I interviewed her. The comparatively short interview indicates that it was a difficult one as she did not easily fall into a narrative mode, so that I had to ask more questions to keep the interview going. But I was not left disappointed as she indeed gave me something to work with as we shall see in the following analysis.

Anja's narration is less a detailed recap of her life course than a subliminal discourse about the construction of contrasting imaginaries of her country of origin and her country of arrival. The imaginaries she creates are a reflection of her sense of belonging. Anja's narration therefore centers on the question of how she identifies with her heritage culture on the one hand, and with the multicultural Canadian society on the other hand. As a result, we shall see how these processes are influenced by her experiences in both countries, and how they impact her self-understanding in such a way that she has become estranged from one culture. Individuals not only celebrate or appreciate cultural experiences in various contexts, but it is also common that they evolve to prefer one over the other. This preference, however, is inconsistent with Anja's mobility experiences.

Sense of (no) Belonging? Aversive Discourses and Dark Imaginaries of Poland

The interview with Anja was difficult. Not only because she has picked a café that is overly loud and crowded—so that we had little privacy—but also because she did not really let herself in for the experience of an autobiographical interview. Anja spoke in English and gave short responses to my questions. It seemed almost impossible to draw her into a mode of narration (Rosenthal 2014). Her lack of (sharing her) memory relating to the experiences she had back in Poland is particularly striking; those memories of the time *before the immigration to Canada*. I did not come to know much about this time, except that she grew up in an artistic family (l.17ff) and that she attended school there for three years (ll.23-27). It was at this point of the interview when Anja, resisting my attempts to ask about her life in chronological order, says: “You know what, Poland is just an ugly dark place.” (l.27) She elaborates:

“Warsaw especially. They modernized the whole country, but left out Warsaw. I mean, it looks pretty in the summer. For sure it is a great place [laughter]. Warsaw is a place full of dogs and they pee everywhere. That is also a great place to be.” (II.31ff)

Anja specifies that she means Warsaw when she refers to Poland. At the same time, however, she makes it clear that Warsaw differs from the rest of the country. She creates an image of Warsaw that is “not modern” and where “dogs pee everywhere.” By using irony, she emphasizes that Warsaw is *not* a great place to be—at least not for her. In fact, most people would be repelled by such a description. Yet, it is the place where (parts of) Anja’s family come from and where she lived for the first nine years of her life (II.2,17,116). She reminds me to keep in mind that: “[...] by Poland I mean Warsaw, I mean that by Poland. I should be very clear ’cause I really don’t like that place.” (II.81f) The imaginary Anja constructs of Poland is therefore an imaginary of Warsaw. She explains why Warsaw is such a “hard place” (I.44) to be:

“[...] people are bitter. Not all of them and I mean, it is like the belly button of war, right? [...] it’s just a graveyard and you are walking on bones. Every street corner had like one shot there or whatever.” (II.37ff)

Anja observed that people are bitter there, which she attributes to the country’s history, referring to the historical events of both World Wars. Particularly World War II nearly completely destroyed the city of Warsaw. Several hundred thousand people lost their lives in the Warsaw Uprising in 1944. In Communist Poland, however, Warsaw was also a central place where people would gather to protest against the government and where a few people were killed, but more often they were violently taken into custody. For Anja, it is “impossible not be aware” (I.48) of these events. As she knows from her Polish grandparents, people would speak about it all the time. They would watch documentaries, celebrate different victories, commission statues on so forth (II.49ff). Accordingly, the outcome of this is “basically [...] a cycle of war.” (I.51) She does not see a lot of hope: “I think if you’d go to a place where there is almost no hope, Poland would be that place. I think now it’s different, but at that time it was like that.” (II.75ff) Anja rejects Poland as she remembers it being a hopeless place at that time she left; yet she acknowledges the possibility for it to have changed over time. Nevertheless, she also points out that: “It’s just there are really depressed people and mothers and everybody over twenty eats fat and ugly [laughter].” (II.77f) Anja considers people in Poland to be depressed—something that has apparently not changed. She refuses certain aspects of Polish culture like the eat-

ing habits, which she assumes to be the same for everyone over the age of twenty. What is more, she thinks of Polish people as being generally too loud (l.364) and—according to her sensibility—they are also too harsh and too rude (l.378f).

Anja constructs the imaginary of Poland as follows: she mixes visions of Poland's historical past, infused by wars and conflict, with subjective ideas about what she thinks current Polish society and culture is. The ideas about current Polish society are partly based on her own experiences: not only did she spend a year abroad there as a seventeen-year-old (ll.222f), but she also undertakes regular visits every three or four years (l.468). While Anja did not experience the two World Wars herself, she was nonetheless born and raised in a difficult time in Polish history. The Communist regime suppressed the population and deprived them of their civil rights. Anja probably remembers something from her childhood in Communism, although she does not share any specifics. In addition, her historical vision of Poland is, in part, also based on general historical knowledge and the stories told to her by her grandparents and parents, creating a sense of "collective memory." (Halbwachs 1950) Anja believes that Poland's history and her idea of current Polish society both show that in Polish culture "there is a lot of definition of 'us' vs. 'them.'" (l.104) History lessons in Polish schools "brainwash" the students, stressing the image of "the evil Germans, the evil Russians, the evil West." (l.106) Anja sharply criticizes the nation's lack of reflexivity about the part they have played in past wars and conflicts. To use her own words:

"But when you go to other schools, what do you have? The evil Polish people, who raped their grandmothers. You know, the evil Polish people who had the concentration camps and did betray this many people on race levels." (ll.107ff)

According to Anja, school children are given a limited understanding of Poland's role in World War II. She underlines the shared responsibility of the Polish nation in the Holocaust and does not credit many Polish people as possessing such views. For her, it is a black and white and highly nationalistic culture (l.110). She rejects such a model for herself:

"I especially don't appreciate people create [a] nationalistic point of view to define themselves, so I feel like I have a strong connection to the idea of being a Slavic person [...] 'cause we come from the same ethnic cultural origin. And you don't need these stupid borders in there. You are creating wars actually [...]." (ll.87-95)

She distances herself from Poland as her country of origin. She does not see herself as being Polish, proposing instead another frame of reference to describe her cultural heritage as a “Slavic person.” She refuses a nationalistic stance or even the concept of the nation state itself. She sees the fight over territories as needless though costly. Poland’s history is characterized by shifting territorial borders, which are strongly linked to the two World Wars. Anja’s sense of identity is broader, one that may be described as a form of “pan-slavism.” (Lüdke 2012, Karl/Skodos 2013)

Pan-Slavism

Pan-ideologies generally aim to unify members of the same ethnicity, religion, or language group, regardless of single nationalities. These ideologies were most prominent in the nineteenth and twentieth century. They generally reject the nation-state, which, historically, gave rise to imperialist discourses, particularly in the case of pan-slavism (Lüdke 2012). By now, pan-ideologies and movements have essentially disappeared from the political scene due to the dominance of the nation-state “as the most prominent unit of the international community.” (Lüdke 2012: 1) Therefore, the concept of “pan-slavism” is scarcely of any importance in current political thinking.

For Anja, however, this similar frame of reference is central to her self-understanding: “I think I am starting more and more to identify as a Slavic person. In fact, I might even delete Polish from my bio.” (ll.125f) She clearly refuses to identify as Polish as she rejects the culture on every level (l.422) thinking even of erasing this information from her CV. In Anja’s opinion, Poland and “being Polish” is too strongly associated with wars and fights for borders (l.128ff), yet she fails to see the paradox that comes with pan-slavism: as history has taught us, territorial policy based on a pan-slavistic ideology is liable to trigger exactly what she opposes: conflicts and wars. Clearly, Anja has a negative attitude toward Poland. She describes Poland as an “ugly dark place,” on account of cruel historical events and cultural features that she rejects. One thing is clear: Poland’s history is still deeply felt by Anja, who resists belonging to this place and its culture. She, indeed, may have developed an aversion toward her heritage, but she cannot *really* delete her heritage from her biography. Whether she agrees or not, her past is a part of her biography. The “ghost of the past” follows her; it shapes her previous and current experiences and attitudes, her aversion toward Poland but also her celebration of Canada, as we will see in the upcoming section.

Assimilationist Behaviour in a Multicultural Context

Anja opens up more when it comes to her impressions and experiences in Canada. She presents the reason for the immigration as inevitable:

“Poland being the dark place that we talked about, it was impossible to live there, so my dad had to flee. He decided to flee and after three years he brought me and my mother.” (ll.66ff)

The immigration from Warsaw to Toronto (ll.2) began with Anja’s father’s departure. During a brief discussion with him, he told me that he was a “state enemy” back in Communist Poland as he had some dissident attitudes, which indeed may explain his escape. We can assume that as a dissident, her father, might have faced persecution, and perhaps even arrest and mistreatment on the part of the Communist regime. After a time, Anja and her mother followed Anja’s father to Canada. The reasons for the three-year gap are not clear. In Anja’s version of the events Poland is a dark place that needed to be left behind. Her father is the central figure in their leaving and Anja gives the impression that he has the same image of Poland as she: “The great news is that [my parents] are also pretty much rejecting [the Polish culture] [laughter]. So, yes, my dad, he just hates everything [unintelligible, A/N], he is rejecting it so I am happy to hear that.” (l.433) This revelation is not surprising given her father’s experiences as a “state enemy” but it is also valuable in that it opens up an interpretational perspective: Anja’s reasons for rejecting her heritage culture may be based on political and ideological reasons, a way of demonstrating loyalty to her father. Interestingly, she does not talk a lot about her mother. She briefly describes her mother as a difficult person, who inspires her in the following way: “She inspired me to be exactly the opposite of that. She inspired me really well [laughter] [9sec]. She is a great mother [laughter]. She does teach me to not be her [laughter].” (ll.434ff) The relationship between Anja and her mother seems to be conflictual. Yet, Anja gives no further comment on this matter. In view of the immigration, Anja first depicts her father’s escape as inevitable, but she then mentions that it was, in fact, a *decision* her father made. She is convinced that immigration to Canada was a necessary step.

Obviously, the immigration is an event of major biographical relevance to Anja. She remembers arriving in Toronto during winter time. She was impressed by the snow: “[...] it was really cold when I moved. We have snowy winters. Snow like over where the cars are, so you walk in these tunnels. It was amazing, actually.” (l.152ff) Anja’s first impressions of Canada are positive. She empha-

sizes the climate differences in her narrative, and immediately articulates her belonging to the (host) country Canada through her use of the personal pronoun “we.” As for her experiences in school, Anja recalls, it was a multiethnic school, to which many children of immigrants went. There were students of 52 nationalities (ll.155f); a reality Anja was not used to: “[...] it was really good, because I never thought it was abnormal. It was different, but it was not abnormal.” (ll.159f) Though different from her experience in Poland, she does not perceive the multiethnic composition of the school’s student body to be in any way undesirable or dysfunctional. Toronto is Canada’s biggest city and, according to Saskia Sassen can be understood as part of a “global city” (2005) as well. A “global city” is an important node of localization, which is characterized by transnational interlinkages of industrial production and services, trade and finance. As a global economic center, it is significantly attractive to many foreign newcomers. Anja’s experiences in school is one consequence of a “global city,” which culminates into a “super-diversity” (Vertovec 2007) or an “increasing diversity of diversities” (Pries 2015b) of the society in general or—as in the present empirical case—of the residents of a particular local space. The “super-diverse” social formation of the student body of Anja’s school divided into smaller groups: “[...] and then, there were all these cliques that start to formulate based on nationality.” (l.160f) Effectively, the super-diversity decreases in view of everyday experiences in school when interactions are predominantly made between students of the same ethnic or cultural origin. Accordingly, Anja had many Polish friends, and yet she already felt an aversion to Poland and Polish culture:

“I think they clung to me, because I don’t remember to pursue them; the Polish group. [...] You know, they were like: ‘Oh, you’re Polish, blah blah blah.’ So, it was something like that, but it was not me going to them.” (ll.189ff)

Anja describes how the Polish students approached her, insisting on the fact that it was not the other way around. On the one hand, she admits to being part of the Polish group at school. On the other hand, she simultaneously distances herself from this group. In her view, there is a relevant disadvantage to only be in touch with persons of the same heritage in a multicultural environment:

“[...] if you are always being with Polish people, so they-they don’t have to learn English. I was always kind of in and out of them, so I learned English very well, better than all my peers. So, I don’t have an accent now. My peers do. And I worked really hard not to.” (ll.161-164)

Here, Anja points to a clear difference between her and other Polish people, who would not see the need to acquire English. She points out that her English language skills are better than those of her peers as she worked hard to not have an accent while speaking. In a multicultural society like Canada, integration is a relevant topic (ch. 1.1). In that sense, it is important to be fluent in (at least) one of Canada's official languages; and as a matter of fact, in Toronto, English is more commonly used than French. For Anja, it was not enough to speak the language, which would prove her linguistic integration. She was rather eager to speak English flawlessly or, in other words, without an accent. Her stance on language acquirement is, in a way, rather assimilationist. Generally, language serves as a "marker of difference" as the language accent may indicate where the cultural origin of people lies. She intentionally "worked really hard" for that not to happen. Therefore, Anja tries to hide her Polish cultural origin on a linguistic level. Her accent-free proficiency distinguishes her from her Polish friends. Admittedly, Anja concedes that an immigration and incorporation experience requires time and effort:

"Immigration is always hard. I think it takes people three years before they start to adjust. It always takes three years minimum unless this person has really moved a lot and that has affected their capability to adapt more quickly [...]" (ll.150ff)

As mentioned above, Anja assesses her families' immigration to Canada as positive, even necessary. Yet, she indicates that there are challenges that come with it. She suggests that it takes people three years to adapt to a new life unless the people concerned are more mobile than what she identifies as the norm. At first glance, Anja's estimated time frame seems arbitrary, but I assume that it is based on her own experiences, or even on the experiences of her father, for whom it took three years to reunite with his family in Canada. Once settled in Toronto, Anja did what most young people do. She attended school, met with friends, and pursued hobbies in her leisure time. Yet, her educational pathway was not so ordinary. Strikingly, Anja changed high schools six times altogether after immigrating to Canada (ll.213). She left the first high school after two years, and then again, after just half a year followed by a mobility experience in Poland (ll.216-221)—a life event I will discuss in detail later on. After returning to Canada, Anja switched high schools three other times:

"When I came back to Canada [...] I went to three other high schools, which was really fun. Actually, I am glad I did that. I think I would always recommend going from high school to high school. It was a very useful experience. It was almost like immigration. It

was a shocker once, but when you continue putting yourself out there, especially when you are younger, it makes you feel less vulnerable in a way.” (ll.235-239)

Anja does not mention what biographical circumstances led her to switch high schools so often. However, she evaluates these developments as positive because they encouraged her “to put herself out there”, to take risks in order to go further and become a stronger person, in spite of the inconveniences. She uses her “high-school mobility” as an analogy for her experience of immigration. A consequence of this was Anja’s making friends beyond the Polish group: “I went to six different high schools, so I have lots of experience [...] with different groups. [...] In the first high school, I had my Polish friends but after that, that was it.” (ll.213-215) Anja’s current social circle barely contains persons of Polish heritage (l.417). The multicultural context of Toronto enables her to have social relationships with persons of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

Canada’s multiculturalism plays a decisive role in Anja’s discourse about her country of arrival, and therefore it also contributes to how she constructs her belonging to it. She describes society in Canada as different (l.263) from society in Poland; more westernized and multicultural (l.366). The multiculturalist way of living not only takes shape through the “super-diverse” composition of Canada’s citizens, but also takes into account “the other”:

“A lot of that has to do with ‘the other’ like there is a lot of mindfulness about what that could be. [...] It is always that consideration for the other point of view [...] It’s definitely present much more here as anywhere else in the world [5sec] and I find that actually really amazing.” (ll.388-393)

In a multicultural society, the social interactions, habitual practices, and gestures of people in daily life are shaped by a shared desire to reconcile different points of view. Anja sees this as a guiding principle of “everyday multiculturalism,” which she appreciates very much. As an example of how to take “the other” point of view into consideration, Anja explains how people in Canada communicate good wishes for religious celebrations:

“You can say ‘Merry Christmas,’ but you can also say ‘Hanukkah,’ so you just say ‘Happy Holidays.’ So, you don’t know what people are celebrating, whatever, you have no idea and you have to care, you have to care.” (ll.395ff)

Since people come from various backgrounds, they do not always share the same festivities. Anja highlights the diversity of peoples’ traditions, customs, and reli-

gions in a multicultural society like Canada. Anja is very explicit when she points out that Canadians demonstrate a degree of openness toward traditions they might not have grown up with. She sees multiculturalism also happening through food:

“[...] so in [Canada], it is nice, because you can get more ethnic food, and when I go to other places I feel actually shocked 'cause I am craving my Indian food, and I want to have a sushi bar, and my Thai food [laughter]. But I think through that, through the food itself [...] it is indoctrinated to have the multicultural perspective without knowing.” (ll.408-412)

Anja talks here about the availability of multiethnic food and how it subliminally promotes multiculturalism. From her *emic* perspective, she refers to what Kymlicka, from an *etic* perspective, criticizes as “a feel-good celebration of ethno-cultural diversity, encouraging citizens to acknowledge and embrace the panoply of customs, music and cuisine that exist in a multi-ethnic society.” (2010: 89) Kymlicka argues that multiculturalism, as a set of policies, should not be about inculcating an ethos of cultural consumption. Anja’s choice of the word “indoctrinating” is interesting as it highlights a kind of normativity behind the concept. However, Anja bases her observation of multiculturalism on everyday experiences rather than the political project. She generally pleads for sensitivity toward “the other” and celebrates cultural diversity, and its outcomes—multiethnic cuisine for instance. In Poland, she finds the opposite: “In Poland, even when you have a Pizza, it is not going to be the Italian Pizza. It is the Polish version of what it could be [...] it’s just ridiculous.” (ll.399f, 408) Anja compares her country of arrival with her country of origin. She not only implicitly points to the differences in the ethnic composition of both countries, but she also explicitly favours Canada over Poland. By using multiethnic food as a metaphor for the society behind it, Anja is critical of Poland. Food can be a symbolic marker of belonging in the context of migration (Wessendorf 2013: 37), but Anja literally rejects it: “I don’t like Polish food.” (l.174)

Antagonisms and Aversive Mobility

Overall, Anja is appreciative of Canada’s multicultural society. She celebrates what she understands as multiculturalism like the different nationalities she encountered in school, a sensitivity toward or interest in “the other,” and multiethnic cuisine. She constructs an imaginary of Canada that is entirely positive: “I love the society. I think it is probably the best that I hear of.” (ll.263f) She al-

ludes to problems in Canadian society only once, yet she backpedals immediately, stating that they are not so serious as they might be elsewhere (l.264). She mentions First Nations peoples but does not elaborate. Anja celebrates (Canadian) multiculturalism. The policy emerged as an ideological and political counter to assimilation: immigrants and their descendants are not required to give up their heritage in favour of the new “dominant” culture. Rather, multiculturalism approves of the existence of multiple cultures in one society. Immigrants are, in other words, free to maintain their cultural traditions and customs and are invited to participate in the institutional and social realms of Canada (ch. 1.1).

Anja is strongly in favour of multiculturalism, yet she does not subscribe to it when it comes to her own cultural heritage because she rejects her Polish origin. It seems paradoxical that instead of preserving, displaying or living her heritage in a society like Canada, she rejects it. When it comes to her own heritage, Anja would rather assimilate. She is generally very wary of being identified as Polish; she “worked really hard” to be culturally assimilated into Canada. Only occasionally, when getting together with her father’s friends, does she even speak the language (ll.418). In the narrative about her life, Anja constructs two antagonistic imaginaries of her country of origin and her country of arrival. Poland is characterized by darkness, bitterness, and war, while Canada is the place where people care about each other and “the other” and generally live in peace. She further illustrates these antagonisms by using “summer” as a metaphor:

“I know Poland, I know it has summers, but it doesn’t feel like it has summers. Just thinking about it, I don’t know, it’s shorter. There’s something wrong with it [...] I remember short summers, but not like in here, in Canada, you have a summer that burns your brain because it’s so hot and so warm, and you sweat so much, right. You just feel like you’re in summer, but I don’t remember any summers there.” (ll.142-147)

Summer is usually associated with warmth, sunshine, and holidays, things most people enjoy. In her post-hoc narrative, Anja does not remember having experienced this in Poland. She cannot remember Poland even having summers, meaning she cannot remember the good times she may have had there. Anja’s sense of belonging to both places are quite polarized. Her appreciation for Canada is strong, even strong enough to make her want to assimilate in this multicultural country where assimilation is an unofficial part of the official discourse.

At the end of the day, Anja’s narrative is about integration in Canada. As mentioned earlier, Anja is professionally successful as choreographer. Already as an eleven-year-old, she was determined to pursue this profession (ll.269ff). In order to achieve her professional dream, Anja did what Canadian society expects

her to do: “Well, in Canada you have to [work hard]. People expect it from you and if you are dancing, this is what you are expected to.” (ll.255f) She did what needed to be done to become successful in the career path she chose, and in this way, subscribes to the values held by her host society. However, Anja left Canada when she was seventeen years old in order to perform in a musical in Poland. The move was for one year. This mobility experience is surprising given the image she constructs of Poland as being the “ugly dark place” she is glad to have left behind. Yet, somehow her aversion toward all things Polish did not hold her back from taking up a professional opportunity there. The move is in keeping with her professional ambition, but does not account for the antipathy she developed toward the culture. Anja does not say a word about how this opportunity came about, yet this mobility experience shows that she was not completely cut off from her country of origin. In contrast to the image of Poland she constructs in her narrative, her mobility experience to Poland was a positive one: “It was really fun. I was in the only musical in the whole country [laughter] and it was so great and busy.” (ll.223f) Once Anja returned to Toronto, she never relocated her center of life out of Canada again, and she does not intend to do so. According to her (up-to-now) life course, Anja remains *predominantly* immobile or sedentary after her immigration from Warsaw to Toronto. Then again, she did relocate her life center for a year to Poland; the country that she does not remember as having summers. When taking into consideration the overall context of her life course and the narrative she constructs out of it, we can understand her relocation “after migration” as *aversive mobility*. We will now learn how immobility comes about in the German context by looking into the life of Sandra.

3.2 SANDRA: “THE ONE WHO TEACHES HER PARENTS HOW TO SPEAK GERMAN”

Sandra is a young adult of Polish descent who lives in Berlin. She responded to my inquiry on *Facebook* and we arranged an interview right away for the upcoming week. As for all my respondents, I suggested that we meet either in a public space like a café, at my place or, if she would prefer, at hers. She decided on a public meeting. We met in a café in Berlin Mitte on 23 April, 2014. She immediately opened the conversation and explained to me that, by responding to my inquiry, she finally dared to “try out something new”; something she usually would not do. After we sat down and ordered coffee, I posed my initial question and she instantly fell into a narrative mode. The interview lasted two hours and ten minutes. Sandra was thirty-one years old when I interviewed her.

Sandra's autobiographical narrative is, generally speaking, a discourse about her and her family's experiences of settlement and incorporation into Germany. Her narrative is what we might call a "success-story of integration," albeit not without challenges, particularly in the early years following immigration. Sandra focuses her narration on her personal experiences about the consequences and outcomes of immigration. Her narrative is driven by the themes of language acquirement, family structures in both countries, processes of cultural identification or alienation, her personal networks as well as her general educational and professional pathway. As we shall see these are biographical dimensions, which are, from a sociological perspective, all interrelated in her life course.

When Kids Educate Their Parents: Collective Integration through Reversed Family Roles

Sandra's mastery of the German language is flawless. It is not only due to her young age upon arrival; and, of course, the assimilationist stance of current policy-making in Germany, but also because the biographical constellation of language in general and the acquirement of the German language in particular is striking in her life story. Her family immigrated to Germany when Sandra was four years old (I.13), so the process of incorporation started in her childhood. Not long after her family's settlement, Sandra attended preschool. She remembers that she was not able to speak German at that time, not only due to her lack of language knowledge, but also because she was afraid of the situation she was put into:

"I know that I got into preschool and I couldn't speak German. I somehow understood German. I already understood the [others] in parts, but I did not speak at first, because I didn't dare to. I was afraid [...] they all spoke differently and the new country and these fears from my parents. I think, as a child, you can feel it." (II.270-276)¹

On the one hand, Sandra was afraid of the unfamiliar circumstances like the new country and people who speak a different language. On the other hand, she indicates that her fear was also influenced by her parents' worries that she could

1 "Ich weiß, dass ich in die Vorschule gekommen bin und da kein Deutsch konnte. Ich hab' irgendwie Deutsch verstanden. Ich hab' die [Anderen] schon teilweise verstanden, aber ich habe nicht gesprochen die erste Zeit, weil ich mich nicht getraut hatte. Ich hab' Angst gehabt [...] es sprechen alle anders und neues Land und diese Ängste von meinen Eltern. Ich glaube als Kind spürt man das."

sense even as a little child. Her parents were, she says, very concerned about adjusting to German society, within which acquiring the German language played a central role:

“Well, my parents always wanted my sister and me to speak German to them, so that they learn the language. They would speak Polish to us and we were to respond always in German. In our family, it was like that and, I think, my parents also wanted very much to adapt. In public, they were more like: ‘Ah, speak rather German,’ so that we don’t attract attention.” (II.278-282)²

Sandra’s parents insisted that the girls speak German to them so that they might *learn from them*. The assumption that parents are the educators of their children was undercut as family members switched roles: the children became the educators of their parents in their efforts to integrate. The linguistic adjustment is a collective familial project, in which the parents benefited from their children’s early embeddedness in social institutions (preschool), their young age and, hence, the children’s ability to acquire a new language very quickly. Sandra’s parents used their children’s newly acquired abilities to improve their own language skills. This required a (moment of) quasi-bilingualism on the side of the children. They had to have an understanding of both languages in order to be able to transmit their knowledge of German to Polish native speakers.

As a matter of fact, integration is interrelated with language acquirement (“cultural integration,” see ch. 1.1). There is no doubt that Sandra’s parents took integration into Germany very seriously. Their motivations became especially apparent when they asked their daughters to speak only German in public, indicating an assimilationist stance on integration, which presumably stems from the social expectations that were directed at the young immigrant family in the form of societal norms and values. Generally, fulfilling the assimilationist expectations of German society was supported by the distinctive institutional infrastructure of the welfare state. Sandra and her family immigrated to West Germany in 1986 (II.14). They were considered “ethnic Germans” (*Aussiedler*) by the state; people of German descent who lived outside the borders of the territory of the German state as a result of state building conflicts in central and eastern Europe

2 “Also, meine Eltern wollten auch immer, dass meine Schwester und ich mit ihnen Deutsch sprechen, damit sie die Sprache lernen. Sie haben mit uns Polnisch gesprochen und wir sollten immer auf Deutsch antworten. Das war bei uns so und meine Eltern wollten sich auch, glaube ich, sehr anpassen. In der Öffentlichkeit waren sie auch eher so: ‘Ah, sprecht’ doch Deutsch,’ dass man nicht negativ auffällt.”

in the nineteenth and twentieth century, and they were granted German citizenship (see excursus in PART II).

The Polish Socialization of Ethnic Germans

For some, it might sound surprising that the vast majority of ethnic Germans (*Aussiedler*), who settled in Germany neither spoke any German, nor did they know German traditions and cultural habits. There were, however, significant historical reasons for this: after World War II, Poland's Communist regime introduced the policy of "Polonisation" of minority groups, including the German minority living on Polish territory. The regime forbade and punished the use of German, it banned German names of places and persons and changed them into Polish ones, and closed all German cultural associations. Ethnic Germans did not only have to reckon with reprisals, but they had to face ethnic discrimination, too, e.g., wage cuts and low food rations (Brinks 1999, Helmich et. al. 2005). In reaction, many ethnic Germans hid their heritage. For decades and across generations, ethnic Germans forgot the German language and culture, but sometimes their German identity remained. The ethnic Germans, who came to Germany during the 1980s, were thus socialized as Polish, while earlier immigrants could, for instance, still speak German when they settled in Germany during the 1950s (Loew 2014: 214f). This is why, paradoxically, ethnic Germans need(ed) to culturally adapt to their own ethnicity. The German state not only granted ethnic Germans access to German citizenship, but also a range of social rights, services, and support before the assistance was heavily reduced in 1988 (Bommes 2012b: 45-50). Language training programs, for instance, were a central part of the services offered to them.

Sandra, interestingly, indicates that her parents engaged in these services. They attended language school:

"[...] especially since the German teacher explained everything in German in my parents' school. But if you cannot speak any German, it is a bit silly. My parents did not really learn German in this school, but rather through the children and later through work. They worked and they watched television, but [they didn't learn German] because the school was [not] so good." (ll.287-291)³

3 "[...] Zumal [der Deutschunterricht] für meine Eltern so war, dass der Deutschlehrer alles auf Deutsch erklärt hat. Wenn man aber kein Deutsch kann, ist das ein bisschen

Sandra justifies the reversed roles of educators and educated in her family as a result of the ineffectiveness of the German language classes her parents attended. The institutional support provided by the German welfare state was apparently not sufficient for learning the language, which Sandra explains as being a result of poor didactical methods employed in class. Rather, her parents developed other strategies within their everyday life, such as talking to their children, watching TV, and taking part in social interactions with colleagues at work. The temporal imbalance between the parents and the children in the process of language acquisition is characterized by another particular circumstance in Sandra's socialization:

"I mean, I could never take my parents as the example of how to speak German, because, indeed, they have the accent. So as a child, I just always had to watch out and orient myself toward my girlfriends in school." (11.364ff)⁴

Sandra's parents did not serve as "best-practice" examples. Contrary to their experience, Sandra's linguistic adaptation succeeded within the German institutional landscape; mainly through the institution of school, which provided her with social interactions that turned into friendships. These friends became her role models when it came to learning German faultlessly, meaning without an accent.

In sum, the familys' efforts of (linguistic) integration brought about two significant outcomes. First, it transformed the family dynamic. It is commonplace that parents are the linguistic role models of their children. This is, in part, also true for Sandra's family as her parents taught her how to speak Polish. Yet, the situation changed drastically when the family immigrated to Germany: the children were suddenly the ones mastering the German language. The children contributed to the integration of their parents, even though it may have been irritating for the family as the question arises: who teaches what to whom? Such a biographical constellation rarely occurs for children whose socialization does not coincide with the process of integration. Second, acquiring German, even to the

blöd. Meine Eltern haben eigentlich nicht über diese Schule Deutsch gelernt, sondern über die Kinder und über die Arbeit dann später. Die sind arbeiten gegangen und haben Fernsehen geguckt, aber nicht weil die Schule wirklich so gut war."

- 4 "Ich meine, bei den Eltern, da konnte ich mir nie das Beispiel nehmen wie ich Deutsch zu sprechen habe, weil sie ja den Akzent erstmal haben. Also musste ich halt immer als Kind schauen, dass ich mich orientiere in der Schule bei meinen Freundinnen."

detriment of the Polish language, is the foundation for social mobility *in Germany*, at least for the children of the family. The parents aimed, I argue, to ensure their children's chances of participating in German society because immigration most often (and this is also the case for ethnic Germans) causes a disqualification with regard to the local labour market (Boswell/D'Amato 2012: 14, a.o.). The linguistic role-switching was a "foundation for social mobility" *at place*, while it hindered the acquisition or solidification of other (foreign) languages as the focus lay solely on the German language. Certainly, insufficient (foreign) language skills (also those of the first acquired tongue) hinder or prevent geographical mobility to other destinations than the "country of arrival."

About Successful and Unsuccessful Integration: The Effect of the Social Milieu

Sandra's early (linguistic) integration worked out so well because it was positively influenced by the neighbourhood she was living in. Sandra's family lived in a wealthy area of Berlin for the first few years after arriving in Germany. Sandra points out that the other children who lived there and with whom she played all came from good homes; from families who lived in villas (II.282f). Sandra's housing situation was quite the contrary:

"Yes, then we crossed [the border, A/N]. First, we stayed with my aunt. Yeah, and my parents found work quickly. [...] Then another brother of my aunt [and] my mother came after us. He came, I dunno, maybe a year later? [...] I can still remember that we lived with my family for a long while, all in one room—four people [...] because back then, it was difficult to find an apartment." (II.15-22)⁵

The private housing situation of Sandra's family stands in opposition to the one she describes as typical for the neighbourhood. While other families lived in spacious houses, Sandra shared an apartment with six people, four of whom she was living with in one single bedroom. Inconvenient housing situations with lit-

5 "Ja, dann sind wir auch rüber [über die Grenze, eig. Anm.] dann sind wir erstmal zu meiner Tante. Ja, und meine Eltern haben recht schnell Arbeit gefunden [...] Dann kam noch ein Bruder von meiner Tante [und] von meiner Mutter nach. Der kam dann, ich weiß nicht, vielleicht ein Jahr später? [...] Ich kann mich noch daran erinnern, dass wir sehr lange bei meiner Familie gewohnt haben, in einem Zimmer—vier Leute [...] weil damals war das noch so, dass man Schwierigkeiten hatte eine Wohnung zu finden."

tle space are not unusual when individuals or families first settle in a new country. Sandra's family had the possibility to move in with her aunt (her mother's sister) who had immigrated to Germany prior to them (l.4). Other ethnic Germans, who immigrated during the same migration wave, were often accommodated in public housing (Bommes 2012b). It generally took some time until the immigrants were able to "get back on track," that is when they received formal registration and legal recognition, when they found jobs in order to support themselves and when they were able to find suitable apartments in housing markets that were often very dense. As Sandra indicated, it took some time until the family found its own place. According to Sandra's narration, it must have been about five years. The housing situation, however, did not bother Sandra as she did not know anything different. Living within such limited space made her feel part of a community, which is why she does not question it (ll.116-124). Generally, she goes into raptures over her childhood years in the wealthy Berlin area:

"Yes, the first three years I went to school in ****[name of Berlin suburb, A/N]. All the kids had a lot of money there and [...] then they celebrated their birthdays inviting the whole class. I can still remember only beautiful houses and the families, who pedagogically handled their children very well. I found it always very impressive and beautiful and the first three years at school in ****[name of Berlin suburb, A/N] were absolutely beautiful." (ll.351-357)⁶

Living in this wealthy neighbourhood, despite having little space, impacted Sandra in a significant way:

"I think it was important to me to simply integrate there, so I had this demand for myself to feel comfortable; especially in the first years. I also had these good examples of German families and they were also always very warm. You wanted to belong [...] In elementary school, [we] had two other Polish kids, and perhaps another foreign kid. So out of 25 children, we had 85% or 90% of this German influence and I wanted to be a part of it. My

6 "Ja, ich bin ja die ersten drei Jahre in ****[Name des Berliner Vororts, eig. Anm.] zur Schule gegangen. Die Kinder hatten dort alle sehr viel Geld und [...] die [haben] dann auch Geburtstag gefeiert mit der ganzen Klasse. Ich kann mich immer nur an schöne Häuser erinnern und an Familien, die pädagogisch total gut mit ihren Kindern umgegangen sind. Fand' ich immer sehr beeindruckend und schön und die ersten drei Jahre [auf der Schule] in ****[Name des Berliner Vororts, eig. Anm.], die waren total schön."

parents were always meddling; emphasizing the need to integrate. They felt it was important.” (II.368-374)⁷

Sandra was almost exclusively surrounded by Germans who treated her very well. It stimulated her desire to belong to them. In addition, this desire was nourished by her parents who expected her to integrate. Because Sandra was welcomed warmly by the Germans in her immediate surroundings; it was easy for her to fulfill her parents’ “imperative” to integrate.

Sandra had to leave the wealthy Berlin suburb when her family moved to another well-known area in Berlin, which had developed into a “problem neighbourhood.” (*sozialer Brennpunkt*, II.28ff) She attended third class in a new school there and noticed that things were different: the families were not as wealthy anymore and the children were less well behaved. She felt it was a different standard, although she was also comfortable there as she has made good friends (II.358-362). Yet, she was happy to have started school in the other Berlin suburb where she had the “warm and wealthy” families as role models for her integration. Sandra points out that a lot more foreigners attended school in her new neighbourhood than in the old one (II.363). That, she believes, has negative consequences for the integration of immigrants. Sandra’s assumption is rather typical for the German context while in Canada such an assumption would be rather uncommon (as we have seen in Anja’s narrative in the preceding section). However, Sandra tells me a story about her cousins in order to make her point:

“I also have two cousins. They are 20 and 21 years old. They have already attended high school in **** [name of the so-called problem neighbourhood in Berlin, A/N]. When I attended high school there, 40% of the students were foreigners. When [my cousins] were there, they had 80% foreigners and maybe 20% Germans, so that the German students also appropriated these accents from the foreigners. My cousins, for instance, [...] they [...] do

7 “Ich glaube, es war mir wichtig mich da auch einfach einzugliedern. Dass ich schon diesen Anspruch hatte, besonders auch in den ersten Jahren sich wohlfühlen. Ich hatte auch diese guten Beispiele von deutschen Familien und sie waren ja auch immer sehr herzlich. Man wollte dazugehören. [...] In der Grundschule hatten [wir] noch zwei andere polnische Kinder, und vielleicht noch ein ausländisches Kind. Also von 25 Kindern, da hatten wir zu 85% oder 90% diesen deutschen Einfluss und da wollte ich dann dazugehören. Meine Eltern haben mir auch immer so-so einmischend mitgegeben: ‘Integrieren.’ [...] [S]ie fanden das schon wichtig.”

not master the German language correctly. They also do not speak in complete sentences.” (II.376-383)⁸

When Sandra’s cousins attended school in the “problem neighbourhood,” the proportion of foreigners in the student body of the class had increased. Foreigners outnumbered those Germans not included in the category of “people with a migration background.” Sandra’s observation is that these figures have had a negative impact not only on the immigrant children but also on the few Germans who began to take on the foreigners’ way of speaking. The result is that her cousins are not proficient in German. She gives me an example for that:

“For three or four years, my cousin always said ‘çüş’ or something. I don’t know. You’re from another city, right? In Berlin, the Turks, they have such a slang, which my cousins have totally taken on. And I think to myself: ‘No employer would give you a job. You cannot talk like that. As if you’re coming out of the ghetto and through language, one instantly recognizes where you come from.’” (II.383-388)⁹

Sandra’s cousin used a Turkish expression, which expresses amazement or contempt in colloquial terms.¹⁰ In this interview situation, Sandra addresses me explicitly in order to give me contextual information about Berlin (since I come from another city), explaining to me that it is the Turkish immigrants who have a slang like that, which her cousins have adopted. With regard to integration, she thinks that too many foreigners in a classroom hinder their successful integration

⁸ “Ich habe auch zwei Cousins, 20 und 21, und bei denen ist es so, die sind schon in **** [Name des Bezirkes bekannt als sozialer Brennpunkt, eig. Anm.]. Als ich auf die Oberschule gegangen bin, hatte ich halt 40% Ausländeranteil und bei denen waren es 80% und 20% vielleicht Deutsche noch, so dass sich die deutschen Schüler auch diese ganzen Akzente von den Ausländern mit angeeignet haben. Meine Cousins z.B. [...] die beherrschen [...] die deutsche Sprache nicht richtig. Die sprechen auch nicht in vollständigen Sätzen.”

⁹ “Mein Cousin hat quasi eine Zeit, da hat er drei, vier Jahre so ‘çüş’ gesagt oder sowas. Ich weiß nicht. Du bist ja aus einer anderen Stadt, ne? In Berlin, die Türken, dann haben die so einen Slang und den haben sich die [Cousins] total angeeignet. Und ich denk’ mir: ‘So stellt dich doch kein Arbeitgeber ein. So kannst du doch nicht reden. So wie aus dem Ghetto und durch die Sprache ist ja sofort erkennbar, wo du herkommst.’”

¹⁰ It is similar to the colloquial use of the German expression “krass” and the English expression “damn.”

as the few Germans who do not have a “migration background” are not the norm or simply “not so cool.” Speaking what Sandra considers bad German or in “slang” is a barrier for the integration of immigrants and, more generally, reduces their employability as language is the first thing that tells others where you come from, not only in terms of cultural heritage, but also in terms of social class (Bourdieu 1987). I understand the cousins’ use of this expression as what Lamont and Lareau call a “marginal high status signal.” (1988: 157) In critical conversation with Bourdieu’s cultural capital, the authors define high status cultural signals as attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviours, etc., used for social and cultural exclusion (ibid.: 156). Lamont and Lareau acknowledge that power relations exist within all classes, even the lower ones:

“It is important to note in this context that we believe that lower class high status cultural signals (e.g., being streetwise) perform within the lower class the same exclusivist function that the legitimate culture performs in the middle and the upper middle class.” (Lamont/Lareau 1988: 157)

The “marginal high status signals” subsequently fulfil exclusionary functions within the realm of the lower classes. Sandra’s cousin who uses the expression “çüş” does so in order to be of “high status” in a comparatively “low class;” assuring his inclusion in the social milieu within which he is embedded. Sandra, however, wants to move beyond this lower social milieu. In so doing, she implicitly formulates linguistic claims, e.g., speaking without an accent and avoiding specific colloquial and/or foreign vocabulary. Such tactics, she proposes, allow one to more successfully integrate into German society and facilitate upward social mobility. Sandra rejects a way of speaking that is specific to a certain milieu or class as it hinders—in her opinion—occupational advancement for migrants; this expressed by her suggestion that no employer would give her cousin a job with his use of such a “marginal high status signal.” Sandra thus clearly distances herself from members of her own family, i.e., her cousins.

What is more, the narration about her cousins’ experiences and her interpretation of it reifies the (populist) discourse about immigrants of Turkish background, and more generally Muslim groups in Germany and throughout Europe, as not being well integrated or being generally “un-assimilable.” (Favell 2014, Vertovec/Wessendorf 2010, Kymlicka 2010, Amelina/Faist 2008)¹¹ Sandra, however, not only distances herself from her cousins, but also from the

11 For empirical studies, confirming the “low integration rates” of persons with Turkish background in Germany, see Esser 2001a, 2003, and Koopmans 2016.

neighbourhood as such: “But we live [...] rather at the end, so not in the midst. It’s the last subway station in the direction of ****[neighbourhood in the south-east of Berlin, A/N].” (ll.28ff)¹² She expresses this distance by pointing to the geographical space between the area where her family lives in the so-called “problem neighbourhood” in Berlin and the neighbourhoods’ center. She underlines that, in fact, her family lives closer to another neighbourhood with a better reputation. Sandra, again, distances herself from a geographical place that does not match her endeavour of upward social mobility. To sum up, Sandra constructs a narrative about successful and unsuccessful integration. In this regard, she emphasizes the importance of social milieu. In doing so, she contrasts her early experiences in the “idyllic” neighbourhood she grew up in with her later one, but more strikingly, with those of her cousins’ even more “problematic” Berlin neighbourhood. For her, successful integration is linked with processes of social advancement in the system of social stratification. In order to make that happen, the acquisition and the regulated mastery of German, which is—according to Sandra—dependent on social contacts with the “dominant majority” (middle-class Germans), is a must. It simultaneously shows an effort for successful integration.

Reintroducing the Polish Language after Successful Integration?

Not only does the German language play a role in Sandra’s narrative about her life, but Polish (as the language of her cultural origin) is also relevant in her biographical experiences. Polish was the first language she spoke. After immigrating to Germany, however, Sandra acquired German, but this acquisition was at the expense of Polish in her everyday life. She spoke German when she was in public and, at first, also within her family. She only spoke Polish when she travelled to Poland. During her childhood, Sandra’s family commuted to Poland almost every weekend (ll.157ff). Later in her life course, around puberty, Sandra and her sister refused to commute so often, preferring to stay in Berlin (ll.166ff). Meanwhile, Sandra leveled out the commute to four to five times a year (l.686). As mentioned before, her parents first got Sandra and her sister to speak German with them, but then:

12 “Aber wir wohnen [...] so am Ende, also nicht drin. Es ist schon die letzte U-Bahnstation in Richtung ****[Stadtteil im Südosten Berlins, eig. Anm.].”

“It is strange. When we were 12 or 13 my mother eventually said: ‘Hey, speak more Polish here at home, too. We have to speak Polish after all,’ because she didn’t want to neglect the Polish language, wanting it to remain intact.” (II.295-298)¹³

It is axiomatic that Sandra’s mother requested her children to speak again in Polish when the parents improved their German skills sufficiently. Her mother’s fear reversed: in the first years of settlement, she was afraid of not being able to learn German until, after a considerable time living in Germany, she was afraid of losing touch with the heritage language. She called for a reintroduction of the Polish language within the family sphere. Sandra therefore lists the languages she speaks with various family members:

“Yeah, then I spoke German with my sister, I spoke Polish with my mother and I spoke German and Polish with my father. It’s a total mix.” (II.298ff)¹⁴

Sandra’s experiences of acquiring German and the code-switching she practices within her family unit provide her with sufficient skills in both languages. Yet, her Polish is not as good as her German. People in Poland would recognize that she does not live there due to mistakes she makes in grammar and pronunciation. While she considers her oral skills to be good (II.303-309), her writing skills are not sufficient. She makes a lot of mistakes as she never learned to write in Polish. She basically writes how she speaks (II.340f). As a countermeasure, Sandra looked into Polish orthographic classes at the community college, but she could not find any that focused on the orthographic training only. She was not interested in general language training (II.340-348). However, her lack of writing skills restricts her. To use her own words: “[...] I would never be able to work in Polish.” (I.342)¹⁵ That is probably one reason why Sandra considers German to be her main language (*Hauptsprache*): “German is my main language, because I

13 “Es ist komisch. Irgendwann hat meine Mutter dann als wir 12 oder 13 waren auch gesagt: ‘Mensch, sprecht doch zu Hause hier auch mehr Polnisch. Wir müssen doch Polnisch sprechen,’ weil sie die polnische Sprache auch nicht vernachlässigen wollte, so dass sie dann auch noch erhalten bleibt.”

14 “Ja, dann habe [ich] mit meiner Schwester Deutsch, mit meiner Mutter dann Polnisch und mit meinem Vater dann auch auf Deutsch und Polnisch [geredet]. Das ist ein totaler Mix.”

15 “[...] Ich würde niemals auf Polnisch arbeiten können.”

grew up with it in school with friends.” (II.302f)¹⁶ The term *Hauptsprache* seems to me quite unusual in the German context. Surprised by her choice of word, I ask her about the notion of “mother tongue.” Her reaction is instructive:

“[Laughter] Yes, mother tongue is associated with the roots somehow, right? Yeah, I think mother tongue is/ but actually I would have to say that German is my mother tongue, even though I stop now to say: ‘Oh, no.’ Actually, it is about the roots and I have not learned German from my mother.” (II.312-315)¹⁷

Sandra associates the notion of mother tongue with cultural roots, which makes her uncertain about claiming German as her mother tongue. She refers to the reversed roles between parents and children in her own biographical experience of acquiring German as she takes the notion of mother tongue quite literary. According to this line of thought, German cannot logically be her mother tongue as it was not her mother who taught her that language. Thus, Sandra considers Polish to be her mother tongue, because, in fact, this is the language her mother taught her, even if she does not master Polish as she does German.

Sandra not only separates both languages into the realms of private and public life, but also, more specifically, between communicating with her family and everyone else. For the most part, her social circle consists of Germans: just like her friends and her colleagues, her partner is also German (II.189, 396). Apart from her family, she is not in touch with other Germans of Polish origin. From time to time she meets others, but usually she is not interested in maintaining a social relationship with them (II.419-438). However, there is one interesting incident; an exception. When she met a young woman of Polish origin within her work context. Sandra works for an association in Berlin. The other Polish woman worked there as a student for a while and Sandra immediately related to her because they were— according to Sandra—on the same wavelength (II.407ff). Yet, the new colleague approached the use of “mother tongue” and “main language” in a fundamentally different way. Sandra tells me about it:

16 “Deutsch ist meine Hauptsprache, weil ich einfach—ich bin damit aufgewachsen in der Schule mit den Freunden.”

17 “[Lachen] Ja, Muttersprache verbindet man ja mit den Wurzeln irgendwie, ne? Ja, Muttersprache ist, denke ich/ aber eigentlich müsste ich schon sagen, Deutsch ist meine Muttersprache, auch wenn ich jetzt so stoppe und sage: ‘Oh ne.’ Eigentlich sind es ja Wurzeln und Deutsch habe ich von meiner Mutter nicht gelernt.”

“I have always talked to her in German. During the break, she sometimes tried to approach me in Polish, but I always switched into German, because I don’t know why. It is at work. I also don’t want to close myself off if someone else joins in. There are only Germans.” (II.409–412)¹⁸

Sandra had the possibility of speaking in her mother tongue to someone who also speaks Polish but she consistently rejected this offer, switching instead to German. Sandra makes a point to adapt in the different contexts she faces in her everyday life. She fears excluding herself and/or being excluded when speaking Polish in a German work environment. She prefers to speak German in order to stay socially accessible and to allow German speakers to join the conversation. For Sandra, this generally applies to any interactions in her public life, but—intriguingly—in her private life as well, as the continuation of the same story shows:

“[This colleague] no longer works there. Also, she had a baby. She speaks with her child only in Polish and she wants me to speak Polish with her too; for she does not hear any German. In that case, I speak Polish with her. But somehow, that’s not very good. I always speak German with my sister, although she is Polish, too.” (II.412–416)¹⁹

When the young women meet in their leisure time, her colleague insists on speaking Polish so that her child does not hear German (II.417). Perhaps Sandra’s colleague thinks that the child will get confused with Polish-German code switching. In this situation, however, Sandra gives in and speaks Polish. Yet, she does not agree with her colleague’s stance on the use of the heritage language and parenting. In order to emphasize her discontentment, Sandra refers to her sister, with whom she speaks German, who is of Polish heritage, and has a little daughter herself. In other words: for Sandra, there is no need to speak Polish just because two persons have the same heritage. Sandra’s use of the Polish language

18 “Ich habe immer mit ihr Deutsch gesprochen. Manchmal in der Pause hat sie versucht Polnisch mit mir zu sprechen. Ich bin aber immer so ins Deutsche gewechselt, weil ich weiß nicht wieso. Man ist ja auch auf der Arbeit. Ich will mich da auch nicht abgrenzen, wenn jemand anderes noch dazu kommt. Es sind ja nur Deutsche.”

19 “[Diese Arbeitskollegin] arbeitet jetzt nicht mehr da. Sie hat auch ein Kind bekommen. Sie spricht mit ihrem Kind auch nur auf Polnisch und möchte auch, dass ich mit ihr Polnisch spreche, damit es nicht Deutsch hört. Dann spreche ich auch mit ihr Polnisch. Aber irgendwie, das ist nicht so schön halt. Mit meiner Schwester spreche ich auch immer Deutsch, obwohl sie auch Polin ist.”

is mainly restricted to her core family (but, interestingly, apart from her sister) and to the extended family back in Poland. Whenever she can, she avoids speaking Polish in Germany, regardless of work or leisure time. She only speaks Polish when she is explicitly requested to do so by her mother, for instance, who fears of losing touch with her cultural roots, and her colleague who demands respect for her way of parenting.

As pointed out before, Sandra considers Polish to be her mother tongue. She values it culturally, but, barely uses it. This is a somewhat paradoxical situation because Sandra distances herself from the use of Polish as she basically neglects the Polish language, but, at the same time, she calls Polish her mother tongue. If we define mother tongue according to language proficiency, German would be Sandra's mother tongue, but, arguably, because her mother could not teach her German, Sandra does not feel entitled to call German her mother tongue. She is thus faced with the situation in which none of these languages could be *legitimately* her mother tongue, so she sidesteps the issue by using the term "main language." When we take a look into her language use, it clearly mimics the rather assimilationist history of her integration into Germany: speaking Polish is rare and selective and used as a cultural symbol while speaking German is comprehensive and her dominant pattern of social action. This is *peculiar* to the German context, while it is safe to state that in the Canadian context there is a good chance that immigrants integrate their heritage language more into their everyday lives.

Cultural Ambiguity in a Settled Life

When I interviewed her, Sandra had been living in Germany for twenty-seven years. Following immigration, she has lived in one specific geographical space, Berlin. Sandra's trajectory is characterized by conformism. She completed her education with a general certificate of secondary education (*Realschulabschluß*). At the age of seventeen, she decided not to take the *Abitur*, which would entitle her to higher education. She did not know what to study, but she knew she wanted to work in an office. She therefore continued with an apprenticeship as a paralegal (*Rechtsanwaltsfachangestellte*) and worked for several organizations. She is currently working for a registered association of journalists and publishers. This job position has inspired her to progress in her profession. That is why she decided to study journalism as a correspondence course and to train further in the field of public relations, besides having gained additional qualifications like a certificate as a training supervisor (II.54-84, 87-99). I believe that her life-path tells us a story of a "successful integration." Some realms of her life are charac-

terized by an assimilationist stance on integration (e.g., the language use), while others are more informed by her heritage culture; even when it comes with reluctance. A realm that cuts across the biography, but is at the same time its precondition and effect, is her self-understanding. Sandra tells me that she has often been asked about how she feels and understands herself. Whether she is more Polish or more German. This is her answer:

“When people ask me, I say, I am a Pole, because we often speak Polish at home. But I don’t feel like a real Pole [...] I wouldn’t call myself a German either, but how can I put this? [10sec] Actually I’m feeling equal [...]. I got this passport here. I have both citizenships [4sec]. It’s kind of odd.” (II.179-182, 185f, 195f)²⁰

Sandra does not provide a clear answer to the question she has been asked so many times. She usually replies being Polish, but in the same breath admits that this is not accurate. And yet, neither is it accurate to self-describe as German. Sandra’s self-understanding is ambiguous as she cannot align herself entirely with either the Polish or the German culture. Owning both citizenships strengthens her affiliation with both cultures. Numerous studies have shown that hybrid identity constructions or a transnational sense of belonging are not anomalous in the context of migration; yet, Sandra feels at odds about it. Presumably because, on the one hand, her self-understanding differs from those Germans who are not or have never been embedded in migration or transnational contexts and who make up a big part of her social relationships. On the other hand, it seems to me that she would prefer to call herself a German, but that she has no full legitimization to do so, not least due to her Polish-sounding real name. This is paradoxical, because she is fully assimilated but nevertheless she *must not* understand herself as a German since her name does not really allow it. It seems as if assimilation has no endpoint or at least not the endpoint of becoming a *real* German, not because—I argue—she isolates herself, but rather because her case irritates the self-conception of German society that promotes a culturally homogeneous picture: the *real* German is a German with, for instance, a German-sounding name; and thus an assimilated person (even if ethnic German) can never be a *real* German, because s/he is or was faced with more than one cultural influence, com-

20 “Wenn mich Leute fragen, dann sage ich, ich bin Polin, weil zu Hause wird oft Polnisch gesprochen. Ich fühl’ mich aber nicht wie eine richtige Polin [...] Ich würde jetzt auch nicht sagen wie eine Deutsche, aber wie kann ich das denn ausdrücken? [10sec] Ich fühl’ mich eigentlich gleichwertig [...] Ich habe jetzt hier diesen Pass bekommen. Ich habe beide Staatsangehörigkeiten [4sec]. Es ist irgendwie komisch.”

pleted with foreign-sounding names or different socialization experiences. This homogeneity of the German self-perception, makes Sandra suffer and it forces her to claim a feeling of cultural (and national) ambiguity, even if she would prefer to be perceived by others as a *real* German. Sandra has trouble expressing this feeling. She tries to be more concrete:

“There are many qualities I like better in Poland, but then again, there are other qualities of the Germans that I like. I guess, I just pick out [...] what I think is simply good and I live the traditions or the things that I like from both sides.” (II.196-199)²¹

Sandra finds affinity with elements from both cultures. In her everyday life, she tries to bring these elements together and to combine them in her social practices. Her self-understanding—as I see it—is (out of necessity) ambiguous, but compatible. Sandra’s everyday life is not anchored in strong Polish social networks, but she makes “ethnic choices” (Waters 1990) and picks these cultural practices that best fit the context. She leaves out, however, those elements that she does not approve of or that she finds difficult to deal with without rejecting her background altogether (Wessendorf 2013: 59) because—in that case—she would become culturally homeless (*heimatlos*) in a state of not being a Pole and not being a *real* German. Confronted with two cultural sets of values and practices, she sometimes needs to negotiate them in specific biographical constellations that she comes upon in her life course.

An example is her father’s funeral, who passed away a few years ago as a result of a car accident (II.210f, 498). Her father was buried in Poland. Part of the Catholic liturgy is characterized by the eating of a Eucharistic bread (*Hostie*). However, the tradition dictates that one makes a confession at the priest’s confessional in order to be granted absolution for the committed sins. Only then, it is one allowed to eat the Eucharistic bread during the funeral ceremony (II.593-596). Sandra did not want to go to the confessional because she feared the priest would disapprove of her living together with a man with whom she is not married (II.597ff). But Sandra’s mother insisted and Sandra gave in:

21 “Es gibt viele Eigenschaften, die ich in Polen besser finde, aber dann auch wieder bei den Deutschen. Ich glaube, ich nehme mir das für mich heraus [...] was ich einfach gut finde und lebe die Tradition oder die Sachen, die ich eben gut finde, von beiden Seiten aus.”

“I really didn’t want [to do it], but then I saw my mother and we all were in an exceptional state. And then I thought that I don’t want to make her life harder and that I’ll go to the confession.” (Il.604ff)²²

Sandra did her mother a favour by going to the confessional, although she really did not want to. She was afraid of making her mother’s life even harder and feeling guilty about it afterward. Yet, Sandra’s fear turned out to be a self-fulfilling prophecy:

“I didn’t much know what to say. Then the priest was really disgusting and he said: [...] ‘Say, have you got a boyfriend?’ I was like yes. He was then like: ‘Are you married?’ I was like no. ‘Do you live together in an apartment?’ I was like yes. [...] He detained me there for twenty minutes and he said it’s not okay, and he said I would have to marry. [...] And I thought what is it that he wants to decide, this kind of thing and he was really disgusting he/ it was sort of sadistic how he approached me. Yeah, and then he said to me that he couldn’t grant me absolution.” (Il.608-618)²³

Sandra tells me about this negative experience to illustrate the kinds of values and social practices of Polish culture she does not agree with. Interestingly, most of my interviewees tell me stories relating to Catholicism in one way or another. They usually intent on pointing out how their opinions diverge from religious traditions. Sandra is not the only one, in other words.²⁴ However, the story about the confession at her father’s funeral certainly underlines the cultural difference between Poland and Germany: To share an apartment with your partner in Germany is widely accepted, while in Poland, extramarital living conditions are

22 “[...] Ich wollte es partout nicht, aber, ich habe meine Mutter dann gesehen und wir waren ja alle in einer Ausnahmesituation und dann dachte ich, mache ihr das Leben nicht schwer und gehe jetzt mal auf den Beichtstuhl [...]”

23 “[...] Mir ist gar nicht so viel eingefallen [was ich sagen sollte]. Dann war der Pfarrer richtig ekelig und er hat dann gesagt: [...] ‘Sag mal, hast du denn einen Freund?’ Ich so ja. Er so: ‘Seid ihr denn verheiratet?’ Ich so nein. ‘Lebt ihr denn in einer Wohnung zusammen?’ Ich so ja. [...] Er hat mich 20 Minuten da festgehalten und meinte, das geht so nicht und er meinte, ich müsste heiraten. [...] Und ich dachte mir was will er denn entscheiden, gleich schon dieses Ding und er war richtig ekelig wie er mich so/ es war schon so sadistisch irgendwie wie er auf mich so eingegangen ist. Ja und dann meinte er halt er kann mir nicht die Absolution erteilen.”

24 Other interviewees, by contrast, complain about the lack of religious values in Germany.

(still) widely discredited, as directed by the Catholic Church. The impact of this conservatism even goes as far as landlords in Poland refusing to rent or sell apartments to non-married couples. For Sandra, this religious normativity prevented her from being granted absolution. She was hurt by this:

“Then I left the confessional, completely desperate, realizing that I could not take this Eucharistic bread and then I started to cry [...]. Then there was the funeral and all others went to the altar to take the Eucharistic bread while I remained seated.” (II.624f)²⁵

The priests' refusal of absolution hindered Sandra from fully participating in her father's funeral ceremony. She was excluded from this part of the ceremony and, hence, from the collective mourning over her father's loss. The ceremony, generally intended to provide a space for mourners to say goodbye to their loved ones and to come to peace with their loss, was instead a further source of grief, and aggravation. This painful incident led Sandra to distance herself from Catholicism as part of Polish culture (II.628f). Besides the conservative Catholic stance of Polish society, Sandra is not fond of the traditional and normative way of life, one her mother carefully adheres to. Sandra explains this conformism with higher social control by a people who tend toward gossip (II.203-218). By contrast, Germans, she proposes, tend not to concern themselves with the choices, moral or otherwise, of others. Sandra assumes that Germans have more interest in pursuing their hobbies or travelling, since they have better incomes. This is what they talk about, while people in Poland do not earn much, which increases their dependence on—and their attention toward—the family and community (II.218-224). Likewise, there are some aspects of Polish culture that she cherishes, like people's kindness and warmth. Sandra believes that Polish people are more welcoming than Germans whom she has not often seen serving food to visitors. For Sandra, Polish people are better hosts (II.203-208). What is more, the cohesion of the family is a bigger topic for Polish people while, in Germany, “it often happens that older people—yeah, we put them into an old people's home [laughter]—and that's not happening so much in Poland. (II.228ff)”²⁶ Sandra cannot identify with this particular social practice, which she sees more often in

25 “Dann bin ich da raus aus dem Beichtstuhl, total verzweifelt, und dachte jetzt kann ich nicht diese Oblate nehmen und dann habe ich angefangen zu weinen [...] Dann war die Beerdigung und alle sind zum Altar gegangen und haben sich diese Oblate geholt und ich bin da sitzen geblieben.”

26 “[...] Ist es ja oft so, dass ältere Menschen - ja die schieben wir mal ins Altersheim ab [Lachen] und bei Polen gibt's das nicht so.”

Germany: it is something she would not do (l.232). Generally, Sandra feels that the Polish culture comes with a range of expectations, which she finds arduous. Germans, in contrast, are more relaxed. Considering her cultural heterogeneity, she tries to pursue something in between the two poles in her own life (ll.230f).

All in all, Sandra's narrative about her life course shows a successful story of integrating into German society, in which she most often puts forward an assimilationist stance, regarding, for example, language acquirement and use, and at other times, her social practices and attitudes correspond more to a transnational or a "reluctant multicultural" view, which is mirrored in the narrative about her self-understanding. It is clear, however, that Sandra "arrived" (in the sense of *angekommen sein*) in Germany and found her place there. After initial difficulties of language acquirement, establishing social relationships, her parents' job search, and, in particular, after finding their own apartment, the family settled: "[when] we found an apartment [...] and I got my own room [...]. Yeah, that's when we arrived." (ll.32f, 39)²⁷ Besides, Sandra has never had any difficulties being accepted as a valued member of German society (though not as a *real* German). She did not experience any form of ethnic discrimination, even when people around her speak derogatorily about foreigners:

"At work, the Germans sometimes complain: 'Man, there are so many Turks or foreigners.' They somehow don't refer to me [laughter] and I also don't feel addressed. Yeah, I could get worked up over it like: What? Do you have something against migrants?' But I somehow don't feel like [a migrant]." (ll.190-193)²⁸

Sandra does not feel like a migrant and she is not perceived as one in her working environment, so the xenophobic statements of colleagues are not addressed toward her. She indicates that they are instead addressed toward people of Turkish heritage living in Germany. Interestingly, she must not claim to be a *real* (culturally homogeneous) German neither, as was pointed out earlier. She is in a state of being denied from understanding herself as *real* German, but she also does not understand herself as a *real* migrant. As a "successfully integrated" eth-

27 "[Als] wir dann eine Wohnung gefunden haben, [...] [und] ich ein eigenes Zimmer bekommen [habe] [...]. Ja, so sind wir erstmal angekommen."

28 "Auf der Arbeit, also die Deutschen meckern auch manchmal: 'Mensch, hier sind so viele Türken oder so oder Ausländer.' Damit meinen die mich irgendwie nicht [Lachen] und ich fühle mich auch nicht angesprochen. Ja, ich könnt' ja auch ein Fass aufmachen: 'Was? Hast du was gegen Migranten?' Aber ich fühl mich irgendwie nicht [als Migrantin]."

nic German, Sandra's biographical experiences clearly show that her life is settled in Germany: she has her friends and core family, she has a satisfying job that she claims would take her further in her career, and, last but not least, her partner is German. Her pronounced settledness and embeddedness in Berlin make the interest or necessity of post-migration mobility unnecessary. In fact, Sandra's orientation toward mobility is aversive:

"Well, my roots are in Poland. I know that these are my roots, and if I were to die, I would rather be buried in Poland, but I would not want to live there. Weird, right? What a contradiction [laughter]." (ll.182ff)²⁹

Sandra's aversion to mobility is directed toward her country of origin, Poland. She indeed acknowledges her Polish roots, but at the same time does not wish to live there. This is similar to what Vickermann (2002) calls a "transnational consciousness," that is an awareness of ties with the parents' homeland but without concrete transnational engagement. This is opposed to an assimilationist stance that denies this homeland. In Sandra's case, it is less about her parents' homeland, but about her country of origin as she is not a member of the second generation. However, a transnational engagement is not completely absent from Sandra's narrative. Sandra visits Poland regularly, which is according to Wessendorf (2013) a transnational activity. Yet, in terms of mobility practices, which I have defined as (*temporally-restricted*) *relocations of one's center of life*, transnational mobility is non-existent and in Sandra's life course and neither does she seek it: Poland is a place good enough to be dead, but not for living. Sandra herself admits that her wish to be buried there may not be consistent with her wish not to live there, not even for a restricted amount of time (ll.692). Until death, she wants to remain in Germany and, in this way, give her descendants the possibility of completing Sandra's assimilation efforts. We can assume that, as a mother, Sandra will teach her children German so that German can be legitimately their "mother tongue"³⁰ and that her children will have German-sounding names. Certainly, Sandra is an individual who lives a sedentary life in Berlin following her immigration in order to—according to my interpretation—complete her assimilation project within subsequent generations. Similar to Sandra, we shall now get

29 "Also, meine Wurzeln sind in Polen. Ich weiss, dass es meine Wurzeln sind, und würde ich sterben, würde ich lieber in Polen beerdigt werden. Das schon. Aber ich würde dort nicht leben wollen. Komisch, ne? Was für ein Widerspruch [Lachen]."

30 Conversely, it does not mean that she won't teach them to speak Polish.

to know Janusz, who at first remains immobile in Berlin, but for quite different reasons.

3.3 JANUSZ, PART I: “THE ONE WHO SPEAKS POLISH WORSE THAN HIS BROTHER”

Janusz is a young adult of thirty-three years who was living in Berlin when I interviewed him. I got in touch with him through my gatekeeper who gave me his contact details. He was open to my inquiry and we arranged an appointment for the interview straight away. The correspondence was short and unproblematic. We met in a quiet and empty café in the area around his neighbourhood, on 6 May, 2014. Our get-together was quite regular: after introducing ourselves, Janusz asked me some questions about my study before the interview started. After I posed my initial question, he fell into a narrative mode immediately. The interview lasted two hours and three minutes.

Janusz autobiographical narrative is a detailed summary of his life, in which he also reflects about the events and situations he has been telling me about. His life course differs from the ones analyzed before as it is based on different pre-conditions. His narrative focuses less on integration into Germany. In contrast to Anja and Sandra, Janusz does not have his own experience of immigration as he was born in Germany. In view of my study interest, I divide the analysis of his narrative into two parts. I have identified these parts based on a specific *key moment* in his life that opened up new future possibilities for him and changed his further life-path. In this section, however, I will deal with the first part of his narrative. The second one will be part of the next empirical section. In the first part, however, Janusz focuses his narrative on language and language education. We shall now see how he constructs a narrative about his life experiences, in which *the lack of language education* plays a significant role.

Two Educational Models in a Bi-Ethnic Family

Janusz has Polish roots, indeed, but with respect to my understanding of migration and mobility it would be too odd to state that he is a migrant in Germany. Following the definition of the *Mikrozensus* (2013: 6), Janusz falls under the category of “persons with a migration background,” and more specifically, he would be categorized as a “not immigrated German.” (*nicht zugewanderter Deutsche*, *ibid.*: 578) We might think that it would be the same as to simply call him a German, but the crucial difference is, by definition, that one of his parents

was born outside of Germany, and in his case, in Poland. Accordingly, Janusz father is a Pole and his mother is a German (I.17). He tells me the story of how his parents met. Janusz's mother grew up in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) in East Berlin. In GDR times, many schools offered East-European language classes of countries with whom they maintained a so-called "friendship between nations." (*Volksfreundschaft*) (II.21-24) Therefore, Janusz's mother learned Polish for several years and developed an affinity for the language, the country, and the people:

"She started learning Polish very early and developed a certain affinity and then she travelled a lot and [...] then she developed a network, a circle of friends, and through that she later [...] met my father when she was in her 20's." (II.27-30)³¹

Through the acquirement of the Polish language, Janusz's mother was able to travel to Poland where she met new people. It so happened that she met her husband-to-be in the wake of her mobility experiences. Janusz's mother soon got pregnant and the couple got married. Janusz's father then moved to East Germany, where Janusz's brother was born first and two years later Janusz himself (II.33-41). He was brought up in a bi-ethnic household until the age of 6, when his parents separated in 1987 (I.48). The educational language model, which his parents followed, is particularly striking in Janusz's narrative about his life course: it not only required an idea of how to educate the children language-wise, but the parents also put forward two different models of (language) education for each of their sons. Since the Polish language skills of Janusz's mother were quite proficient, the family mainly spoke Polish within the household at first. For Janusz's brother, the situation turned out as follows:

"Within the household, my parents talked to each other in Polish until my birth and so my brother was educated in Polish at home. He learned German through the German grandparents and the kindergarten [...] as far as the family legends and family histories go, he spoke Polish first than German." (II.70-74)³²

31 "Sie hat also sehr früh Polnisch angefangen zu lernen und eine gewisse Affinität [entwickelt] und ist dann viel gereist und [...] entwickelte dann ein Netzwerk, ein Freundeskreis und dadurch hat sie dann später [...] in den 20ern meinen Vater kennengelernt."

32 "Meine Eltern [haben] bis zur meiner Geburt Polnisch miteinander gesprochen im Haushalt und mein Bruder wurde also auch zu Hause Polnisch erzogen. [Er] hat Deutsch über die deutschen Großeltern, über den Kindergarten [gelernt] [...] soweit

Janusz's parents continued his brother's Polish language education and sent him to a Polish school in addition to the general school system in East Germany. The GDR provided extra-curriculum language schools for some other communist nations, such as Poland (II.78-85) and his parents took up this offer for his brother. When Janusz was born, however, his parents had the idea to put forward a different language model: "My mother spoke in her language, in German, to me and my father spoke in Polish to me. That was the idea." (II.87f)³³ Yet, this idea was not put into practice as he remembers always having spoken German with his father (II.93). Consequently, Janusz did not acquire Polish to the same degree as his elder brother (I.90). As mentioned before, the lack of Polish language skills is very present in Janusz's narrative about his life course; not least because it takes a certain turn later on.

Janusz has had conversations with his father about the upbringing he and his brother each had. He was wanting to know why the initial idea failed:

"According to his recollection, [my father] said that it was much easier to speak German with me, because he felt that I didn't understand Polish very well. He said, he didn't have patience and it was more important for him to communicate with me quickly, rather than to be consistent, so to speak." (II.125-128)³⁴

Janusz has been preoccupied for quite some time over the fact that he cannot speak Polish, otherwise he would rather have not touched on the topic. As a result, the brothers had different language proficiencies, even though Janusz's parents also sent him to the Polish language school, but he stopped after six months (I.609). It was easier for him to communicate in German. As a child, he basically developed a defensive attitude toward communicating in Polish:

"[...] I also spoke Polish very reluctantly as a child. I always tried to escape from it, which is, of course, related to the fact that I was not able to [speak the language]. And you feel so powerless as a child, right, at least that is the way I see it. Of course, language is a very

die Familienlegende und Familiengeschichten es immer beschreiben, [hat er] auch erst Polnisch gesprochen als Deutsch."

33 "Meine Mutter hat in ihrer Sprache, also in Deutsch, zu mir gesprochen und mein Vater hat in Polnisch zu mir gesprochen. So war die Idee."

34 "[Mein Vater] meinte in der Rückerinnerung, dass es viel einfacher war dann schon mit mir Deutsch zu sprechen, weil er das Gefühl hatte, ich hatte Polnisch nicht so gut verstanden. Er meinte, er habe keine Geduld gehabt und es war für ihn wichtiger dann schnell mit mir zu kommunizieren, anstatt dann sozusagen konsequent zu sein."

important instrument in the social world and if you cannot express yourself, then you are so degraded.” (II.102-106)³⁵

Janusz was often confronted with situations where others communicated in Polish. These memories are negative ones: He remembers that he did not at all like to speak Polish and that he always tried to get away from it. He felt uncomfortable. His denial of Polish has been based on the feeling of powerlessness and degradation, as Janusz explains *ex post*. It was nurtured by the fact that he was just not able to express himself. Those situations, in which he was exposed to the Polish language, promoted a set of psychological factors, which linked the Polish language with negative emotions. The negative emotions of powerlessness and degradation solidified during his childhood:

“During my childhood, we were also often in Poland [...] as long as my parents were married [...] we were always there in the summer for several weeks, sometimes without our parents, I think.” (II.140-143)³⁶

During Janusz’s childhood years, the family often visited relatives in Poland. The brothers would spend their whole summer holidays there. Even when their parents had to go back to work, they stayed with their grandparents (II.144). This kind of “holiday transnationalism” (Wessendorf 2013: 33) and spending so much time in a Polish-speaking environment was stressful for Janusz, even though his elder brother always translated for him (I.623f). Nevertheless, his family teased him about his lack of Polish. Interestingly, the boys held Polish citizenship up until their parents separated and the *Wende* occurred: the German turnaround and the reunification of Germany. Janusz’s German grandmother made fun of him, imagining a future scenario, in which Janusz would have to struggle due to his lack of Polish language skills:

35 “[...] Ich [sprach] auch sehr ungern Polnisch als Kind. Ich habe mich da sehr dem versucht immer zu entziehen und was natürlich auch damit zusammenhängt: Ich konnte es auch nicht. Und [...] so meine Erklärung, man fühlt sich als Kind so machtlos, ne. Sprache ist natürlich ein ganz wichtiges Instrumentarium in so ‘ner sozialen Welt und wenn man sich nicht ausdrücken kann, dann ist man so degradiert.”

36 “Wir waren ja auch viel in meiner Kindheit in Polen [...] solange meine Eltern verheiratet waren [...] wir waren immer im Sommer mehrere Wochen dort, teilweise auch ohne unsere Eltern, glaube ich.”

“She then alluded to my non-existent Polish that I will be left empty-handed, because I would have to serve in the Polish army eventually. This was my greatest fear as a child.” (II.266-269)³⁷

Jansz’ grandmother painted a picture of his future, which scared him very much. What was meant as a joke, ended up being a “horror scenario” in Janusz’s childhood and most likely contributed to his dissociation from one of his cultural origins.

Marginalizing “Polishness”

Janusz was certainly familiar with the Polish environment, but he never understood it as a part of himself:

“Polish has become a marginal phenomenon, which was not entirely unfamiliar to me [...] but it was rather ‘the other.’ I conceived of Polish rather as ‘the other’ and [...] never as a part of me.” (II.136ff)³⁸

People around him would often speak Polish, but Janusz himself would not. The language he used was German. He always perceived Polish as “the other” language, which he was not unfamiliar with, but which he did not see as a part of himself. After his parents separated, Janusz and his brother still travelled to Poland with their father, but the language fell out of daily use (II.149-151). Puberty was a particularly decisive life phase, in which Janusz wanted to do his own thing. He withdrew more and more from any Polish influences:

“You become adolescent, you become a teenager, and then you get an incentive to do your own thing. [...] Perhaps because I never spoke Polish, I was not interested. I continued to distance myself more and more, I didn’t necessarily want to have anything to do with it.” (II.153-155)³⁹

37 “Sie hat dann angespielt auf mein nichtexistentes Polnisch, dass ich ja irgendwann das Nachsehen habe, weil ich werde am Ende ja irgendwann in der polnischen Armee dienen müssen. Das war immer als Kind meine große Angst.”

38 “Das Polnische [ist] zu einer Randerscheinung [geworden], die mir zwar nicht vollkommen unvertraut war, die [...] aber doch eher das Andere war. Ich habe das Polnische doch eher als was Anderes begriffen und [...] nie als ein Teil von mir.”

39 “Man wird dann pubertär, man wird dann jugendlich, man kriegt dann auch so einen Anreiz sein eigenes Ding zu machen. [...] Vielleicht weil ich auch nie Polnisch

His interest in the Polish part of his heritage decreased continually. He not only visited his relatives in Poland less and less, but at one point he completely stopped (ll.168f). As a teenager, Janusz would not even mention his Polish roots:

“I never liked this ‘Polishness’ as a child and teenager. I met friends, and I never mentioned it. [...] Only very close friends knew about it, those who also entered into my family world. They knew I had a Polish father, but otherwise, I have never discussed it with my friends. It was as if I wanted to ban it.” (ll.653-658)⁴⁰

Other people, and even his circle of friends—except for a few exceptions did not know of Janusz’s Polish roots. He intentionally concealed this biographical fact from others. As he states himself, he was eager to “ban” it from his everyday life in Germany. In a way, he was ashamed of it (ll.660), but—according to his *ex post* reflection—not because he feared being stereotyped by others, but rather because he connoted it with a kind of pressure and expectation, that he did not feel able to fulfill (ll.667ff). Janusz did not go to Poland for many years. He was still in touch with his father, with whom he spoke German, but he basically broke off contact with his relatives in Poland. He refused to go there due to his lack of the Polish language: “I didn’t go there for years. It was more and more so, because I had no desire to encounter this lack of understanding in the very strict sense.” (ll.208ff)⁴¹

In the interim, Janusz’s life in Germany proceeded quite normally. First, he completed his education in Berlin with the certificate of *Abitur*. Then, he “was lucky to have been rejected as unfit for military duty” (ll.307), but did not know what to do professionally. Janusz took a year off to try out different internships. It was at this point in time that he attempted to learn Polish of his own volition: “At one point of time, I started to take a test course at the community college [...]. [The idea] emerged out of a conversation with my brother, I think, if I re-

sprach, mich hat es nicht so interessiert, ich habe mich immer weiter distanziert davon, wollte auch nicht unbedingt was damit zu tun haben.”

40 “Ich mochte als Kind und Jugendlicher, ich mochte nie auch dieses ‘Polnisch-Sein.’ Ich habe Freunde kennengelernt, und ich habe das nie erwähnt. Das fiel immer runter. [...] Es wusste nur ganz enge Freunde, die auch eingedrungen sind in meine familiäre Welt. Die wussten, dass ich einen polnischen Vater hatte, aber ansonsten, ich habe es mit meinen Freunden auch nie thematisiert. Es ist wie als ob ich das verbannen wollte.”

41 “Ich bin ja seit Jahren nicht mehr hingefahren aus diesem Grund immer mehr, weil ich keine Lust hatte, auf dieses Unverständnis im eigentlichen Sinne zu stoßen.”

member correctly [4sec].” (ll.179-182)⁴² He only attended the class for a few months because he considered it to be of no great use (l.183). Since his knowledge re-activated very fast, the class for beginners was not challenging enough for him. Retrospectively, he assesses the class as “didactically unconvincing” (l.188) and so he stopped. In the further course of his life, he decided to study history, political science, and economics (l.193) and moved from Berlin to Greifswald. For the time being, Janusz’s student years signified a biographical “cut” in which he did not concern himself with Poland or the Polish language until toward the end of his studies (ll.189ff). In this first part his story, the lack of his Polish language skills and the outcomes of it in the form of a loss of Polish cultural and familial ties dominate Janusz’s narrative about his life. However, this is not to last as Janusz develops a strong will to learn what he was initially denied and also denied himself.

3.4 IMMOBILITY: INCORPORATION, AVERSION, AND SEDENTARINESS

The results of analyzing these three life stories show us that *language*, a *sense of belonging* and *family structures* play a role in the respondents’ narratives about their immobile experiences of being in the world. These discourses interrelate with experiences about integration, aversion, and predominant post-migration sedentariness. Anja constructs contrasting imaginaries about her country of origin and her country of arrival, in which she rejects her Polish cultural heritage and puts forward a strong sense of belonging toward Canada. Constructing senses of belonging, however, is not necessarily an “either/or question.”

While both Anja and Sandra are well-integrated into their countries of arrival, they have different relationships toward their countries of origin. They both are quite successful in their career paths and this is something that “non-migrants” and “migrants” alike are usually proud of and like to share, yet for those labelled “migrants” professional success is always interrelated with integration. Conversely, Sandra constructs a narrative about successful and unsuccessful integration, viewing her own process as successful. Adjusting to German society was a mutual project of the whole family. The acquisition of German was so central to this endeavor that the familial roles of the “educators” and “ed-

42 “Irgendwann habe ich so an der Volkshochschule angefangen einen Probekurs zu machen [...]. Es kam aus dem Gespräch mit meinem Bruder, glaube ich, wenn ich mich richtig erinnere [4sec].”

ucated,” were reversed with Sandra’s parents learning German from their children. Once integrated, Sandra puts forward an assimilationist stance on her language use, yet she also makes “ethnic choices” (Waters 1990), but rather reluctantly. By contrast, Janusz’s narrative is not about incorporation. Not least because I choose neither to label him as a “migrant,” nor to call Germany his “country of arrival” only because his father is Polish-born (as the definition of the German federal bureau of statistics indicates). “Country of arrival” and “country of origin” are categories commonly used in migration research, but I doubt their analytical value in Janusz’s life story. Understanding Germany as his “country of arrival” and Poland as his “country of origin” would distort social reality. Germany is certainly Janusz’s country of origin and Poland is also a country where (parts of) his cultural roots lie. Therefore, I argue that Germany as well as Poland both account for his *countries* of origin (“travelling origins,” ch. 5.2).

In addition, all three respondents construct discourses in their narratives, which include more or less strong aversions. Anja is averse to Poland and Polish culture. When I think of Anja retrospectively, I find her reservations about doing an interview with me perfectly understandable, even logical. Now it makes all sense: since she generally rejects her heritage culture, she was probably not thrilled to do an interview that focuses on exactly that: her life as a young adult of Polish heritage in Canada. Anja, however, could proudly display her heritage in a multicultural society like Canada, but she chooses to reject it, which seems “unnecessary” as some of Canada’s federal governments officially perceive Canada as a country without a dominant majority culture (not so in Quebec, ch. 4.2), enabling people with different ethno-cultural backgrounds to be perceived as fully-fledged Canadians. Anja’s rejection of her heritage culture is, according to my interpretation, rather based on the contempt of Poland’s history and policy. Anja has political or ideological reasons for refusing her Polish heritage and she openly proclaims her rejection because her father—as her most important familial attachment figure—is of the same opinion. In fact, Anja’s father was a political refugee, a dissident in the eyes of the former Communist regime in Poland. Her dislike of everything that is Polish therefore is a way to show understanding of her father’s situation and to assure her loyalty toward him. With this in mind, Canada’s policy of multiculturalism appears even more desirable for Anja as it strongly reflects her political attitudes, arguably, not least because Canada accommodated her father and his family. Interestingly, Anja’s life course contains a post-migration mobility experience in the form of a *temporally restricted relocation of her center of life* from Canada to Poland. At first glance, it seems paradoxical: Why would she go to live in a place she rejects? Her going

“abroad” for a year is inconsistent with her aversion toward Poland, yet it is quite consistent with her career ambitions. What is more, Anja maintains social networks in Poland, which can only have been established through her family relationships *in situ*. This “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004) means knowing about professional opportunities and, potentially, moving for them. Besides, Anja’s language skills in Polish are good. She immigrated to Canada at the age of nine. Thus, she attended school in Poland for three years and, accordingly, gained basic writing skills in addition to her oral proficiency in Polish, diminishing the risk of encountering language barriers. Anja left Canada in order to work in a musical in Poland for a year. She thus connects spatial mobility with social mobility. She gained valuable career-related experience, though she is mainly based in Canada. Her aim to become professionally successful outweighed her aversion. In a way, we can understand her temporary move to Poland as a factor contributing to her professional success in Canada, and thus also supporting her integration and social advancement there. In this case, mobility is the means to an end, not the objective.

Sandra, however, avoids mobility experiences, most notably those that would take her to Poland, but also elsewhere. Apart from her initial migration, Sandra’s life takes place in only *one geographical space*, Berlin. She has not experienced any kind of spatial movement (domestic or border-crossing): she never moved out of Berlin. In fact, this kind of immobility is rather rare. Sandra lives a settled life in Berlin where she has everything she needs. Relocating her life center is not a potential possibility for her. Mobility seems out of the question. Sandra maintains transnational connections with her family in Poland and can thus potentially establish social networks there, but she does not activate this “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004) because she lacks an important resource: language, or more precisely, the writing skills in Polish. Going abroad to Poland would mean that Sandra would not be able to work in her profession there, since she works in an administrative profession for which writing skills are key. This kind of capital is simply not available to her because the families’ integration endeavour focused on the acquirement of the German language, leading to a neglect of other languages, namely Polish. Poland, however, does not need to be the only “eligible” destination to which my respondents direct their mobility experiences. But again, Sandra does not have any other foreign language skills, making it difficult for her to pursue a professional life in any country other than Germany. The lack of (foreign) language skills hinders mobility experiences, but her focus on German aids her in her project of upward social mobility in the highly stratified German society. Sandra tries hard to climb the social ladder as becomes obvious when she distances herself from her cousins, who demonstrate

milieu-specific behaviours of a lower class. For her, successful integration is linked with processes of social advancement. In her case, geographical mobility would, arguably, imply a lower social standing due to lack of writing skills in Polish and a general lack of knowledge of foreign languages, but also a lack of social contacts. I interpret Sandra's immobility as a means to improve her social standing in Germany and to prepare the "best conditions" for the intergenerational completion of her assimilation project. In her lifetime, she will not be perceived as culturally-homogeneous, i.e., the *real* German, but her children may. All these factors make sedentariness after migration plausible in her life course. In sum, both young women, Anja and Sandra, fulfill their (parents') original migration project (Juhasz/Mey 2003).

Janusz developed an aversion toward the Polish language. He grew up in a bi-ethnic, and, in fact, in a bilingual family, but he was not bilingually educated. In contrast to his brother, his parents never taught Janusz the Polish language. From early on, he had a defensive attitude toward communicating in Polish. He distanced himself more and more from his Polish cultural roots, which resulted in him breaking off contact with his relatives in Poland for many years. The analysis shows a reversed migration narrative: since Janusz did not immigrate into Germany, he is not struggling to learn German as it is his mother tongue, yet not having learned the language of his other country of origin burdens and restricts him. Janusz does not construct a narrative about integration success or failure, he constructs a narrative about the consequences of the lack of language skills. His lack of the Polish language is a barrier for maintaining ties to the Polish side of his family, and it certainly hinders him from potential mobility experiences to Poland.

Anja, Sandra, and Janusz all incorporate the national discourses of immigration policy of either Canada or Germany, i.e., of that country in which they are sedentary. The effects are often paradoxical, limiting, and even painful. Anja celebrates the Canadian multicultural tolerance of cultures, but she does not tolerate her own heritage culture. It leaves me wondering: what remains of multiculturalism if one refuses one's cultural roots? Conversely, Sandra would like to understand herself as *real* German, not least because she subscribes to the German assimilationist policy, yet she cannot or perhaps she *must not* due to her real name that reveals her heritage to be non-German, *even though* she is integrated. Last but not least, Janusz's discourse is not about integration into Germany, but rather about *disintegration from Poland*. However, he will not leave it at that and this will result into a shift of mobility patterns later in his life course. As we will see in the following, immobility evolves into transmobility.

4 Transmobility: The Transnational Pattern of Mobility

The three life stories of Janusz, Oscar, and Malinka that I will discuss in-depth in this section serve as illustrations of the social phenomenon I have conceptualized as the pattern of transmobility. These life stories will not only instruct us on the variety of biographical circumstances leading to transnational mobility during certain phases of my respondents' life-courses, my analysis will also demonstrate how and when individuals change their mobility practices from one pattern to another. As mentioned earlier, analyzing Janusz's life story is important because his mobility practices change. In this chapter, however, his case reflects the typical biographical constellations, life strategies, and motivations for bi-local mobility. Bi-local mobility means that the mobility practices are directed to two destinations—not random ones, but specific destinations—namely the so-called “country of origin” and “country of arrival” (Poland—Germany/Poland—Canada). It therefore opens a comparative perspective with the pattern of immobility. Oscar's life story, the next case that I will examine in depth here, will instruct us on multi-local transnational mobility. His biographical experiences are symptomatic for the context of Montreal, not Toronto or Germany. Including his life story is essential because it opens up contextual comparisons with the other stories and the other patterns. Last but not least, I include the life story of Malinka. Her life story, like that of Janusz, emphasizes changes to and the evolution of mobility practices over time. She, too, shifts from one pattern of mobility to another. Her story, however, is exceptional in many ways, which serves as a good contrast to the former more typical stories.

Transnational mobility is a heterogeneous post-migration experience. We will now see how my interviewees construct narratives about experiences of suffering or not as the case may be, cultural otherness, and experiences of integration into heterogeneous or multiple contexts, and how these experiences are linked with the border-crossing activity of transnational mobility.

4.1 JANUSZ, PART II: “THE ONE WHO SPEAKS POLISH BETTER THAN HIS BROTHER”

Given the topic of my study, I have divided the analysis of Janusz’s narrative about his life-course in two parts. I have analyzed and discussed the first part in the section above. In this section, I will focus on the second part of his narrative, the one emphasizing a key moment in his life. The analysis will show that the key moment opened up future possibilities that not only changed his familial, educational, and professional direction, but it also triggered a transformation of his mobility practices from “immobility” to “transmobility.”

New Language, New Possibilities

As stated previously, Janusz moved to Greifswald in order to pursue his studies. He remembers this day very well:

“Then I moved, right away [...]. I think it must have been 28 September, 2002. It was a Saturday, it was warm. I arrived in Greifswald in the evening and it was warm and summery.” (ll.322ff)¹

His recollection of this event is impressive. He recalls the exact date of his arrival, the weekday, and the weather. This precision indicates that the event has significance for him on a personal level, not least because it was the first (internal) relocation of his center of life. During his studies, he engaged in social relationships with fellow students, most of whom pursued Slavonic Studies (l.194), and many of whom studied Polish. When these relationships became more established, his friends knew about his Polish origin and they addressed his lack of Polish on several occasions:

“We got to know each other better and then they approached me: ‘[Janusz] why, hey, why can’t you speak Polish? You’re from Poland.’ We were always talking like that. They were very good friends who did Slavonic Studies and who might have been teasing, but they were also saying, ‘Learn Polish.’” (ll.196-200)²

-
- 1 “Dann bin ich umgezogen. Auch sofort. [...] Ich glaube, es muss der 28. September 2002 gewesen sein. Es war ein Samstag, es war warm. Ich kam abends in Greifswald an und es war sommerwarm.”
 - 2 “Wir haben uns ein bisschen besser kennengelernt und dann haben die mich drauf angesprochen: ‘[Janusz], warum, hey, warum kannst du denn kein Polnisch? Du kommst

At first, Janusz perceived it more as a joke, but then around the end of his studies, he reflected upon the issue. He thought to himself that here was an opportunity: he could take advantage of his registered status at the university, which offered good language classes for free. Time also played a role; Janusz knew that, as long as he was still pursuing his studies, he had more time and peace to devote to learning another language (II.206). His new circle of friends motivated him to develop an interest in learning Polish. Retrospectively, he sees his friendships with these persons, who have an affinity for Poland and the Polish language, as “a funny, profitable coincidence.” (I.192) Profitable insofar as he, again, started to attend Polish language classes at the University of Greifswald and this time, he mastered it. However, the influence of his new friends was not the only decisive factor for him in making another attempt to learn Polish. In addition, he reflected about his family relations:

“I thought OK, maybe it would be good to learn Polish. Well, the idea of speaking Polish with my father. What’s with my/with other relatives? I’ve noticed that I haven’t been to Poland in years.” (II.206-209)³

Janusz was aware that his lack of proficiency in Polish influenced his familial relationships; he had lost touch with his relatives in Poland and subsequently did not travel there anymore. Besides, he imagined being able to speak Polish with his father; that was something he was never able to do and apparently wished for. Perhaps he wanted to make his father proud and to strengthen their father-son relationship by communicating in his father’s mother tongue. If Janusz’s interest in his heritage grew, he stresses that it was not in a genealogical sense:

“It was the interest in my heritage, not in the genealogical sense [but] to not tear off the bonds. I don’t want to romanticize, but I think the idea was, for example, I have several aunts and uncles and they were always good contacts in my childhood. Well, it sounds

doch aus Polen.’ Da waren wir immer so im Gespräch. Es waren sehr gute Freunde dabei, die Slawistik studiert haben und die haben mich vielleicht nicht aufgezogen, aber es ist gekommen: ‘Lern doch mal Polnisch.’”

- 3 “Ich dachte mir so ok, vielleicht wäre es nochmal gut Polnisch zu lernen. Also, den Gedanken mit meinem Vater [sich zu] unterhalten [auf Polnisch]. Was ist so mit meiner/mit anderen Verwandten? Ich habe gemerkt, ich bin ja seit Jahren nicht mehr hingefahren [nach Polen].”

paradoxical now, right. [I] told you about expectations, pressure, nevertheless I liked those people.” (II.961-966)⁴

Janusz’s main concern was not to lose contact with his relatives in Poland. Despite his aversion toward the Polish language and the pressure related to it, he likes his Polish relatives. Maintaining the relationship with his favourite aunt and uncle was an important factor in his decision to study the Polish language (II.369-372). He felt sorry for not visiting them because of the language barrier (II.975ff). Janusz must have been about twenty-six or twenty-seven years old when he started to acquire the Polish language again. As before, classes in the first semester were easy for him. Yet, unlike with his first attempt, Janusz did not stop; his interest grew and he continued to take lessons and eventually made progress. Soon after having started the classes, Janusz travelled to Poland for a holiday visit and met with his relatives there. He particularly enjoyed the reunion with his favourite aunt and uncle (II.373ff). The acquirement of the Polish language was far-reaching in his life-path, not only in terms of private interests, e.g., maintaining relationships with his Polish kin, but also in terms of professional orientation:

“Initially, it was purely a private interest [to learn Polish]. Sometime [...] during my studies [...] I still didn’t know [...] What are you actually going to do professionally? Then a thought crossed my mind: OK, why not apply my language skills acquired for personal reasons professionally? And then, very late in my studies, I changed to Eastern European History.” (II.225-228)⁵

With the acquirement of Polish came a professional opportunity, one that had previously remained closed to him. Increased interest and success in learning the

-
- 4 “Das war Interesse für Herkunft, aber nicht [im] genealogischen Sinne, [sondern] im Sinne von die Bindungen nicht abreißen. Ich will es auch nicht romantisieren, aber ich glaube der Gedanke war, z.B. ich habe mehrere Onkel und Tanten und es waren immer gute Kontakte in der Kindheit. Also, es klingt jetzt paradox, ne. [Ich habe] was erzählt von Erwartungen, Druck, nichtsdestotrotz mochte ich diese Menschen.”
 - 5 “Es war am Anfang ein reines privates Interesse [Polnisch zu lernen] [...] Irgendwann [...] im Hauptstudium wusste [ich immer noch nicht] [...] Was machst du jetzt eigentlich so beruflich? Dann kam der Gedanke, ok: Warum nicht verbinden, warum nicht sozusagen meine privaterworbene Sprachkompetenz mit dem Beruflichen verbinden? Und habe dann sehr spät im Studium, dann nochmal so einen Schwenk zur Osteuropageschichte gemacht.”

language offered a way to reorient his studies and perhaps develop more specific professional ambitions. Since his professional path was not determined but still “in the making” during his studies at Greifswald University, Janusz took advantage of another possibility: to go abroad for a semester:

“It was at the end of my studies and I knew I would be finishing in a year, at the latest. It was now or never. I would never again be as free to do this and I had a very specific regional interest, namely Poland. It was easier, otherwise you have to think where to go. It was clear: when it came to going abroad, it was going to be Poland.” (II.1017-1020)⁶

In his penultimate semester before graduating, he made up his mind to go to Poland. Janusz gives two key reasons that account for a stay abroad: first, he anticipated that going abroad later would probably not be as “carefree” were he no longer a student, and, second, he knew where he wanted to go, namely to Poland. In this quote, Janusz implies that he would probably not have gone abroad if it had not been to Poland. Therefore, we can assume that the acquirement or the on-going process of learning Polish enabled him to take advantage of a mobility opportunity. Knowledge of the Polish language granted him “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004) which he was able to make use of in a concrete way. The “timing,” or his life cycle stage, was also crucial in this regard:

“I always wanted to study abroad but it never worked out. There was always something [...] quasi objective reasons, like having a relationship. [...] At that time, I was unattached and professionally free. Other than that, I had always worked a lot during my studies. But here was a moment where I could say, I have no job here and no one is holding me back so I can go.” (II.1013-1023)⁷

-
- 6 “Es war am Ende des Studiums und ich wusste in einem Jahr bin ich spätestens durch. Entweder jetzt oder nie wieder so unbeschwert und ich hatte auch ein ganz konkretes regionales Interesse, nämlich Polen. Es war auch einfacher, sonst muss man überlegen, wo geht man denn hin. So war es klar: wenn es ins Ausland geht, dann nach Polen.”
 - 7 “Ich wollte immer ins Ausland zum Studium und es hat sich nicht ergeben. Es war immer irgendwas [...] quasi objektive Gründe, wie man [hat] gerade eine Beziehung. [...] Ich war in der Zeit gerade ungebunden und beruflich gerade frei, ansonsten habe ich immer viel gearbeitet im Studium, aber es war gerade so eine Phase wo ich sagen konnte, ich habe kein Job hier und keinen der mich hält und kann gehen.” (II.1013-1023)

Janusz's decision to undertake a mobility experience largely depended upon his life phase: he chose to go abroad at a time when he was without significant personal or professional responsibilities. Here, we can note that language proficiency and a particular life phase are the conditions under which "going abroad" evolved into a realistic scenario. His main reason, however, was professional:

"I knew Poland could be professionally important to me so my line of thinking was certainly career motivated. Certainly, I didn't want to look bad and I thought: I want to improve my Polish—and I can't do better than to go there." (ll.1024-1027)⁸

At the end of the day, going abroad to Poland worked out for him, although not everything went according to plan. Initially, Janusz applied to a student association that organizes exchanges between Central and Eastern European countries. He would be attending the University in Cracow. This did not work out (ll.346-351). Then he applied for a semester abroad again; this time through the University of Greifswald, which had Erasmus exchanges with two Polish Universities in Szczecin in Poznan.⁹ Students widely use the Erasmus program as an opportunity to spend a restricted amount of time abroad within the educational institutions of collaborating universities. Janusz was accepted and decided to go to University in Poznan because Szczecin was geographically too close to Greifswald, but also for financial reasons (ll.355-62): in Poznan, he had the possibility of staying at his favourite aunt and uncle's place (ll.366f). What is more, in the meantime his father had moved back to Poland and was living in Poznan as well. In preparation for this semester abroad, Janusz attended intensive language classes and met many new people (including my gatekeeper, ll.402ff). Finally, he spent the academic winter term of 2008/2009 at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan. At that point in time, he was twenty-eight years old.

8 "Ich wusste Polen ist mir beruflich wichtig und das ist auf einmal auch so ein Karrieredenken gewesen. Ich will natürlich jetzt auch nicht schlecht dastehen und es war auch der Gedanke: Ich will mein Polnisch verbessern—und wie kann ich es besser verbessern als dort."

9 The Erasmus program is a support program of the European Union for student mobility. Since 2014, Erasmus merged with other programs and is now officially called *Erasmus Plus*. For further information about the mobility stipends for students, see the homepage of the European Commission: <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus>

Transnationalising Relationships

Once Janusz arrived in Poland, he experienced a new way of living:

“Then I moved in [with my aunt and uncle]. They had a guest room and then I lived there for one term and I enjoyed the whole thing that Polish students have at home if they live with their mom and dad, so this whole full service, from cooking food up to doing my laundry and vacuuming my room. So, I felt a bit like I was transported back. No, totally wicked, even my mother had never done something like that for us. It was again a very different experience.” (II.376-381)¹⁰

Janusz alludes here to the differences in the “student lives” of German and Polish students.

Student Life in Germany

Students in Germany more often move away from their hometown to pursue their studies in another city, and if not, students mostly do not live with their parents anymore but rather in residence halls, or in a flat shared with fellow students (*Wohngemeinschaften*), with their partners, or alone. Most of the time, beginning a university education is the first time a young adult learns to live alone, to be independent, if not financially then at least in the way of housework. Another difference that some interviewees mentioned is that students usually work outside of their studies (often in so-called *Minijobs*)¹¹ in Germany, whereas this would be an exception in Poland. Yet, we should not forget to perceive these differences while keeping in mind the slogan “the exception proves the rule.”

10 “Dann bin ich eingezogen [bei meiner Tante und meinem Onkel]. Die hatten ein Gästezimmer und dann habe ich dort ein Semester lang gewohnt und durfte das ganze genießen, was polnische Studierende bei sich zu Hause haben, wenn sie bei Mama und Papa wohnen, also diesen ganzen Full-Service vom Essen kochen bis hin zum Wäschewaschen und mein Zimmer saugen. Also, ich habe mich ein bisschen gefühlt wie zurückversetzt. Nee, so krass, selbst meine Mutter hat sowas nie für uns gemacht. Es war nochmal eine ganz andere Erfahrung.”

11 *Minijobs* are employments which are deduction-free for employees who earn up to 400 Euros a month.

He indicates that students in Poland often live with their parents during their studies when they study in the same city. Their parents generally provide and take care of everyday tasks, such as cooking, washing, and cleaning. Janusz, however, was not at all used to this kind of “full service” that his aunt and uncle suddenly provided him with. This becomes particularly apparent in his colloquial statement, “totally wicked” (“*so krass*”). He points out that his mother had never done that for him and his brother, indicating a cultural difference or a difference in gender roles. Janusz felt that he was taken back to the past, and thereby invoking a cultural disposition that seems to be less modern than he was used to. Due to his living arrangements, he was able to improve his Polish greatly as he spoke Polish with his relatives every day. What is more, he got to know the city of Poznan for himself; a different city opened up to him than the one he encountered during childhood (II.381-388). He also established new social relationships, though mostly not with other Erasmus students as—according to Janusz—they were a lot younger than him and due to his living arrangements and his classes, he basically had less opportunities to meet them. Janusz was already in his late twenties when he went abroad, while most of the other Erasmus-students were in their early twenties. Besides, he did not live in residence halls and did not attend the classes for Erasmus-students (II.392-399). Instead, he met with people whom he got to know in his language preparation seminars and others, whom he met through his familial networks (II.405-412).

Janusz saw his aunt and uncle on a daily basis and he also saw his father on a regular basis. Being impudently curious, I asked Janusz why he was not living with his father. In the first moment, he was reluctant, but then he answered my inquiry, which touches on a very personal issue:

“There were several reasons [why I did not live with my father]. [...] Yeah, it had nothing to do with my father, but more so with his new wife. My father re-married and she and I are not on the best of terms.” (II.420ff)¹²

We learn that the relationship between Janusz and his father’s new wife is somewhat conflictual, but we do not learn why. Certainly, it leaves room for speculation, but Janusz did not give any further information on that topic. Although father and son were not living under the same roof, their relationship continued, and, in fact, changed significantly. They met frequently while Janusz was

12 “Hatte verschiedene Gründe [dass ich nicht bei meinem Vater gewohnt habe]. [...] Ja, es hat nichts mit meinem Vater zu tun, sondern eher so mit seiner neuen Frau. Mein Vater hat nochmal geheiratet und da sind die Beziehungen nicht die besten.”

in Poznan and they got to know each other in another way: before it would have been a father-son relationship, while during his semester abroad it turned into a kind of friendship: they would go for a drink together, watch a movie, go to a jazz concert (II.423-429). He recalls this time as being very nice. If their continuous getting-together intensified their relationship, the following changed:

“Until my semester abroad, we spoke in German. [...] During the semester abroad we switched [...] we had tried to speak Polish when I started to learn [...] [but] I lacked vocabulary [...]. Yes, and in the semester abroad it was hundred percent and since then we actually speak Polish, with some very rare exceptions.” (II.429-439)¹³

Once Janusz started to communicate in Polish with his father, he tells me, he observed a sparkle in his fathers’ eyes (I.1070). His father was proud: “He was just what one would call proud. I think the term is often misused, but here it’s like a kind of bliss.” (II.1067ff)¹⁴ Janusz indicates that, by learning the language, he was able to make his father very happy. It appears to have been something Janusz was striving for, and he managed to make it possible. Since his semester abroad and up to the moment of the interview, he mostly spoke Polish with his father, unless—and that is the exception Janusz indicated—his elder brother is present. His brother almost always speaks German, except when a third party present cannot speak German. This happens for instance, when they get together with their Polish relatives (II.1075ff). Interestingly, the linguistic roles between the brothers reversed: during their childhood, it was Janusz who rejected Polish and now it is his brother. This reversed situation also underlines the fact that Janusz is more fluent in Polish now than his elder brother who at one point during puberty no longer wished to attend Polish school, refusing to speak Polish altogether (II.601-607).

In sum, Janusz has reached his goal: he improved his Polish language skills so as to communicate with his father and his relatives in Poland. Due to his newly acquired language skills and his mobility experience to Poland, Janusz transformed and, in fact, transnationalized many of his social relationships. By now,

13 “Wir haben bis zu meinem Auslandssemester Deutsch geredet miteinander. [...] Im Auslandssemester sind wir geswitched [...] also wir haben vorher versucht immer wieder mal Polnisch zu reden als ich angefangen habe zu lernen [...] [aber] mein Wortschatz reichte nicht aus [...] Ja, und im Auslandssemester war es dann zu 100% und seitdem reden wir mit einigen ganz wenigen Ausnahmen eigentlich Polnisch.”

14 “Er war einfach nur das was man stolz nennt. Ich finde der Begriff ist ja oft falsch verwendet, aber hier ist es sowas wie eine Glückseligkeit irgendwie.”

he has significant relationships in Germany as well as in Poland and is therefore embedded in various social circles in both countries. His mobility to Poland has been a temporally restricted border-crossing relocation of his center of life. After six months, Janusz returned to Greifswald and graduated from university with a master's thesis on a Polish-German subject (I.447). As we will see, he was not to stay in Germany for too long.

The Mobile Search for a Profession

Once Janusz was back in Greifswald, it took him another semester to graduate from university. He finished his studies in January 2010 and in February 2010 he was back in Poland. When he started to improve his Polish language skills more and more, he had seen an offer to do an internship in the Polish parliament (*Sejm*). He applied for this internship once he was back in Greifswald and he was lucky to be selected (II.451-456). So, he moved back to Poland, this time to Warsaw:

“[I] also got to experience Warsaw. Then, generally, an intense phase of Poland began again, right. Again, getting to know a completely different Poland, again meeting new people.” (II.457ff)¹⁵

Janusz's memories of this internship are consistently positive. He hoped to be able to stay in Warsaw after the internship was over and to find a job (II.460f). As his plan did not work out, he had to come back to Germany. He relocated his center of life from Warsaw back to Berlin, where he ended up being unemployed. In August 2010, he received welfare from the German unemployment benefit system (*Hartz IV*) until February 2011 when he got a job in Stralsund. He had heard of the position through contacts from Greifswald which is not far away from Stralsund. His application was successful: “Then my new job began. Surprisingly, in a German-Polish project [laughter].” (II.481f)¹⁶ By using irony, Janusz indicates that it was not exactly surprising that he found a job in a Polish-German project, which was about coordinating several events for a German-

15 “[Ich habe] auch Warschau nochmal kennengelernt. Dann fing so eine Phase generell an, nochmal ein intensives Polen, ne. Nochmal was ganz Anderes von Polen kennenlernen, nochmal neue Leute kennenlernen.”

16 “Dann [fing] mein neuer Job an. Überraschenderweise in einem deutsch-polnischem Projekt [Lachen].”

Polish audience (II.496f). At first, he depicted the application and acceptance of the position as driven by professional reasons; yet, he later mentioned personal reasons, which very likely influenced his decision to move out of Berlin:

“Back then, I had a long-distance relationship, so all was somehow quite good. My girlfriend at the time was also in Greifswald. OK, so back I went [...]. She was Polish, and I met her through these German-Polish things.” (II.486-490)¹⁷

It becomes clear that his internal relocation was not only professionally motivated, but also worked out well for him on a personal level. Janusz moved to Greifswald and commuted to Stralsund to work. We notice that while Janusz stayed in Germany, he in fact, increasingly incorporated German-Polish relations into his everyday life: he transnationalized (and therefore transformed) his social relationships in Poland and, later, in Germany. Transnational scholars would probably argue that his quotidian life evolved into and is now structured by a transnational social space (or field). This becomes apparent in both his professional and private life at that time.

The position in Stralsund was limited to one year, which soon forced Janusz to look for another position. Anyhow, he was dissatisfied with this job and he did not feel as though he were in good hands there (I.498). That is when he started thinking about doing a Ph.D. He was looking for a challenge: “[...] but honestly, through this professional experience, I realized that I felt bored by all that and that I needed something that challenged me.” (I 505)¹⁸ He then started to work on a dissertation proposal to apply for a Ph.D. position. Since he was working a lot, it took time to write the proposal. His writing motivation increased immediately when he saw a job advertisement in Munich:

“In one weekend [I] knocked together an exposé [...] Sit down, I said to myself, try to write yourself into this advertisement. Lucky me, somehow, they invited me [to the interview].” (II.522ff)¹⁹

17 “Ich hatte damals auch eine Fernbeziehung, also das war irgendwie alles auch ganz gut. Meine damalige Freundin war auch in Greifswald. Ok, also zurück [...]. [Es war] auch eine polnische Freundin, die ich auch durch diese deutsch-polnischen Sachen kennengelernt habe.”

18 “[...] Aber ehrlich, durch die Erfahrung im Berufsleben habe ich festgestellt, mich langweilt das alles irgendwie und ich brauche irgendwas was mich fordert.”

19 “In so einer Wochenend-Aktion [habe ich] ein Exposé zusammengezimmert. [...] Setz’ dich mal hin, habe ich mir gesagt, versuche dich in diese Ausschreibung hinein-

In Munich, a new doctoral program focusing on German-Polish research questions was just opening up (I.521I). Janusz was admitted to the program, but without funding. Since Janusz did not have a better opportunity at that time, he accepted the proposition and commuted to Munich while still working in Stralsund. Janusz underlines that he did not need to go to Munich every day or every week, but a couple times in a month to take part in workshops (II.533-538). He evaluates his attendance in the doctoral program as intensive and motivating for elaborating his research proposal. Eventually, he got an invitation to another doctoral program, in Frankfurt (Oder), which offered funding. Janusz tells me that the decision to go to Frankfurt (Oder) was not an easy one: he had met nice colleagues and professors in Munich, but—at the end of the day—he did the “rational thing.” He then moved back to Berlin. When asked why he moved to Berlin instead of Frankfurt (Oder), Janusz responded that commuting between Berlin and Frankfurt (Oder) is something many people do (fifty minutes train ride). Besides, living in Frankfurt did not appeal to him: he sees Frankfurt (Oder) as a stigmatized place (II.555ff). His position started in January 2012 and since then he has been working on his doctoral thesis, which deals with the local administration in Communist Poland and how it contributed to stabilizing and maintaining communist dominance (II.574ff). We could say that such a topic provides another kind of “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004) because it opens up further mobility experiences to Poland, which are directly linked to his research activities. Doing research on such a topic is not restricted to only one geographical space. In fact, Janusz is back and forth between Germany and Poland:

“Last year I was working in the archives in Poland a lot. So [I] was mainly in Poland last year; more than I was in Germany. This year I have to write more, so [I have] to be more in Germany than in Poland, although at the end of the year the goal is to be more in the archives [in Poland] again.” (II.582ff)²⁰

He continuously relocates his center of life between Germany and Poland without officially moving from one country to the other. These circular movements

zuschreiben. Glück gehabt, irgendwie haben sie mich eingeladen [zum Vorstellungsgespräch].”

- 20 “Letztes Jahr war ich viel dafür in Archiven in Polen. [Ich] war also letztes Jahr mehrheitlich in Polen; mehr als in Deutschland. Dieses Jahr muss ich mehr schreiben, also mehr in Deutschland sein als in Polen, obwohl am Endes des Jahres ist das Ziel wieder mehr in die Archive [nach Polen].”

are incorporated into his professional activity. In his previous job, Janusz also dealt with Poland, but did not practice geographical mobility to Poland. His current research would be unfeasible without geographical mobility to Poland. In sum, his life course is characterized by border-crossing activities. Since Janusz acquired the Polish language, he has increasingly practiced geographical mobility. Learning the Polish language was a *key moment* in his life in many ways. It was a turning point, which, I assume, changed his life-path significantly. Acquiring the language was initially intended to serve personal interests, namely to reconnect with the Polish side of his family, but then the language acquirement also became central to his professional endeavours. Profession and mobility have become entangled. As we have seen, his geographical mobility experiences combine domestic and border-crossing spatial movements. Up until now, his mobility has been voluntary: he *carried out* as opposed to *underwent* geographical mobility. Certainly, it is transnational, and to be more precise, it consists of bi-local movements between Germany and Poland.

Janusz's mobility, however, is not the only one standing out in this life story: the mobility of Janusz's father also shines through Janusz's narrative. At one point in his narrative, Janusz even mentions that his father is a "mobile guy." (l.626) In one passage of his narration, he tells me about how his father advised him to study. Janusz assumes that his father wanted him to have better professional possibilities than he has had (l.782f). In this context of the narration, Janusz indicates that his father's mobility evolved under different circumstances than his own and it thus takes on another shape:

"You have to do something with your life, not like me [...] the one who was back and forth between different worlds, did everything, but nothing real and eventually ended up doing different jobs [...] he has managed it well." (ll.786-789)²¹

Except for the last sentence, Janusz puts himself in the speaking role of his father. The quote is an imitation of his fathers' speech, in which he underlines that his father was "back and forth between different worlds." His transnational mobility between Germany and Poland is actually not so different from Janusz's mobility practices; yet, what Janusz implies that the difference is in the intentionality of mobility experiences. While Janusz integrates mobility into his professional tasks, his father needed to integrate or rather find new jobs *ad hoc* eve-

21 "Du musst doch was aus deinem Leben machen, nicht so wie ich hier ... der [...] zwischen verschiedenen Welten rumtingelte, alles Mögliche machte, nichts Richtiges und irgendwann bei ganz anderen Jobs landete [...] er hat das gut hinbekommen."

ry time he was geographically mobile. In a way, we can assume that Janusz's mobility is somewhat more deliberate, but more striking, is his father speaking about his social status. At the end of the day, we can grasp a discourse about social advancement, more precisely, about Janusz's father's wish for his son to be upwardly (socially) mobile. In fact, Janusz uses his mobility to improve his social position (by finishing his thesis), while we can assume that, in the case of his father, mobility may have often implied a lowering of his former status. To some extent, we could say that Janusz follows in his father's mobile footsteps. Transnational mobility plays an essential role in Janusz's life. His future plans and wishes are marked by it:

"Do I see myself in the German-Polish realm? [...] Somehow, I've done a lot for the German-Polish realm. [...] It is not as if I say: 'Oh, I have to do something with Germany or Poland.' That's not the point. I would like to work in Poland. I always wanted to do it. Except for internships, it never worked out in Poland. It was a bit of a shame. I never succeeded." (II.1263-1268)²²

On the one hand, Janusz does not want to force himself to continue his border-crossing activities in the German-Polish social space. On the other hand, he would like to accomplish his desire to work in Poland, a wish he has not yet been able to fulfill. In fact, he incorporates mobility into his future plans. Mobility is the precondition of his wish to work in Poland someday. Being curious about the duration of this "envisaged mobility scenario," the following dialogue developed between us:

A.W.: "So, you would actually consider working in Poland?"

Janusz: "For a while, yes"

A.W.: "For which period of time?"

Janusz: "Five years or so. Everything under one year is not really enough time."

A.W.: "What about forever?"

22 "Sehe ich mich im deutsch-polnischen Bereich? [...] Irgendwie habe ich ja viel dafür gemacht als ich lange dort war. [...] Es ist nicht so, dass ich jetzt sage: 'Oh, ich muss was mit Deutschland oder mit Polen machen.' Das ist nicht der Punkt. Ich würde gerne in Polen arbeiten. Das wollte ich immer mal. Das habe ich—außer so Praktika—habe ich nie in Polen gearbeitet. Das war ein bisschen schade. Es [ist mir] nie gelungen."

Janusz: "I don't know. If it turns out to be forever; that's another thing. That would be the result of certain life circumstances." (II.1269-1278)²³

Interestingly, Janusz has no clear idea about the time-span of his "envisaged mobility" to Poland. He does not want to stay for too short a period of time. He wants to spend a certain unspecified amount of time working in Poland; yet, he is also not opposed to spending the rest of his life there. This, however, strongly depends upon his prospective life-path.

Cultural Irritations under the Condition of Mobility

Due to his numerous mobility experiences between Germany and Poland, Janusz not only navigates between two countries, he also navigates between two cultures and societies. In his narration, he often talks about the differences he encounters and how he negotiates or simply rejects certain cultural elements or social norms. He needs to manage several cultural repertoires and selectively engages in transnational activities. Typically, he sees a difference in the way Polish and German families get together and celebrate. In a German nuclear family, the celebrations are rather plain, while Polish families generally celebrate with a lot of food, drinks, and with many family members and friends (II.880-884). While Janusz enjoys the family celebrations in Poland, he encounters other differences that are more difficult to deal with. One example is his observation of divergent "life concepts." In Poland, Janusz tells me, he is often asked when he will get married and start a family. This happens most often within the realm of his familial relationships. For such situations, he developed a strategy by not engaging in these discussions (II.898). Most of his Polish relatives cannot relate to his way of life:

"Having kids and the like. If you were to say that this is not part of the plan. Then [...] you get the shaking heads. I do not address it, except with my aunt who's just really so close. She is the only person in Poland [with whom I talk about these things]." (II.708ff)²⁴

23 A.W.: "Also, du würdest das schon in Betracht ziehen [in Polen zu arbeiten]?"

Janusz: "Für eine gewisse Zeit, ja."

A.W.: "Was soll das für ein Zeitraum sein?"

Janusz: "Fünf Jahre oder so. Alles unter einem Jahr ist keine richtige Zeit."

A.W.: "Auch nicht für immer?"

Janusz: "Das weiß man nicht, wenn es für immer wird, das ist eine andere Sache. Das ergibt sich dann aus dem Leben heraus."

He only talks with his aunt about such sensitive topics as they have developed a very close relationship. Arguably, his aunt may be more understanding about this matter as she and her husband do not have any children themselves. Being approached by his Polish relatives illustrates that social expectations and what is considered to be the norm in Poland also affects Janusz; at least to the extent that he needs to justify himself. This topic is potentially a conflicting one, because Janusz has a slightly different “life concept” in mind. He experiences similar reactions with regard to his professional situation of writing a dissertation and being a doctoral candidate. Some of his Polish relatives welcome his decision to do a Ph.D. while others ask when he will finally start to earn a living:

“It is a totally different perspective [in Poland] even if the [perspective] is also problematic in Germany, because also in Germany one has to justify oneself for doing a Ph.D. and how long it takes. But it is more acknowledged [...] and in Poland, if you are a Ph.D. student, you are a student and you’re a child somehow and [...] everyone asks when you will start working. When will you begin to live properly? You have to make money.”²⁵

Janusz feels that his Polish family does not perceive his dissertation as “serious grown-up work.” They rather link it with student life, in which the young people earn no money, and are not yet grown up. We could assume that Janusz’s Polish family does not strongly value such educational efforts and be tempted to link this attitude to a lower-class status. In fact, Janusz mentions that he is the only academic in his family on both the German and Polish sides (II.773f). The fact that Janusz does not earn (much) money is related to his other observation of another “space of difference,” that is the perspective on material life: “Perspectives on material things, I’d always find very Polish.” (II.750)²⁶ He sees the interest in material goods as much more pronounced in Poland than in Germany, which he

24 “Kinder kriegen und so auch wenn man sagen würde, dass sowas nicht zum Konzept gehört. Dann [...] kriegt man nur Kopfschütteln. Man spricht das auch gar nicht an, außer mit meiner Tante, die halt wirklich so eng ist. Es ist die einzige Person in Polen [mit der ich über sowas rede].”

25 “Das ist eine ganz andere Perspektive [in Polen] auch wenn die [Perspektive] in Deutschland auch problematisch ist, weil man sich in Deutschland auch rechtfertigen muss warum man promoviert und wie lange man braucht. Es ist doch anerkannter [...] und in Polen, wenn man Doktorand ist, ist man Student und man ist Kind irgendwie und [...] alle erwarten, wann fängt man an zu arbeiten. Wann fängt man an richtig zu leben, man muss doch mal Geld verdienen.”

26 “Perspektiven auf Materielles finde ich immer sehr Polnisch.”

extrapolates from the way people talk about it. He does not necessarily perceive it as “pretentious,” but as a means to make sure that one does not need to worry (II.1133-1136). It is a difference for Janusz, but he can understand it as he points to historical differences of both countries, which are characterized by divergent economic developments and its social consequences. While Polish people are afraid of having to live in poverty, Janusz believes that Germans do not share these fears to such a great extent. He admits that his perspective might be, in fact, a spoiled one (II.767-771).

A topic that many of my interviewees mention is religious life in Poland. Janusz, too, gives a rather detailed account on that matter. He tells me what kind of experiences he had with religion and church in Poland, and how he evaluates them. Generally, religiosity in Poland leaves a big question mark for him. In this context, he cites the example of his father. Janusz is struck by the fact that his father goes to church while he is not even religious or devout: “He is the kind of a person who always goes to church. He finds church apparently quite important as an institution. It’s just tradition. Absolutely Poland.” (II.732f)²⁷ Janusz puts forward the significance of the Polish tradition of “church-going.” He generalizes it as typical behaviour of Polish people, even when they are not particularly religious. He struggles with this traditional behaviour as it does not make much sense to him. He interprets it as being useful on “an abstract collective level” in terms of community life, but not individually. Janusz’s father, he mentions, does not even subscribe to the opinions of the Polish episcopate (II.858). Besides, Janusz disapproves of the debates in Poland about questions pertaining to the social realm of the church. Homosexuality and abortion are, according to Janusz, two prime examples. With regard to his father, Janusz assumes that he would take a liberal position on these matters. For Janusz, his father is a “a liberal Pole, but a liberal Pole is not a liberal German [laughter].”²⁸ Generally, Janusz knows that positions against homosexuality and abortion can be found in both countries, but he nevertheless believes that they are more representative of Poland, although he immediately acknowledges that Polish society is a differentiated society, in which there are also radical proponents of gender studies (II.741-746).

As mentioned above, the theme of religiosity is a recurring motif in the narratives of my respondents. They approach the topic in view of expressing more liberal views than those espoused by the Catholic Church and by extension the many Poles whom my respondents see as incorporating the dictation of the

27 “Er is so’ne Person, der geht immer in die Kirche. Er findet Kirche scheinbar ganz wichtig als Institution. Es ist halt Tradition. Absolut Polen.”

28 “Ein liberaler Pole, aber ein liberaler Pole ist ja kein liberaler Deutscher [Lachen].”

church into their dispositions and attitudes without question. However, Janusz himself was brought up “firmly atheistic,” typical for a socialization in East Germany, and he only experienced the Catholic Church through his visits to Poland as a child. Following Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004), in this particular case, we can say that he participates in *ways of being* within transnational social fields, meaning that he is embedded in transnational practices without identifying with them. He remembers a striking experience from his childhood. Back then, he did not feel good about being in a church because he thought it was “strangely unpleasant.” Janusz describes a situation, in which he went to church as a child. Here are his impressions:

“So, I was taken to liturgical ceremonies as a small child, I entered buildings, into which I would never have gone otherwise, even if it was with my father or family members. No one says a word and all people change. You have to imagine that: A small child comes into a church and all [family members] change their behaviour, their demeanor, yeah.” (II.835-839)²⁹

Such impressions from his childhood were, more than anything, a deterrent to Catholicism and the practice of “church-going,” not least because, back then, no one of his Polish family would explain to him what these ceremonies meant (II.832-835).

Encountering such differences creates a paradoxical condition, in which Janusz is neither perceived to be a typical Pole in both Germany and Poland, nor is he the typical foreigner in Poland. Janusz assumes that he is perceived by his Polish relatives as:

“The German who does not dance at parties, who drinks too little, who speaks funny, who is still studying. That’s who I am, I think so. Not everyone says so, but I think that’s what most people think.” (II.1164ff)³⁰

29 “Also, ich bin als kleines Kind in liturgische Zeremonien hineingekommen, in Gebäude hineingekommen, in die ich niemals sonst hineingegangen wäre, zwar mit meinem Vater oder Familienangehörigen. Keiner sagt ein Ton und alle verändern sich. Das muss man sich mal vorstellen, da kommt so ein kleines Kind in so eine Kirche rein und alle verändern sich in ihrem Verhalten, in ihrem Gehabe, ja.”

30 “Der Deutsche, der nicht tanzt auf Feiern, der zu wenig trinkt, der komisch redet, der immer noch studiert. Der bin ich, ich glaube schon. Sagt nicht jeder, aber ich glaube das denken die meisten.”

It becomes clear that the cultural differences Janusz encounters when in Poland, are also encountered by the Poles surrounding him. In other words: the differences encountered are mutual. Whenever Janusz perceives cultural values or social norms as odd and acts against them, likewise, his relatives perceive his behaviour as odd because he stands out from the crowd. Janusz mentions that he is neither a “typical foreigner” who

“[...] comes to a foreign country and perhaps even knows the language, but [...] I have access to non-public spaces in Poland and I didn’t buy them and I didn’t have to work for them, but I have them from birth. I mean that by ‘no typical foreigner.’” (II.1153-1156)³¹

By the same token, Janusz benefits from certain privileges in Poland that are not as easily accessible for those without Polish roots. As we have seen, he partially does not fit in, but he is nevertheless not excluded from, let us say, familial celebrations or other social events. This condition results from—what I call—the *accumulation of origins*. I have argued above that the common differentiation between “country of origin” and “country of arrival” is of no analytical use in Janusz’s case, but that both Germany as well as Poland make up his *countries* of origin. Generally, I assume that individuals can accumulate more than one (cultural) origin; yet, it is dependent on specific biographical constellations in their life-courses. The accumulation of origins is intensified by mobility experiences, which show cultural fractures and irritations. Bi-local transnational mobility, as in Janusz’s case, makes him feel at ease in Poland, but not “at home.” (“heimisch,” II.1249f) His narrative about cultural differences and the ambiguous state of not being typically Polish nor a typical foreigner in Poland means he must meet the standards of both “here” and “there.” He is expected to match two sets of social norms. It certainly brings about potential conflict, yet it is characteristic of “multiple integration” in both societies.

Self-Acknowledgement through Language Acquisition

Acquiring Polish and re-uniting with his Polish relatives transformed both his feeling of belonging and his feeling of estrangement toward Poland and the Polish language. As a child, Janusz felt estranged from the culture and, most ob-

31 “[...] In ein fremdes Land kommt und vielleicht sogar die Sprache kann, aber [...] ich habe ja Zugänge zu nicht-öffentlichen Räumen in Polen und die habe ich mir nicht erkauft und die habe ich mir auch nicht erarbeiten müssen, sondern ich habe die per Geburt. Das meine ich mit ‘typischem Ausländer.’”

viously, from the language. Nowadays, Janusz tells me, that he does not perceive it as something alien anymore:

“Today, it is, of course, no longer strange to me [...] Professionally, I deal with Polish almost every day. In this doctoral school, we are more Poles than Germans. [...] Our professor is Polish and Polish is almost the *lingua franca*, [more so] than German [...] of course, it became a part of me.”³²

Polish has now become an integral part of his life. It is linked to his professional activity and to his other social activities, as is German. Janusz’s life is now embedded in a (bi-local) transnational social space that is characterized by border-crossing social practices between Poland and Germany. Therefore, he is able to incorporate Polish into his self-understanding. In his narrative, he insists that Polishness *has now become* a part of him, rather than having been a part of him all the time:

“I think it has become. I think of it more like something that has become [laughter]. Certainly, I have integrated something from the past that was there. [...] But still, I feel the Polish rather as something that was added. [...] Well, German, I think, is somehow more causal.” (ll.679-671)³³

By comparing the German and the Polish languages (and other cultural elements), Janusz feels Polish to be a part of his “self,” but one that has evolved; something that was added only later on. By now, Janusz considers his Polish language skills as good, but not comparable to that of a native speaker. His friends say that his Polish is *specyficzny* (specific, ll.993). He likes to communicate in Polish and he also misses it in phases in which he does not often speak Polish. At the same time, he is sometimes bothered when talking in Polish because he is not able to express himself like he could as a native speaker; nevertheless, speaking Polish is not as exhaustive anymore as a “real foreign lan-

32 “Heute ist es natürlich überhaupt nicht mehr fremd [...] ich habe einfach beruflich fast täglich mit Polnisch zu tun. In diesem Graduiertenkolleg sind wir mehr Polen als Deutsche. [...] Unsere Professorin ist Polin. Also, Polnisch ist da fast die *Lingua Franca* [mehr] als Deutsch [...] es ist natürlich ein Teil von mir geworden.”

33 “Ich glaube eher geworden. Ich glaub eher an sowas Gewordenes [Lachen]. Sicherlich habe ich etwas aus der Vergangenheit integriert was da war. [...] Aber dennoch empfinde ich das Polnische weiterhin eher als was Hinzugekommenes. [...] Also, das Deutsche finde ich irgendwie ursächlicher.”

guage” for him (ll.1002-1005). In a way, Janusz’ personal development is liberating: “There are no barriers in my head, saying: ‘Uh, Polish, I don’t want that.’ You could say I have emancipated myself from this.” (ll.1054f)³⁴ Not only has he broken down those barriers that once surrounded the Polish language, he also acknowledges that his father is a Pole. Now it is something that he is not ashamed of anymore; something that he is able to handle a lot better than before (ll.680). Most importantly, Janusz has acknowledged his Polish roots: “I have acknowledged it. It [is] so integral in my life today. Almost everything I do is connected with it.” (ll.1241f)³⁵ In contrast with Janusz, we will now learn about Oscar’s life story, who strongly acknowledges his Polish belonging, but gets confused about it once he lives in Poland.

4.2 OSCAR: “THE ONE WHO COULD BE ANYTHING IN A WEIRD WAY”

Oscar is a young man of Polish descent who came back to Montreal following a rather lengthy mobility experience a few months before we met. When I interviewed him, he was twenty-nine years old. I got in touch with him through one of my gatekeepers who is distantly related to him. He was open to my inquiry, but it was not too easy to arrange an appointment with him; he needed to re-schedule a few times because he took advantage of ad-hoc work opportunities. As with all of my interviewees, I asked him where he preferred to meet me. He kindly invited me to his home. Oscar established an interview setting, in which I was able to take a peek into his current life-phase. I interviewed Oscar on December 1, 2013. At first glance, our get-together seemed quite regular: after introducing ourselves, he asked me some details about how I met my gatekeeper and what kind of study I was doing. But then, after having answered his questions, Oscar surprisingly asked me: “So, you’re not Canadian? You’re German? And you don’t live in Canada, you’re just here for your research?” He confided to me that he had assumed that I was Canadian. Surprised at this, I reminded him that I had written to him that I was a sociologist from Germany, looking for Polish-Canadians to do interviews with, being of Polish heritage myself, etc. He then responded that he just assumed I would have German-Polish parents, but

34 “Es gibt keine Sperren im Kopf, die sagen: ‘Öh, Polnisch, will ich nicht.’ Man könnte sagen, ich habe mich emanzipiert von dem.”

35 “[Ich habe es] anerkannt, weil es [ist] in meinem heutigen Leben so integral. Fast alles was ich tue ist damit verbunden.”

would be Canadian anyway as so many Canadians have different cultural backgrounds. I realized that this type of misunderstanding would most likely not have happened in Germany or in other countries with an assimilationist stance on integration policy. After having a good laugh about this incident, I posed my initial question and Oscar fell into a narrative mode right away. The interview lasted one hour and thirty-five minutes.

Oscar's autobiographical narrative is not only a more or less detailed recap of his life, it also includes (short) passages in which he conveys his knowledge of his family history over generations. His life story, however, highlights his experiences of diverse cultural influences in more than one geographical space. He speaks mostly about the Canadian and the Polish contexts; yet, his biographical experiences also go beyond these two contexts. The part of Oscar's life story about his childhood, youth, and early adulthood is *typical* for the Montreal context. Certain aspects are *specific* to the Canadian province of Quebec as opposed to other provinces in Canada. In another part of his life story, Oscar focuses on his mobility experiences to Poland and to other parts of Europe. As in many of my respondents' narratives in both Canada and Germany, Oscar constructs a narrative about his life, in which *languages, familial networks, and cultural belonging(s)* are crucial for the direction his life-path has taken, and therefore for his multi-local biographical experiences. Before I discuss Oscar's life experiences in-depth, I will let him recount his family history to point out the historical background of his family's immigration to Canada so as to contextualize his experiences.

Aristocratic Nobility and Diasporic Mobility

In Oscar's narrative, not only his own biographical experiences and inherent social practices play a significant role, he also gives some contextual information about his family's past. Most importantly, Oscar underlines that his family differs from other Polish families, who emigrated abroad. In his narrative, Oscar did not really know how to tell me about the "special status" of his family:

"I don't know how to approach it [...]. I could tell you that my family [...] has an *herb* [coat of arms, A/N], which is, I don't know how to say [...] in English, it's an aristocratic symbol." (II.392ff)

Concretely, this aristocratic symbol is made manifest by a huge silver ring, which is, according to Oscar, "very king-like." (II.429) He tells me that his family is quite well known in Poland, because they held the status of counts before

World War II. However, the Polish nobility lost their possessions and belongings when aristocratic privileges were ultimately abolished in 1945³⁶ under the accruelement of the Polish People's Republic (1952-1989). Under these circumstances, Oscar's family lost many castles that were once in its possession, because the Bolsheviks destroyed them (l.405). As for Oscar's nuclear family, both of his parents share an aristocratic background: "My dad is some sort of an aristocrat and my mum as well." (l.412) Meanwhile, his family has tried hard to get back two remaining castles: "[...] since the fall of Communism, we started with the lawyer to try to get back this property that we lost during the war." (ll.406ff) The attempt to get property back, which is legally no longer theirs is instructive for the collective identity of the family. The family has tried to get its former aristocratic status legally re-recognized or re-acknowledged by the Polish government. In a way, the family not only aims to maintain a sense of belonging to their heritage culture, they try to re-acknowledge their former privileges and thus to re-establish a *high social class status*. Oscar incorporated the "collective memory" (Halbwachs 1950) of his families' aristocratic past, even if he has not personally experienced aristocratic privilege in Poland. This becomes particularly evident in his use of the personal pronoun "we," which marks a belonging to and a high opinion of his family's past. He emphasizes that he perceives himself to be part of the aristocracy and considers the efforts of getting back the castles into the family's possession as perfectly self-evident. Then again, he does not live the "high life" like some of his cousins in Poland whose photographs are regularly taken for Polish magazines. As Oscar grew up in Canada, he is not confronted daily with his (family's) prominence in Poland; yet, he had other experiences when he was there:

"[...] when I went to Poland and I was saying **** [aristocratic family name, A/N] everybody was like: 'Wow, you're like coming from some defined family.' Since I was in Canada all this time, I was like: 'What? [laughter] No, I'm normal [laughter].'" (ll.421ff)

Oscar refers to the differences of his family's status in two different geographical spaces: in Poland his family name is well known, while in Canada it is just one name out of other (immigrant) names and thus the experiences differ due to the geographical contexts. Oscar points out that he "is normal," meaning that he has had a life in Canada, which was not significantly influenced by his aristocratic belonging, i.e., he was not famous in "gossip rags." As stated above, he

36 Konstytucja marcowa, article 96.

indeed values his aristocratic roots, but as opposed to some of his cousins, Oscar does not wear his ring:

“[The ring] is something that I would never wear, but I have cousins that wear this and they kind of show it off [laughter]. I find that very pretentious. I feel like our past shouldn’t define us. I feel like be who you are [...] like how you are born and what made you and what surrounds you rather than what your family did in the past even though it is very respectable. Most of our past family members have their books that were written and lot of heroes were there, so that’s always nice to think back to and I mean I admire that, but I’m not gonna wear my ring.” (ll.429-435)

On the one hand, Oscar tries to distance himself from the ring as a symbol of aristocracy. He seems not to be opposed to the meritocratic principle but, on the other hand, he strongly admires his families’ aristocratic past and celebrates them as heroes. Here, we can empirically observe what Vertovec (1997) refers to as the “diaspora consciousness,” which is marked by both negative and positive experiences. Vertovec also refers to an “awareness of multi-locality,” which stimulates the need to connect oneself with others, both “here and there.” This can also be inferred from Oscar’s narrative, as his close relatives in Canada and in Poland are not the only families that belong to former Polish aristocracy. It is rather an aristocratic circle or diasporic network dispersed all over the world, which comes together from time to time:

“Oh, I didn’t tell you about the family reunions that we have? Every five years, we have family reunions for **** [aristocratic family name, A/N]. **** [Name of my gatekeeper, A/N] comes there as well. We go to a different spot in Poland every five years and we meet. People [...] appear from all over the world. They just converge into one spot in Poland and we spend four days together. [...] We rent out a hotel [laughter], so it is about five hundred people.” (ll.989-1002)

This piece of his narration illustrates the extent of the diaspora of Polish aristocratic families. Accordingly, we cannot speak of a few family units, but rather of a relatively large network of former aristocrats. This network, however, can be more precisely referred to as a diaspora (ch. 1.2), because it includes members of a community and their ancestors that have been dispersed to many foreign regions from their original “center,” in this case Poland under Nazi and Soviet occupation. Certainly, non-aristocratic Polish groups who fled during World War II, are also referred to as a diaspora; yet, their “myth of homeland” differs. Because aristocratic privileges in Poland were abolished, the vision of Poland as a

country in which the aristocrats were privileged over others was ultimately destroyed and thus probably influenced the “myth of return” as less desirable, while non-aristocratic members of the diaspora did not have any privileges to lose. We could assume that their “myth of return” was more pronounced, even though the majority of Polish refugees did not return to Poland after the fall of communism (Currle 2005: 70). The big family reunions Oscar mentions are followed by activities during the day that everyone can sign up for, and by dinner parties and dances during the night. The parties combine traditional Polish songs and dances with pop cultural elements like hip hop that are mostly brought into the celebrations by those members of the diaspora who live abroad. Oscar evaluates these regular get-togethers as “really cool.” (Il.1023-1028) While they are linked to Oscar’s maternal family and display a multi-local dispersion of aristocrats, he also attends reunions that are linked to his paternal side of the family; these are smaller, with about hundred people of whom most members have remained in Poland (Il.1009f).

Aside from the aristocratic network of which he is a member, Oscar tells me about his nuclear family: his parents as well as two younger siblings, a brother and a sister (Il.869-872). Both of his parents are of Polish descent. While his mother was born in Poland (Warsaw), his father was born in Morocco. His father’s family immigrated to Canada (Montreal) when Oscar’s father was a little child. His father lived in Montreal for eighteen years until he met his mother on a summer trip to Poland, who subsequently immigrated to Canada. The couple got married and, one year later, Oscar was born in Montreal (Il.6-10). Oscar’s narrative not only indicates that he belongs to an aristocratic network due to his family background, it also tells us that mobility is present within a multi-generational temporal frame in his family history. According to categories commonly used in migration studies, he would be classified as “second generation.”

A Limited Scope of Montreal: Growing up within the Polish Community

Oscar was born into a vibrant Polish community in Montreal. His parents had many Polish friends who had children at the same time. Oscar refers to these children as his cousins (Il.13-16), yet it remains unclear whether he is really related to his peers since it is common among Poles to refer to parents’ friends as “uncles” and “aunts” and to their children as “cousins,” even though there is no real blood relationship. In any case, these cousins would become his closest friends. During his childhood, Oscar was surrounded by the Polish community:

“I was brought up in a very happy community with Polish people, where we had quite a limited scope of what Montreal was, because we were so ingrained in that Polish culture, which was going to Polish church, going to Polish school, and hanging out with Polish parents and Polish kids.” (II.20-23)

Oscar remembers his childhood as “happy.” The members of the Polish community followed many social activities that were exclusively linked to Polish culture and tradition. Oscar reflects *ex post* that being surrounded only by people of Polish origin limited—as he repeatedly refers to it—his scope of the city of Montreal. By that he refers to Montreal’s ethnic diversity and cultural variety. While Oscar enjoyed his childhood, he later realizes that his experiences were culturally one-sided. In this context, his choice of the word “ingrained” is instructive as it indicates a very strong embeddedness in the Polish community in Montreal. One of the activities that Oscar mentions in this quote is Polish school.

Polish Schools in Canada

Learning about the existence and my interviewees’ experiences of Polish schools in Canada during my fieldwork was fascinating to me: I had never heard of such schools in the German context and I was astonished how many of my interviewees in Canada attended these schools during their childhood. Polish schools are Saturday schools that conduct classes from the elementary school level to the high school level. This educational program complements the Canadian school system. Although not compulsory, many of my interviewees attended these schools, in which language, history, geography, and mathematics classes are offered. The textbooks used, grading systems, and promotional rules are recognized in Poland. Parents have to pay a fee, but the schools are mainly financed by the Polish consulates. There are schools in Montreal and Toronto, apart from many private language classes.³⁷

Realizing that attending the Polish school constitutes (early) biographical experiences of many of those Polish-Canadians whom I interviewed, I became curious about similar offers in Germany. Despite a few private programs, I found out that the Polish Institute in Berlin offers similar Saturday classes for children, yet it only recently re-established these classes after

37 For further information, see the website of the Polish Embassy in Ottawa: <http://www.ottawa.mfa.gov.pl/en> For the Polish school in Montreal, see <https://szpkmontreal.wordpress.com> and for the Polish school in Toronto, see <https://www.spktoronto.com>

many years. Besides, there is no mention of the classes as being officially recognized in the educational system of Poland.³⁸ Interestingly, neither the Polish consulates in Germany offer such classes, nor the other Polish institutes in Germany as in Düsseldorf and Leipzig; only one Polish parish in Wiesbaden offers language classes for children in the afternoons. The teachers there also work with textbooks authorized by the Polish Ministry of Education.³⁹ The result of this internet research reflects the experiences of my interviewees: while many young adults of Polish heritage in Canada attended these complementary classes during their childhood years, my interviewees in Germany did not receive this kind of officially acknowledged complementary Polish education during childhood. Janusz, who briefly attended a Polish language school in the former GDR and acquired Polish in his later years pursuing higher education at university, was an exception. I assume that the demand for such an education is simply low. This discrepancy cannot be explained due to the share of persons of Polish origin living in both countries as there are more persons of Polish origin in Germany than in Canada. Arguably, this discrepancy can be traced back to the different integration policies in force: Canada is known for its multicultural policies, where the consulates are more active, while Germany takes up an assimilationist stance on integration. What is more, the offers of the Canadian consulates in Montreal and Toronto in Polish education can be clearly seen as a transnationalization of state policies, which may promote (migrant) transnationalism or in some cases even transnational mobility between Canada and Poland.

As for Oscar, however, he preferred to watch TV than go to Polish school:

“[...] instead of watching Saturday morning cartoons, we were rushed off to Polish school to learn the language and how to write it and speak it [...] from eleven to four [...]. That was our weekend for a good three years until I made my parents realize that I was not watching Saturday morning cartoons and on Sunday church and I have my whole week just like kind of booked, you know? [...] So, then I left [Polish school].” (II.154-159)

Since Polish school is complementary to compulsory education in Quebec, Oscar's schedule was busy. After three years, he convinced his parents that he

38 For further information, see the website of the Polish Institute in Berlin: <http://berlin.polsnischekultur.de>

39 For further information, see <http://www.pmk-wiesbaden.eu/uber-gemeinde.html>

should quit Polish school and they agreed, not least because some of his cousins had quit Polish school by that time, too (ll.467f). Oscar does not explicitly state that he did not like the Polish school or that he had any kind of bad experiences there. He basically left because he wanted to have more leisure time. In his case, quitting Polish school does not mean that he distanced himself from his cultural heritage; it rather means that he distanced himself from the obligation of attending formal lessons. As soon as the group of friends quit, they found another activity for their newly gained leisure time: skiing. They mutually joined a ski club and they were all wearing the same winter jackets, even in the elementary school, they attended (ll.163-167). At this point of his narration Oscar indulges in “self-realization”:

“[Polish] kids going to the same school all dressed the same. [...] There is no identity, we were collective, you know? Now that I’m talking about it I’m having like self-realizations on how together we were like in bunches. That’s funny.” (ll.166, 172f)

His social group was purely ethnic Polish. In his *post-hoc* evaluation, he realizes that he and his peers displayed a collective identity rather than individual ones. The “outside world”—composed of other students at the school—recognized this collective belonging as Oscar and his peers wore the same clothing and were always together. I came across the emergence of this kind of ethnic “groupism” (Brubaker 2004) quite often in the narratives of my Canadian-based interviewees while the German-based ones would rather socially orient themselves towards Germans, with and without migration experiences.⁴⁰ However, my Canadian-based interviewees experience this “groupism” most often during their schooling years whereas they later tend to engage in social relationships with persons from various ethnic origins. Here again, we can see how the different policy agendas of both countries are incorporated in the social practices of individuals and how multiculturalism and assimilation have an impact on the biographical experiences of individuals.

Certainly, Oscar and his peers made it clear that they were seen as a unit, grounded in their mutual Polish heritage. The Polish heritage was also reinforced by their taking part in *harcerstwo*, the Polish scouts. As I had not heard of this before, I asked what this Polish scouting was all about. Oscar told me that the Canadian Polish community organizes two weeks of scouting in Kaszuby (region of the lake Wadsworth) in the province of Ontario (the region around the

40 The German-based interviewees who rather engage in social relationships with fellow Poles are mostly first-generation migrants.

first village in Canada settled by Poles), where Polish kids from all across Canada get together. Camps were divided by cities: Montreal, Toronto, Edmonton (II.178-183). Taking part in Polish scouting was a significant event in Oscar's childhood:

"So *harcerstwo* was a pretty big deal. I think it kind of establishes how many activities our parents were kind of making us do. So, there's no dead time, there's no time for video games, there's no time to like take drugs [...] you're always doing an activity." (II.202-205)

Following many activities would have kept him away from criminal activities such as taking drugs, therefore keeping him "on the straight and narrow." In addition to Polish school and Polish scouts, Oscar regularly went to Polish church with his family:

"All of our family was controlled by our mum [...] religion-wise. She was like: 'This is where we are going.' If it would be without my mum, we wouldn't be going to church [laughter]. We were going there to make her happy." (II.489-492)

Oscar states that it was his mother's wish to go to church. He indicates that the rest of the family would rather not have gone there, implying that the practice of "church-going" was a tradition rather than a social practice grounded in deep religiosity. In fact, he quit going to church at the age of eighteen (I.522). Later in his narration, Oscar and I engage in a discussion about religion and faith. He tells me that he believes in God "in the sense of trying to understand the meaning of life" (I.549) and "treating Jesus' story as a metaphor." (II.544)

All in all, we have seen that Oscar lived his childhood years in a "Polish bubble," more or less disconnected from other cultural realms in Montreal. In this context, his expression of having had a "limited scope of Montreal" gains meaning. He made good friends within the Polish community, with whom he is still very close. He sees his cousins on a regular basis but at some points in their lives they parted ways a little as they went to different schools, made other friends, and "got more ingrained into the actual Montreal world." (I.212f) For him, this development began with his attending a French-speaking elementary school. He explains to me that he could not choose the language of instruction, because "by law, any immigrant has to send their children to French school in Quebec [...] only the second generation can decide." (II.28-31) In fact, according to Quebec's *Charte de la langue française/ Charter of the French Language*, second generation individuals (and, of course, other Canadian citizens as well)

can only be educated in English when one of their parents received instruction in English.⁴¹ There is an ongoing debate about Quebec's language laws in the public sphere, which I cannot delineate in more detail here. My focus lies on Oscar's biographical experiences, and, for him, attending French elementary school "was the only connection to the Montreal culture" (11.27) during his childhood years.

Broadening the Scope: Experiencing Montreal's Diversity

Leaving the sheltered "Polish bubble" was not an easy task for Oscar. He was suddenly faced with a yet unknown "outside world" encompassing other social groups with different ethnic origins, cultural traditions, and, most importantly, different languages. The theme of language is predominant in Oscar's narration; he was not only confronted with one language other than his mother tongue, but with two. Polish was the only language he would know until he was four years old. He then started to pick up English through his cousins who were the first to teach him the language. Last but not least, he needed to acquire French as—to put it in his words—at the age of six he was "kind of forced into French school." (11.33-36) Using this strong expression of being "forced" to go to French school may arguably stem from the fact that he had some unpleasant experiences while learning the language. He suffered at the beginning of his schooling because he did not speak a word of French:

"I got into French school without knowing any French [laughter]. You could imagine how retarded I must have looked in a class where everybody just spoke French and I was supposed to learn subjects rather than the language [...] all these subjects were terrifying for me since I didn't understand a word and I was very impressionable about/I mean at a young age, you are always very, you know, sensitive to all that criticism." (11.42-45)

As a child, these criticisms made him suffer. He gives a more concrete account of how this came about:

"So, when your French teacher is getting impatient with you, that's quite rough for a Polish kid [...] So that was my first experience with the language and I kind of had no choice but learn the language as I went from year to year. (11.47ff)

41 For further information, see the *Charter of the French Language* granted in the province of Quebec, section 73: <http://www2.publicationsduQuébec.gouv.qc.ca>

Here, Oscar concretizes that his teacher was impatient with his language progress. Interestingly, he points to his Polish ethnic belonging. By that, he refers to his childhood experiences within an active Polish community, in which learning other languages than Polish was not a concern. However, despite his struggles with learning French, Oscar eventually became comfortable with French around the grade six. By then, he would have had less of an accent and he would finally get “more friends that are not Polish, but Québécois as well as English-speaking.” (l.53)⁴² We can assume that his lack of French not only prevented him from following the lessons, but also from building friendships with other students in school. That is probably another factor that contributed to his suffering. He felt excluded: “In school as a Polish-speaking person, I feel totally like apart from this Québécois culture ’cause I felt like everybody was different in this weird world [laughter].” (ll.124f) Oscar felt that the Québécois culture, which he initially experienced in French school, was completely different from what he was used to. He did not feel a part of it. Indeed, he tells me that he took the Polish culture for granted. It was in school that he realized that not only the language was different, but also the traditions and customs:

“Christmas is different or Easter is different and the fact that I’m painting eggs on Easter [...] and people in school aren’t and I’m like: ‘Oh, how did you paint your egg this year?’ They’d think I’m a weirdo [...]. I thought everybody does this.” (ll.65-74)

Oscar reveals that he was not aware of the cultural differences he would encounter when he stepped out of the “Polish bubble.” He assumed that everybody followed the same traditions. He, however, indicates that he learned this lesson when the other students mocked his inquiries about egg painting at Easter. Oscar does not explicitly state that he was bullied by other students, but some other of my Canadian-based interviewees told me about their experiences of being bullied and ostracized due to their lack of French or their accent and the differing cultural habits.

By the time he got to high school (*École secondaire*), he had made friends. He already understood that “you are different and that everybody else has their own culture and you kind of learn from each other and I think, we grew together [...]” (ll.136ff) As soon as Oscar acquired French, he was able to construct a more ethnically diverse group of friends. His schooling experiences were a tip-

42 The categories—as mentioned in Oscar’s quote—are not mutually exclusive. More adequately, we would speak of “Francophones as well as Anglophones” or “French speaking as well as English speaking Québécois.”

ping point in his life-course or as he calls it “a transitional period or like a period to get ingrained in the Québécois culture, into the Montreal culture.” (ll.59f) Oscar discovered the ethnic diversity of Montreal, getting in touch with Québécois people and culture as well as with persons from other ethnic backgrounds. He was better able to understand what kind of society he lived in; a society that certainly goes beyond his Polish childhood experiences. Polish culture was nevertheless always on his mind, meaning that he “kind of [went] back and forth between two cultures.” (ll.80) Though his upbringing initially hindered him from integrating, it later allowed him to differentiate himself from the Québécois culture. At the beginning, he suffered on account of being “different,” until he got older and wanted to be different:

“It took me a while before I realized that [going back and forth between two cultures] was something special I guess. [...] Something that kind of allowed me to differentiate myself from the normal Québécois culture, which I don’t wanna be mean, but it’s pretty *prosty* [Polish for simple, A/N], very simple.” (ll.83-88)

He describes Québécois culture as “simple” in probable contrast to Polish culture. His argument is based on the fact that Quebec society, once steeped in religion, has since become highly secular (ll.91). This is a paradoxical argumentation, because he himself, as stated, is not a practicing Catholic. His lapsed Catholicism will emerge in future discussions of his experiences in Poland. However, he links the decline of religious practice in Montreal with the influx of immigrants into the city as he offers the following explanation:

“[Religion] got kind of numbed, maybe it’s also because of all the crazy immigration that now Montreal is fully mixed like there is no real Québécois identity anymore. It’s basically a mix of cultures that kind of exist together [...] and accept each other, which is beautiful I find.” (ll.84-88)

Oscar talks about immigration and its impact on national identity, a discussion we all know too well from politics and media, not only in Quebec, but basically in every “western liberal society.” These discussions are often exploited by populist parties, which plea(d) for stronger restrictions on immigration that poses a threat to the national identity—be it Québécois, German, Swiss, French or other. On the one hand, Oscar perpetuates these populist statements (“immigration threatens the Québécois identity”). On the other hand, he celebrates Montreal’s ethnic and cultural diversity.

Interculturalism in Quebec

Accommodating cultural difference and diversity is implemented in Canada's multicultural policy, yet some of the sitting governments of Quebec have opposed Canada's policy of multiculturalism while continuously encouraging immigration to Quebec. In scholarly discussions and official documents, Quebec's integration policy is often described as interculturalism, however there is no official policy of interculturalism in Quebec (Howes/Classen 2016). The main reason for rejecting multiculturalism is that it treats the Québécois just as another immigrant group in the Canadian cultural mosaic, instead of treating Quebec as a distinct society and nation. Therefore, multiculturalism does not deal enough with the French-English duality (ibid.; Bouchard 2010, Taylor 2012). Generally, both ideas of multiculturalism and interculturalism are quite similar, but many advocates of the latter argue that it better acknowledges the specific story of Quebec, which is not only characterized by a long-term struggle to survive as a francophone society and to flourish as a democratic society. To put it in a very simplified manner, interculturalism as the favoured notion in Quebec puts greater emphasis on the immigrants' integration into Quebec's majority culture, which itself constitutes, in turn, a minority in Canada and the rest of the North American continent. Historically under the threat of assimilation due to their minority status on the continent, some people in Quebec still perceive the language and culture to be fragile. As opposed to some of Canada's sitting governments at the federal level, which have adhered to the idea that there is no majority culture in Canada, Quebec rather insists on having a distinct culture, to which immigrants need to conform, particularly in terms of acquiring the French language. To use Taylor's words: "Because of our [the Québécois, A/N] situation, we have to work to ensure that integration takes place in French rather than English." (2012: 417) Similar to multiculturalism, interculturalism advocates cultural pluralism while simultaneously protecting the French language (Howes/Classen 2016, Bouchard 2010, Taylor 2012, Isajiw 1999).

In fact, Oscar endorses Montreal's cultural pluralism:

"Montreal is fully mixed. It's fascinating how you go to one school and [...] there are Indians, there are Koreans, there are Chinese people, Blacks, Arabs, Italians and [...] you kind of have no choice but to accept at a young age because, I mean, that's all who you hang out with." (Il.106)

The ethnic diversity that he finds in Montreal schools is fascinating for him as it promotes an acceptance for all these different cultures from early on, because these “cultural others” are, in fact, the ones that you engage with in everyday interactions, and sometimes they become your friends. Oscar indicates that the fear of “the other” is diminished in cultural pluralist settings, but he also has some reservations: “Let’s not be super hopeful for all this [cultural] mixing ’cause there [are] always some kind of like gangs happening in schools.” (II.108) This is an interesting objection, stemming from his own *emic* experiences (and as mentioned above, many other Canadian-based interviewees confirm this experience) as one *etic* argument in favour of interculturalism in Quebec—as opposed to Canada’s multiculturalism—is that it promotes more intercultural exchange and social interaction between different ethnic groups, therefore diminishing the risk of social fragmentation, segmentation, and immigrants retreating (only) into their communities of origin; at its worst in the form of ghettoization (Bouchard 2010: 464, for a counterargument see Taylor 2012: 414). Oscar’s experiences mirror a kind of segmentation of social groups according to the same ethnic origins of students in school. This is an attenuated form of the well-known criticism of multiculturalism as promoting social stratification (as argued, for instance, by Esser, see ch. 1.1), a criticism that has also been picked up by the advocates of interculturalism who attempt, at least theoretically, to overcome this danger. However, in empirical reality of everyday experiences, tendencies of ethnic segmentation are still evident. If, on the basis of distinct ethnicities, small groups of students are formed in school, the inversion of the argument is not to say that there is no social and cultural exchange. As for Oscar, we have seen that the acquisition of French was central to his integration into Montreal and, additionally, it enhanced his possibilities to establish several new social relationships with peers. Hence, interculturalism in Quebec as the idea of an integration path taking place in French, and, as I would add, through the French language is empirically observable.

After Oscar graduated from high school, he attended CEGEP (*Collège d’enseignement général et professionnel*).

CEGEP

CEGEP is a publicly funded pre-university college, which is exclusive to the educational system in Quebec. Attending CEGEP is obligatory for students as it mainly fulfills two functions: it either prepares students to enter university or a technical profession. The former requires two years of classes in CEGEP. The resulting DEC-diploma (*Diplôme d’études collégiales*) allows individuals

to attend university in Quebec. The latter requires three years of classes and is mainly geared towards immediate employment in the labour market.⁴³

Oscar, however, chose the first option and studied commerce or “management of trade” (*Gestion de commerces*) in a CEGEP where the language of instruction is French. At this point in their education, students are free to choose the language of instruction. Studying in French was not a big deal for Oscar anymore, but commerce was, in fact, not the field of study he would have chosen for himself:

“Because of my parents, they forced me. I wanted to go into film [laughter] and they were like: ‘No, this is not something for your future. So, you’re going to do commerce’ and I was like: ‘OK’ and I did this stupid commerce for two years. I did all my math and I graduated.” (II.226-229)

Oscar’s parents did not agree with his idea to study film in CEGEP and, again, he felt as though he were being “forced” to do something he himself would not have elected to do. His parents perceived film studies as inadequate preparation for the future they imagined for their son and Oscar gave in to their demand. He finished his studies in commerce. His referring to commerce as “stupid” certainly conveys his reluctance. Then again, later he admits that his parents’ decision was not too bad:

“[...] but I was thankful to do commerce. It was good. My parents are very smart to have made me not waste two years on film in CEGEP ’cause that’s ridiculous, [...] I have that kind of business sense at least, like basic [laughter].” (II.232-234)

In retrospect, Oscar is happy to have gained a business sense during his studies at CEGEP, particularly because he has come to see that studying film in CEGEP is ridiculous. Arguably he means that it is ridiculous in the sense that it is not of high quality or that it does not lead to a job. Oscar eventually studied film in the further course of his life, but prior to that, he enrolled in the French-speaking Université de Montréal (UdeM). At first, he forgot to mention his studies at *l’UdeM* in his narrative about his university education:

43 For further information, see the homepage of the CEGEP federation in Quebec: <http://www.fedecegeps.qc.ca>

“Oh no! Sorry! I did even *Université de Montréal*, French literature [...] So after CEGEP, I did two years, from twenty to twenty-two years, I did *Littérature française et cinématographie*. It’s more theory in cinema and the study of French literature.” (ll.253f)

Oscar does not give any contextual information as to how this decision came about, yet I assume that it could have been a compromise between him and his parents, who had dismissed film studies as not proper for his future. French literature and cinematography, however, comes close to his initial idea of doing film studies. Studying at *l’UdeM*, Oscar became “really aware” of what Québécois culture is because he was “[for] the first time [...] surrounded by Quebec, that’s it, like there is no other mix or anything. It was all Québécois [...]” (ll.261ff) It was the first time that Oscar came across less ethnic diversity compared to his former experiences in Montreal’s educational institutions. He perceived *l’UdeM* as rather homogeneously Québécois, making him feel uncomfortable again as he found himself being in the position of the “cultural other” notwithstanding his proficiency in French:

“I must say I didn’t like it. I didn’t feel comfortable [...] because I was different [...] I was like the immigrant, let’s call it. That was the only time I felt really not in my world, so that was a [...] tough two years.” (ll.263-268)

His feeling of being “the immigrant” was probably intensified by the fact that he encountered few others like him. Therefore, he evaluates this time as having been tough, likely because he felt a relatively high pressure to conform. Intriguingly, Oscar’s life-path in Montreal is characterized by experiences of being the “cultural other,” which makes him suffer every time, while he simultaneously seeks to differentiate himself, at least from the Québécois culture, as we have saw earlier. In a way, he is torn between integration or conformism and boundary-making. Not only did Oscar feel uncomfortable in—as perceived by him—an “all too Québécois environment,” but he was not entirely happy with his field of study. He therefore decided to quit theory of cinema to focus on the practice instead and switched to “film production” at Concordia University (l.257). Arguably, it was the first time he made an independent decision, which he most likely needed to negotiate with his parents. His first “autonomous” choice had consequences. He not only changed his field of study, but also the language in which he would learn and work: “So, I finally switched languages [...] when I switched to Concordia [...]” (ll.246f) There he realized: “that I’m more English than French, I’m more comfortable in English than French.” (ll.276) Oscar figured out that he feels a stronger sense of the English language and a greater sense of

belonging and he found his professional passion, yet he was still not completely happy:

“I was not happy with the school still ‘cause I wanted to do cinematography and this school [had] a little film department. It was like the best school in cinema in Canada, but I was not happy, so I decided to move to Poland after I graduated and I went to Lodz.” (II.280-284)

In pursuit of his professional aspirations Oscar made another far-reaching decision, and this time his choice was literally “far-reaching,” not only in the biographical sense, but also in the very geographical sense of the word: he relocated his center of life to Poland after he graduated from university in Montreal.

From Canada’s Heterogeneity to Poland’s Homogeneity

Oscar must have been around the age of twenty-four when he relocated his center of life from Montreal, Canada to Lodz, Poland for a total length of five years. His transnational mobility experience was motivated by his discontent about his experience of the education programs on offer in the field of film studies in Canada. He had developed a passion for film and more concretely for cinematography, yet he found the range of courses offered at Concordia University to be too limited. He chose Lodz as his mobility destination, because there is “the most known school in cinematography in the whole world. There [are] three that are known [...] like Polański, Kiesłowski, Wajda, all these like huge stars.” (II.299f) Oscar presents his reasons to relocate his center of life to be educational. However, we can also assume that his Polish descent, particularly his belonging to the aristocratic network, promoted his *motility*, i.e., the potential of being mobile (Flamm/Kaufmann 2006). In other words: moving to Poland enabled him to build on familial relationships and networks that were already on site. These may have functioned as facilitators as he put his educational project of studying cinematography in Lodz *into practice*. Through his networks, Oscar could get support when it came to, for example, finding accommodation or dealing with bureaucratic tasks, which are still nationally organized and unavoidable when settling in another geographical location. Yet another factor that might have impacted his decision to follow his studies in the specific geographical space of Poland is that it is the place where his cultural roots lie. Oscar interlinks mobility with experiencing his “roots society” and therefore the place of his cultural origin becomes his destination of mobility, or to put it differently: *where he is from (culturally), is where he goes*. Oscar’s knowledge of the Polish culture cer-

tainly affected his decision to move to Poland: he may have wanted to reconnect with his cultural roots, maybe even because of his constant experiences of “cultural otherness” in Montreal. The anthropologist Susanne Wessendorf observed a similar, but not the same, mobility phenomenon in the case of second generation Swiss Italians who returned to their ancestral country, though neither were they neither born there, nor had they lived there before. She termed this kind of transnational migration as “roots migration.” (2013) The biggest difference between these two mobility practices is that Wessendorf’s empirical material and her conceptualization of it hints towards a permanent “return” of her respondents to Italy, their (parents’) country of origin, while Oscar’s stay in Poland is clearly *temporally-restricted*. He therefore cannot be understood as a sedentary “roots migrant,” but as an individual, who practices *transnational mobility* within his life-path.

As mentioned above, Oscar’s school was in Lodz where he lived for the first three years of his studies. He then commuted from Warsaw to Lodz for the remaining two years of his education (II.296). In his narration, he did not explain why he moved from Lodz to Warsaw, yet it may be linked with the fact that his mother’s family lives there (I.8). In Lodz, however, he studied how to control the statics, cameras, and lighting in the process of film production aiming at graduating with a master’s degree, trained as a director of photography (II.303-308). As for his studies, Oscar admits that his three-year’s attendance at the Polish school in Montreal was a big advantage for him:

“I am thankful I did those three years [in Polish school], because once I went to Poland, you know, I could write. I had more of a structure even though Polish is so hard and I still can’t find how to conjugate most of these words. It’s insane. I was there for five years.” (II.478-781)

Being able to speak and write in Polish was, indeed, a big advantage for Oscar. At the same time, he puts forward that he, nevertheless, had to struggle with the language because his proficiency is not at a level of a native-speaker. Training for the profession of a director of photography particularly requires flawless communication; certainly in Polish:

“[...] on the set, I have to be very verbal. I have to use my words carefully to communicate what I want. I delegate to like five people, right, and I have to be quite consistent. [...] It’s very tough ’cause you get stuck. You know what you wanna say in English, but you’re like translate it and it’s hard ’cause you feel like you are so much smarter. [...] It’s quite frustrating ’cause you feel kind of stupid in their eyes [...] and your work suffers in

consequence. As a result, you are less quick. You get less of that what you want, especially on set.” (ll.703-727)

In this quote, Oscar goes into detail about his work procedures. He points out how central communication and therefore language proficiency is. However, Oscar’s message is ambiguous. On the one hand, he narrates his struggles with the Polish language in view of his professional training. He sometimes could not translate fast enough or well enough to communicate what he wanted to express. Therefore, his work suffered, and he got frustrated. Again, Oscar suffered because of an insufficient mastery of a language. On the other hand, he makes it clear that, despite these problems, it was very useful to already have a certain degree of knowledge and proficiency in Polish. This became especially evident with regard to other international students, who had less knowledge of Polish than he (ll.726).

The school was composed as follows: half of the student body came from Poland, and the other half was international: “people came from India, from Korea, from Ukraine, from France, from America and they didn’t speak a word of Polish.” (ll.682f) Oscar observed how hard it was for those “internationals” who were not able to speak Polish because at the beginning it was “very hard for them to be accepted by the Poles.” (ll.688) A big reason for that is the language barrier as—according to Oscar’s experiences—Poles would refuse to speak English, even if they knew how, as he observed with his Polish friends:

“Most of my friends that speak English, it’s extremely rare that they would start a conversation in English knowing that I had difficulties in Polish or knowing that others are barely speaking Polish. They are always speaking Polish. They know Polish. That’s all they know well, and it’s like their identity relies on that.” (ll.692ff)

Oscar makes the point that Poles would make no concession to switching languages in order to make communication easier for those who lacked proficiency in Polish. He assumes that their identity is strongly interwoven with their (national) language. From a sociological standpoint, language is certainly significant for processes of identity construction, particularly for collective identities. In addition, Oscar indicates that Poles would not like to speak another language (e.g., English) as they do not master it as well as they master their native tongue. This is, of course, a given whenever one speaks in a foreign language. However, this code-non-switching did not affect him so much as it affected his fellow students. In a way, this account reminds me of Oscar’s early experiences in French public school in Montreal with the difference that Oscar’s role reversed: he al-

ready had a knowledge of the Polish language, although he also struggled with technical terms, but it was the others who suffered (more). Certainly, French is the official language in Quebec as is German in Germany, Polish in Poland, English in the United Kingdom and so on. The difference is, as I see it, that while French was spoken in the public realms in Montreal, other languages would also be spoken in the private spheres or in private conversations in public spaces, i.e., with family and friends. Montreal, in particular, is *factually* bilingual where French as well as English is being spoken (Poitras 2016: 184, footnote 9) so that one observes a diversity of spoken languages (French, English, and various heritage languages) in the streets of Montreal. This is due to Quebec's intercultural stance on integration, while in other societies, which are rather assimilationist, talking in the non-official language while having a private conversation in a public space is sometimes frowned upon. Oscar's narration emphasizes that Poles have incorporated an assimilationist stance with newcomers expected to adapt to all aspects of social life, including personal relationships. Admittedly, we should keep in mind that Poland has less experience with immigration than with emigration or to put it differently: there are not many "foreigners of any kind" in Poland compared to settler societies like Canada or other European immigration countries like Germany.

However, language barriers led to a segregation of social contacts in school:

"Polish people in school were hanging out together. The international people were hanging out together at first and that was how friends formed and then once the international people started to speak Polish, there was more of a mix, but the dynamic is still less as I sense here [in Montreal]." (ll.738-741)

Oscar now explicitly compares his experiences in Poland with his experiences in Montreal. He states that friendships were mainly formed on the grounds of language proficiencies, which would have eased once the international students acquired Polish. Notwithstanding, he sees a difference in social dynamics in Montreal. Indeed, having asked Oscar about the social relationships he established while in Poland, he gave the following reply:

"[...] my good friends are international [...] it's an American, another good friend is from Sweden and no Polish persons 'cause I feel it's very hard to relate [to Poles] [...] maybe I'm being close, you know, how to say it? Blind to the fact that I'm the one that can identify with them and not vice versa, but I believe that because I'm friends with so many different cultures, that it is the Polish culture that can't kind of open up to people that are international. I couldn't really get that close with Polish people, which is sad." (ll.761-773)

Oscar is of Polish descent, but he nevertheless made friends with international people rather than with Polish people. He was somehow not able to get close to them. He evaluates this circumstance as sad and he reflects on the reasons for this. He considers that it could be he who cannot identify with Polish people enough to build friendships, yet due to the fact that his social relationships meanwhile consist of persons from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds, he concludes that it is the Polish people who would not open up as much, which he sees as a cultural characteristic. His best friend in Poland was “somebody that was born in Montreal and moved to Poland,” thus it was somebody who basically had a similar “background of experiences” as Oscar. The constellation of similar experiences, Oscar assumes, makes it easier to establish a relationship: “The fact that somebody is Polish from Canada, it’s huge. Polish from Canada compared to Polish-Polish is a different world.” (ll.787) This differentiation is common in the narratives of most of my interviewees, whether they live in Canada or Germany. They constantly emphasize how the migration experience has transformed them and has made them different from the “Polish-Polish,” the Poles in Poland. This process of differentiating themselves from Polish people who have not emigrated is a phenomenon that has long been observed: it was first put forward by Florian W. Znaniecki and William I. Thomas in their biographical work *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* ([1918-1922] 1958). One of the biggest differences lies in the question of how to deal with persons from different ethnic backgrounds. Oscar sums up his response to this question, which stems from his experience in Poland:

“[...] if you’re Polish, you’re quite afraid of other cultures. I’ve lived in Poland for five years [...] so I’m quite aware of what the Polish mentality is vs. here. So, I’m just going to do that parenthesis where Polish people in Poland are usually very unaccepting or afraid of other cultures. Anything that is different from them, they have troubles with comfort-wise. They close up right away, they’re not as open [...] even with me, a Canadian speaking Polish, I saw that they behaved differently with me.” (ll.112-121)

Based on his experiences, Oscar considers Polish people to usually be wary or afraid of “the cultural other” and that they avoid such social interaction. To put it bluntly: Oscar states that Polish people in Poland are xenophobic. Without a doubt, many of my interviewees’ biographical experiences led them to make similar statements. Interestingly, this (non-generalizable) result gains significance in the context of the political position of Poland’s government, led by the right-wing party *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* (PiS), in power since 2015, on receiving refugees from Syria—a humanitarian act, they vehemently refuse to engage

in. Although Oscar was in Poland three years before PiS came into power, his past experiences hint towards the present political atmosphere there. However, truth to be told: governing parties are far from representing the political opinions of all citizens of a country. Oscar, however, experiences xenophobic attitudes or mild discrimination “first-hand” as Polish people behaved differently toward him, even though he is of Polish origin and speaks the language. Interestingly, here he puts forward his self-understanding as “Canadian,” while earlier in his life-course he rather understood himself as “Polish.” Therefore, we can assume that he generally expresses a *contextual self-understanding*, in which he localizes his self in his heritage as well as residence cultures. It remains striking that this kind of Polish “symbolic ethnicity” (Gans 1979), which is characterized by an allegiance to the Polish culture and a love for a tradition, appears reversed now at the point of Oscar’s life when he is in Poland, surrounded by his “root culture.” As for the case of Janusz (ch. 3.3), I argue here that differentiating into the commonly used categories of “country of origin” and “country of arrival” is of no great analytical use in Oscar’s case for the simple reason that these categories are *situationally constructed* rather than fixed and essentialist. We can very well witness here that Oscar understands himself as “being Polish” mostly when he is in Canada, while he understands himself (and is understood by others) as “being Canadian” when he is in Poland. His cultural origins situationally change depending on his geographical location (“travelling origins,” ch. 5.2), leaving him in a paradoxical situation characterized by a contextual sense of belonging that only evolves in non-sedentary post-migration life-courses.

As indicated earlier, another difference Oscar addresses in his narrative is the topic of religion and the practice of “church-going.” Within his family, his mother was strict about going to church every Sunday, yet he stopped eventually. In Poland, however, he experienced an even more severe handling of this tradition:

“[They are] very Catholic and [...] all my mum’s relatives are extremely Catholic like way more intense than she is, like in a scary way. They are going to church and it’s serious when you miss it. It’s like the end of the world, so I really pity the kids, my cousins [...] it’s way more strict than my mum.” (II.510ff)

Oscar describes his relatives’ religious practices as kind of “scary.” He thought that his mother’s attitude on religious traditions and Catholicism was strict, but in Poland he realized that people were even more severe about it. They would punish those who missed church on Sunday with social contempt. Since Oscar

was interested in this way of practicing Catholic traditions; he would sometimes start discussions with his friends about it:

“I had a lot of friends in Poland that go to church, which I always had fascinating discussions with, because I don’t understand it. But they had their way. They didn’t wanna explain it, they just said this is how everything [is].” (II.512-516)

Not only Oscar, but many interviewees have mentioned similar experiences whenever they tried discussing this topic with Polish people in Poland. This practice corresponds, on the one hand, with what Max Weber (1864-1920) has called value-rational social action (*wertrationales soziales Handeln*) which is determined by a conscious belief in the value of something for its own sake, and in this case religious practice, independent of its prospect of success (1921 [1978]: 24f). On the other hand, it is also at the edge of traditional social action (*traditionales soziales Handeln*), which is determined by ingrained habituation. Weber himself admits that these two ideal types easily shade over into one another (ibid.: 25). One could say that Poles believe in the value of church-going, which has been a long-held tradition. Many interviewees, including Oscar, find Polish people to be “unreflective” on this topic, especially when it comes to the stance of the Catholic Church on homosexuality and abortion. In this context, Oscar feels that Poles are “closed-minded.” (I.566)

The Simplicity of European Mobility

However, Oscar evaluates his experiences in Poland as positive:

“This experience in Poland was amazing. It was eye-opening not only for Polish culture, because I was obviously not ever aware of what Polish culture was before that, but also because of the potential of travelling from Poland. It was quite open to possibilities. I visited all of the European countries, except two. Portugal and Spain, I’m missing on my list.” (II.312-316)

Oscar points to a certain kind of “horizon broadening” when he admits that he was not aware of what Polish culture was before coming to live in Poland, although he practiced Polish cultural traditions from early on. We can assume that this experience made him realize that he still differs from the Poles living in Poland due to his particular biographical experiences. He was probably not aware that while often playing the part of the “cultural other” in Montreal, he ended up having similar experiences in Poland, one of the country of his cultural origins.

Besides his experiences of “what Polish culture is,” another significant insight he gained while being in Poland is—as he refers to it—“the potential of travel.” While Oscar was living in Poland, he used the cheap inner-EU flights to visit other European countries as travel has become bureaucratically simplified within the EU *Schengen* zone. Oscar has both Canadian as well as Polish citizenship, the latter enabling him to move freely within the member states of the EU, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, and Norway. He used this form of “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004) extensively, not least because his girlfriend at the time moved to Scotland at one point while Oscar was residing in Poland. The couple had already met in Montreal and when he moved to Poland “she was coming and going” (I.330) before she relocated her life center from Canada to Scotland for one year (I.331), which

“[...] allowed me to go to Scotland every week from Lodz. [...] It was just like fate brought us this airplane that opened for thirty Euros [...] We were like amazed from Lodz directly to Edinburgh sometimes we got ten Euros. It was very easy for us to see each other and I fell in love with Scotland.” (I.334-343)

Oscar’s mobility experiences evolved and gained a new geographical destination. It emerged under the specific condition, as Oscar presents it, of the (geographical) constellation of his romantic relationship at that point in his life-course and under the condition of cheap travel opportunities. He travelled every week to Scotland to see his girlfriend. While she lived there, Oscar was the “majority of time over there.” (I.349) It was with her that Oscar travelled through Europe. His mobility in the form of travelling to, and short-term stays in, different places without relocating his center of life, was not only linked with his personal situation, but also with his career ambitions:

“If you really wanna know what cinema is, you have to kind of live full of experiences. So, like go travel, come back, do documentaries, meet new people and like explore. [...] That’s what I’m passionate about. That’s the kind of exploration of the world. So, I did that.” (I.322-327)

As becomes clear, Oscar understands mobility in the form of travel as a precondition to becoming successful in his career. He believes that good movies and documentaries can only be created when the people who create them have, at least to a certain extent, explored the world. Here, he puts forward a cosmopolitan perspective on travelling, experiencing destinations all over the world. During his travels to Edinburgh, however, he encountered other Polish people, who

also took advantage of the free-movement zone established by the *Schengen Agreement*:

“[...] and then I hear *kurwa* [a vulgar swearword in Polish, A/N] and then I’m like: ‘Oh my god, is that the culture that’s traveling nowadays?’ [...] I hate that so much and it’s like the lower classes are now travelling and it’s just so embarrassing ’cause it is like [...] the drinkers and the loud-mouth and that really bothers me.” (II.801-806)

Oscar refers to these other Polish people, who are now frequently mobile, as “lower classes.” As becomes clear in this quote, he is embarrassed and bothered by such people, who do not behave decently (at least according to his understanding of decency). In order to distinguish himself from these “other Poles,” he strongly puts forward his high social class status, that is grounded upon—as we have seen above—his belonging to an aristocratic network, practicing mobility already for generations. The mobility of these “other Poles” differs from Oscar’s mobility, which is certainly linked to class status. Like Oscar, they are mobile, yet for different reasons:

“[...] but it’s also good for Polish people to travel because many people go to Scotland to work and they come back for the weekends [...] It’s worth it for them to work over there to make a load of money for their value. [...] There’s also [other] popular destinations for Poles to go to work and, you know, they do all the blue-collar jobs like bus drivers [...] they are known as the hardest workers, they come there and then they make the most hours.” (II.806-815)

Facilitated mobility through EU-regulations and the emergence of cheap flights enables individuals with a low(er) socio-economic status to use the transportation system extensively for the sake of earning a living. Oscar admits that it is also a good development, which basically allows these less-skilled individuals to earn a “more decent” income than they would be able to do in Poland. It is safe to say that Oscar encountered “circular migrants” on his travels, who practice a form of mobility that is completely different from his own. However, not only did Oscar combine border-crossing mobility experiences within a transatlantic mobility experience, but he also travelled within Poland due to his educational training: “Obviously, I did films, you know, [...] and travelled to festivals and because of that, I kind of got to know Poland. I went everywhere in Poland with these films.” (II.355ff) Oscar, indeed, travelled a lot.

Looking Back and Looking Ahead

Oscar graduated from film school in Lodz with a master's degree and came back to Montreal. His biographical experiences are complex, especially in view of his mobility practices and language acquisitions. When I asked him to sum up for me the places that he had lived in, Oscar mentions Montreal, Lodz, Scotland, and Warsaw (ll.929-937). We see that his transnational mobility is mainly directed to Poland, but not only as he includes Scotland in his enumeration because he perceives that he lived there during the year his former girlfriend studied there. Compared to some other interviewees, Oscar became more mobile relatively late in his life-course, when he was already twenty years old. It does not mean that his experiences were culturally homogeneous at all because they were made in only one geographical social space. In his narrative, he reflects about the geographically immobile part of his life:

"I mean my life was in steps: first, I was Polish fully. Then I had to go French, because of school, but I always had my cousins, who were English. So, that was always a parallel. So, my life is divided in three kinds of sectors: French was school, English was friends and cousins and Polish was family." (ll.635-637)

Oscar was not geographically mobile, yet his life implied movements in form of "steps." These steps are mirrored in his life-phases that he divides according to language acquisitions and usage. Making one step after another allowed him to open his "cultural scope," most importantly through language. Nowadays, he has solid competences in each of these languages as he was also educated in each of these languages during the course of his life. It is an advantage; one that is crucial for the development and the maintenance of his *motility* as he can theoretically work in many different places of the world. However, he perceives his multilingualism not as a choice, but rather as heteronomous: "I suck with languages. I have three to take care of and I hate it [laughter] but, you know, I just had that life where I had to speak everything." (ll.729-733) He emphasizes that it is a lot of work and effort to take care of three languages, particularly because he does not feel as though he is especially gifted when it comes to learning languages. He had no choice but to learn these languages due to his biographical experiences, which are not only determined by his family context—more concretely the Polish origin—but also by living in Montreal. Being proficient in three languages, that is, in the heritage language and the two official languages of Canada is *typical* for my Montreal-based interviewees as opposed to my German- or Toronto-based interviewees. Indeed, I have also interviewees who speak more than

two languages, who have not lived in Montreal, nevertheless I argue that being fluent in *at least three languages* is more common to the life stories of my Montreal-based interviewees. Interestingly enough, not all of them are geographically mobile. However, Oscar's life-course includes various mobilities, a dynamic which we can refer to as the "mobility of languages":

"Whenever I spoke with my cousins, it was mainly three languages at the same time in one sentence and there I felt the most comfortable when I could do that. [...] I felt like I don't have to force myself at any point, because every language I [spoke] I had an accent in. I was not fluent in any and still to this day when I go to Toronto, they tell me I have a French accent in my English. Whenever I go to Poland, they tell me I have an English accent in my Polish. [...] When I speak French, they are like: 'You're not from here' and I'm like: 'I know, I *am* from here, but, you know.'" (ll.640-650)

Oscar feels permanently uncomfortable language-wise when he needs to speak in only one language. What he enjoys most is to mix all three languages within only one sentence with whatever language comes to mind first and fits best. This intensive code-switching prevents him from feeling "forced" to choose only one language. Oscar masters none of these three languages perfectly. In each language, he has an accent, which he is repeatedly reminded of in his interactions with other speakers, who would always classify him as a "non-native speaker" leading to the paradoxical situation that he is perceived as a foreigner wherever he is. Oscar clearly states that at the beginning of his life, he suffered because he was "that." (ll.665f) To conclude his sentence, I would say: that kind of a "hybrid." Nowadays, however, he embraces and cherishes it more (l.666). His experiences of multiculturalism, multilingualism, and geographic multilocality have, without a doubt, an effect on his self-understanding:

"So, all this to say like wherever I am, I don't think defines me or who I am 'cause I could be everything in a weird way. I don't speak anything fluently. I'm kind of weird in everything, but, I don't know, I like it." (ll.668f)

Oscar implies that he is always perceived as "the other," as someone, who behaves in strange and weird ways in the eyes of others. This paradox is that he is both excluded and included, if only as someone who does things in a "weird way." He could or he could not be Polish, or French or English Québécois by the same token. Oscar emphasizes that his self-understanding goes beyond his current location. In fact, he puts forward a rather "cosmopolitan" self-understanding:

“I don’t have like a specific place to be, but I call myself a citizen of the world and that’s what my dad always called himself, so I think I identify.” (ll.652f)

Oscar mentions his father when he expresses his self-understanding. This is interesting insofar as his father has also been living a mobile life. As mentioned earlier, he was born in Morocco, immigrated to Canada, went to Poland where he met Oscar’s mother and started a family in Montreal. In a way, it seems like Oscar continues his parents’ mobile lifestyle. As for his self-understanding, he constructs his “self” as independent of any specific geographical localization. In fact, he understands himself as a “citizen of the world,” which highlights his attitude of belonging everywhere, but at the same time, nowhere specific. He localizes himself beyond geographical categories because he believes that the place he is currently living in does not define who he is, but rather that the places he has been living in affect him insofar as to be geographically and culturally open towards places all over the world. It becomes apparent that his cultural localization goes beyond geography: it includes references to both *the whole world* as well as *no place in specific*.

We can also find this self-understanding reflected in his future plans. Since Oscar’s return from Poland, he has been working as a director of photography on a freelance basis: “Right now, I’m obviously freelancing from production to production, so I’m working irregularly.” (ll.878f) For his future, Oscar is “dreaming to go to New York to work there and to make bigger films.” (l.891f) He rented the apartment in Montreal, in which he was living when we met, on a temporary basis. Back then, he had five more months left until he needed to look for something else. However, his plan is to be able to move away from Montreal:

“My goal is to move to New York, so all my efforts now are to figure out how to emigrate there as a freelancer. It’s very hard. Usually you have to have a company that backs you and since [...] I’m a freelancer I have two options. The most retarded one is the lottery. You could play a lottery and hopefully you get a green card [...] Then there is this sponsor program also, I have a lot of family in the States and if one of them sponsors me, I have to read up still on this. This is actually the only thing I’m doing today to figure [it] out.” (ll.884-888)

Since Oscar has “a lot of family” in the United States, the second possibility might work out for him. The family members he refers to are obviously other members of the Polish aristocratic network, who do not necessarily need to be blood-relatives, but who settled in the United States during or right after World War II. If this possibility does not work out for Oscar, he would also consider

moving to Toronto: “Toronto [...] is more television, so I could do that as well. Toronto is pretty cool. I mean it’s not cool in the sense that it is a wide and annoying city, but there are a lot of jobs over there.” (Il.896-899) This time, Oscar presents the reasons for his “envisaged mobility” as professional ones. While his relocation from Montreal to Poland was motivated by the expectation of having access to better training for his professional aspirations, his “envisaged mobility” is motivated by having better career chances. During the process of establishing his career, Oscar wants to “get married and have kids.” (Il.901) To conclude, Oscar is aware of the uncertainty of his future in geographical and professional terms in the sense of where to live and what to work, but he is determined to make the next step: “I love life [...] you don’t know where it’s gonna bring you and you’re going for it all the time, right?” (Il.944f) Similar to Oscar, we will now see how Malinka broadens her mobility orientation from bi-local mobility flows between Germany and Poland, to multi-local mobility practices to the United States, yet she has a different time frame in mind.

4.3 MALINKA, PART I: “THE ONE WHO WANTS TO EMIGRATE”

Malinka is a young adult of Polish origin, whom I met in a quiet café in a southwestern neighborhood in Berlin. I got in touch with her as a result of the “snow-balling” procedure: one of my other interviewees suggested I interview her and gave me her contact information. Malinka was open to my inquiry and we made an appointment right away. The meeting was ordinary. We talked about my research project and about how I met my other interviewee, who is Malinka’s good friend. I interviewed her on July 8, 2014. At that point in time, Malinka was 34 years old. After having posed my initial question, she did not immediately fall into a narrative mode, so I had to encourage her to elaborate quite a few times. She narrated in paragraph form only later in the interview. The interview lasted one hour and fifty-one minutes.

Her autobiographical narrative is a detailed summary of her life. Malinka often indulges in reflection when narrating her life story. Her biographical narrative differs from those analyzed before insofar as the issue of mobility arises very early in her life-course and the frequency of mobility experiences is a lot higher than in the biographical experiences of the other interviewees. In fact, Malinka had the most mobility experiences, amounting up to twelve relocations of her center of life. Her story is especially interesting as it emphasizes how her mobility practices evolve during her life-course at specific points in time. In

view of my study interest, I divide the analysis of her life in two parts in order to show how her mobility practices change and what biographical constellation underlie these developments. Similar to Janusz—whose narrative I have also divided in two parts—there is also a specific *key moment* that I identified as “life-changing” which consequently had an impact on her mobility practices. The changes as such, however, were rather insidious and unpredictable. In this section, I will deal with the first part of her life story in which *family structures, languages, and social relationships* play an important role in the early emergence of *mobility practices* in her childhood and adolescence. I will analyze the second part of her life story on the biographical consequences of this *key moment* in the next empirical chapter. But before I discuss Malinka’s early life experiences in-depth, we shall first see how her mother’s history frames the background of her own story.

Transnational “Motherhood” Reversed: Living a Transnational “Childhood”

Malinka was born in Berlin (l.4) and in keeping with commonly used categories in migration research, she would be categorized as a “second generation migrant.” In fact, there is a migratory movement in her family history, namely that of her mother’s. Although Malinka was not born in Poland, all her family lives there—yet again:

“My whole family, they live in Poland. My mum, well she is, yet again, back in Poland by now. Exactly, she lived here in Berlin for a long time [...] My dad has never lived in Berlin. Well, my parents separated. Yeah, this is why my mum came to Berlin.” (ll.6-10)⁴⁴

While all of her family lives in Poland, Malinka is the only one living in another country, namely in the country she was born: Germany. However, Poland is significant not only in terms of her cultural heritage, but also as a geographical space since all her family lives there. Before the family’s reunification in Poland, Malinka’s mother lived in Berlin for quite a considerable time. The family relations that Malinka introduces here emphasize the context of her mother’s mobility towards Berlin, which indeed, clarifies Malinka’s birthplace. She tells me that

44 “Meine ganze Familie, die leben in Polen. Meine Mama, also mittlerweile ist die auch schon wieder in Polen. Genau, eine ganze Zeit hat sie halt hier gelebt in Berlin [...] Ich habe drei Halbgeschwister. [...] Mein Papa hat nie in Berlin gelebt. Also meine Eltern haben sich getrennt. Genau, deswegen ist meine Mama nach Berlin.”

her parents separated, probably when Malinka's mother was pregnant with her. This event subsequently led to her mother moving to Berlin. Her family history tells us not only about delicate issues like her parent's separation, but it also indicates ongoing mobility practices in her mother's life-course as we learn that she moved to Berlin, but eventually moved back to Poland—in the sense of “return-migration.” However, in the early stages of her life-cycle, Malinka first lived with her mother in Berlin. The reason why both mother and daughter lived there lies in her mother's personal circumstances:

“[My mother] worked at customs and she met someone there. And it was also someone from Poland. He, however, lived in Berlin. Exactly, he was of Polish heritage and therefore she moved to Berlin. Because she married him.” (11.91-94)⁴⁵

Malinka spent her formative years in Berlin where she attended kindergarten from an early age, but she got sick very often:

“Well, I went to the kindergarten here [in Berlin]. My grandma was very often at our place and also, I had been ill. Well, my grandparents, they lived in Poznan in the countryside and I spent a lot of time there. I felt a lot better there [...] that's not so far away. At my grandma's, I was all the time with her.” (11.24-27)⁴⁶

Malinka's illness, which is left unspecified, brought about her grandmother's presence in Berlin until Malinka could spend more time in Poznan, Poland with her grandparents. She eventually “moved” to Poland as a toddler: “I was three or two when I moved to Poland.” (11.43f)⁴⁷ Malinka lived for the first few years of her life in Berlin and then she relocated to Poznan due to her illness, where she was subsequently raised. I could not quite understand the links and circumstances of this relocation, so I asked Malinka to tell me a little more about this situa-

45 “[Meine Mutter] hat gearbeitet für den Zoll und da hat sie halt Jemanden kennengelernt und das war auch Jemand aus Polen, der hat aber in Berlin gelebt. Genau, also mit polnischen Wurzeln und deswegen ist sie halt nach Berlin gegangen. Genau, weil Sie ihn dann nochmal geheiratet hat.”

46 “Also ich bin hier [in Berlin] in den Kindergarten gegangen. Meine Oma war auch ganz oft bei uns und ich war auch krank. Also, meine Großeltern, die wohnten in Posen auf dem Land und da hab ich dann viel Zeit verbracht, und da ging es mir auch viel besser [...] das ist nicht so weit. Bei meiner Oma, da war ich dann die ganze Zeit bei ihr.”

47 “Da war ich drei oder mit zwei bin ich nach Polen gezogen.”

tion. Since Malinka was so young at the time of the move, she struggles to remember:

“Well, I can remember when I was a child, I attended kindergarten and I didn’t like it at all. It was really terrible for me to go there. Maybe that’s why I got ill so often.” (ll.54ff)⁴⁸

Malinka tries to make sense of how her illness came about and proposes a physical manifestation of her dislike of kindergarten. However, she does not really know what caused this emotional and physical distress (l.60), yet it influenced the families’ decision to raise her in Poland instead of Germany. Since Malinkas’ childhood memory is rather vague, she supplements her own recollections of this history through a “family narrative”:

“They told me that I didn’t like to go there and also that I cried a lot and then she took me to Poland and, then I was in Poland.” (ll.70ff)⁴⁹

Malinka can only repeat what she was told about this situation by others, namely her family members. She, however, tries to find explanations for it in her narrative, and suspects she had difficulty being separated from her mother: “The familiarization phase, maybe she should have approached it a little differently. I don’t know how it was back then.” (ll.64ff)⁵⁰ Malinka points to the process of familiarization into kindergarten and her mother’s role in this context (“she”) wondering whether her mother could have handled the matter differently. At the same time, Malinka relativizes her statement when uttering that at the end of the day, she would not have known what was going on at the time. Basically, we get to know that Malinka moved from Berlin to Poznan very early in her life-course. This relocation is related to health and/or emotional reasons. While Malinka moved to Poznan, her mother stayed with her husband in Berlin. Once in Poland, Malinka recalls how much better she felt there (l.78). *Ex post*, she emphasizes both sides of the coin of living in Poland as a child:

48 “Naja, also ich kann mich erinnern als ich klein war, war ich [...] ja im Kindergarten und das mochte ich gar nicht. War ganz schlimm für mich wieder hinzugehen. Also, vielleicht kam es ja auch deswegen, dass ich so oft krank war.”

49 “Das wurde mir dann erzählt, dass ich da nicht gerne hingegangen bin und ich habe dann auch [...] häufig geweint und dann hat sie mich nach Polen genommen und ja dann war ich in Polen.”

50 “Diese Phase des Eingewöhnens vielleicht, dass die das ein bisschen anders machen sollte. Ich weiß auch nicht wie es früher abgelaufen ist.”

"It was on a farm and we had many animals. I had my cat there, [...] I also had a lot of friends and my cousin lived not far away, too. It was certainly great. But actually, I always missed my mum. It was difficult. She was there very often. Every weekend, she was there. Exactly, but this was difficult, but somehow, I didn't want to be in Berlin. [...] I simply didn't want to go to Berlin." (ll.47-52)⁵¹

What she liked most about her childhood in Poland was that she was surrounded by animals, other children and other family members such as her cousins. Yet, Malinka regretted her mother's absence. The negative side of being raised in Poland was, as Malinka underlines, the difficulties of not being with her mother on an everyday basis. Her mother, however, was going back and forth between Berlin and Poznan to see her daughter as Malinka "simply did not want to be in Berlin." From early on, she had a negative connotation with her birthplace, Berlin, which explains why her mother intensively practiced transnational circulation flows between the place she was living and the place her daughter was living. We witness here an alternative border-crossing child-rearing arrangement between Malinka's mother and Malinka's grandparents in Poland in order to accommodate the spatio-temporal separation of mother and daughter. In transnational studies, this phenomenon is known as "transnational motherhood." (Hondagneu-Sotela/Avila 1997) In most empirical studies, transnational motherhood is an economic arrangement: women work in other countries to earn a better income in order to support their children and other family members back home. The mother-child separation in this case, we can assume, was influenced by more than just an economic factor, such as Malinka's unhappiness in Berlin conflicting with her mother's married life there.

The first relocation of Malinka's center of life transformed her living conditions not only in the form of a *geographical dislocation*, but also for the *re-configuration of her attachment figures*. It was her grandparents and particularly her grandmother who took care of Malinka in Poland. Thus, Malinka's grandmother switched positions with Malinka's mother as the immediate day-to-day caretaker. During her early childhood, Malinka's relationships mostly consisted

51 "Das war auf einem Bauernhof und wir hatten da ganz viele Tiere und ich hatte da dann meine Katze [...] und dann hatte ich da auch ganz viele Freunde und meine Cousine lebte auch nicht weit weg und das war natürlich ganz toll. Aber eigentlich habe ich meine Mama immer vermisst. Das war schwierig. Sie war zwar ganz oft da. Sie war jedes Wochenende war sie da, genau, aber dies war dann schwierig, aber ich wollte irgendwie nicht nach Berlin. [...] Ich wollte halt nicht nach Berlin."

of family members. Despite the geographical separation, the relationship between Malinka and her mother remained close, particularly as a result of her mother's efforts to go back and forth between Berlin and Poznan. However, on a daily basis, Malinka was living with her grandparents, a circumstance that she *ex post* considers to have been difficult for her grandparents, too:

“Yes, I think I was a little difficult as a child. Especially for my grandparents because I believe that grandparents as such cannot or do not want to be as strict as the parents. And I don't know, they weren't.” (II.127-130)⁵²

In retrospect, Malinka thinks of herself as having been a difficult child. Nevertheless, she had a fairly good relationship with her grandparents who were not strict with her and took good care of her. Malinka's early relocation not only transformed her social relationships, but it also had an impact on language acquirement and use. While Malinka was still living in Berlin, her mother spoke Polish with her (I.81), but once she attended kindergarten, she started to catch up on German. As her stay in Poland continued, Malinka forgot how to speak German as it was not a part of her daily life (I.1036). Therefore, Polish is her first language (I.1035). In the course of her childhood in Poland, Malinka attended elementary school there for the first two years. She remembers Polish school as being quite strict:

“I know [...] that it was stricter. [...] I know that sometimes, when we were naughty, for example we had to go in the corner and on our knees and hold up our hands, etc. Sometimes you got it with a stick on the hands [...] I know we had a very good class community and somehow, if something had happened, then [...] we caught each other. [...] In retrospect, [I] did not perceive it as bad. Well, it happened to everyone sooner or later [laughter].” (II.105-116)⁵³

52 “Ja, ich glaub' ich war ein bisschen schwierig als Kind. Also, vor allem für meine Großeltern, weil ich glaube so Großeltern können oder wollen auch nicht so streng sein, nicht so wie die Eltern. Keine Ahnung und das waren sie auch gar nicht.”

53 “Ich weiß [...], dass es strenger war. [...] Ich weiß zum Beispiel, dass wir manchmal, wenn wir unartig waren, mussten wir dann in die Ecke und auf die Knie und die Hände hochhalten usw. Manchmal hat man auch mit so einem Stock auf die Hände bekommen [...] Ich weiß wir hatten eine ganz gute Klassengemeinschaft und irgendwie, wenn sowas passiert war, dann [...] [hat] man sich gegenseitig aufgefangen. [...] Im Nachhinein, fand [ich] es halt nicht schlimm. Also, es hat jeden mal getroffen [Lachen].”

All in all, growing up in Poland seemed rather regular, except the fact that Malinka missed her mother all the time. After having lived in Poland for about five years, Malinka moved back to Berlin to be with her mother.

Between Regret and Integration

Understandably, Malinka tells me that her mother wanted to take her daughter back to Germany (1.149). First of all, it is likely that Malinka's mother missed her daughter as well and that living geographically separated was emotionally difficult for both of them. Second, maintaining "transnational motherhood" takes a lot of effort. When Malinka was eight years old, her mother finally decided to take her daughter back to Berlin—against her will. The main reason, as narrated by Malinka, involved the issue of integration:

"She had wanted to take me [back to Berlin] earlier, but I didn't want to [...] but one day she said: 'No, there's no other way now. It's time and I will take you with me now.' Because eventually it would be more and more difficult to integrate me and for me to learn the language and handle the subjects [in school, A/N] and yes, therefore the decision was made." (ll.139-145)⁵⁴

The decision to take Malinka back to Berlin was a rather lengthy process, which was eventually initiated by Malinka's mother. Malinka was not able to have her way in this situation. She was passively exposed to her mother's decision to relocate her center of life back from Poznan to Berlin. Her mother was worried that the longer Malinka lived in Poland, the more difficulty she would have in adapting to Germany. For that, acquiring the German language in order to follow classes in school played a decisive role in her mother's considerations. By the same token, this decision also indicated that her mother did not plan to return to Poland anytime soon. Subsequently, Malinka stopped attending school in Poland and started attending grade two in Germany (1.37). In fact, in the initial weeks and months following her arrival in Germany, Malinka missed being in Poland:

54 "Sie wollte mich schon früher immer mitnehmen [zurück nach Berlin], aber ich wollte nicht [...] aber irgendwann meinte sie dann: 'Nee, jetzt geht's halt nicht anders. Es ist soweit und dann nehme ich dich jetzt mit.' Denn irgendwann wird es immer schwieriger sein mich dann einzugliedern und die Sprache zu lernen und mit dem Unterrichtsstoff irgendwie zurechtzukommen und ja, damit war das entschieden."

“Yes, it must have been 1986/87 [...] we were very often in Poland then since I really missed it [...] and I had a bit of a trouble to somehow acclimatize here in Berlin.” (II.245ff)⁵⁵

Malinka went back and forth between Berlin and Poznan, because she missed her old environment. She regretted not being there. “Missing Poland” went hand in hand with the difficulties of adapting or—as she puts it—acclimatizing to Berlin. It appears as though both issues were interrelated. Malinka’s emotional attachment towards Poland persisted for several months. The (already established) transnational connections were intensified by regular bi-local mobility flows, and this time Malinka and her mother carried them out together: “At the beginning, every two weeks at least [we’d go to Poland]. [...] It did not last for long, though, at least a couple of months and then it was more rarely.” (II.254f)⁵⁶ Yet, after a while, her transnational mobility practices decreased as did her emotional attachment to Poland: “I missed it for a while and after a while it did not matter anymore, I guess.” (I.251f)⁵⁷ At the end of the day, Malinka’s mother was right: Malinka’s process of integration into Germany was successful without facing too many difficulties. An advantage was certainly that Malinka met another Polish girl in her class, who was also not able to speak German so both girls soon became friends. Another advantage was that acquiring German was kind of an automatic process:

“At first, I didn’t understand so much. Well, but eventually it came. It went automatically without me being aware. [...] I also don’t feel that I was aware of learning the language. We also had remedial courses [in German], so for the foreign children in small groups [...] it happened by itself somehow.” (II.167-174)⁵⁸

55 “Ja, dann war’s 1986/87 [...] da waren wir sehr häufig in Polen. Da habe ich [Polen] auch noch sehr vermisst [...] und da hatte ich so ein bisschen Schwierigkeiten mich hier [in Berlin] irgendwie so zu akklimatisieren.”

56 “Also, mindestens alle 2 Wochen am Anfang [waren wir in Polen] [...]. Das ging aber nicht lange, mindestens ein paar Monate und dann halt immer seltener.”

57 “Ich hab’s vermisst eine Zeit lang und nach einer Zeit ist es egal, glaube ich.”

58 “Am Anfang habe ich nicht so viel verstanden. Also, aber irgendwann kommt es dann. Das ging automatisch ohne dass es bewusst [war]. [...] Ich habe auch gar nicht gefühlt, dass ich bewusst die Sprache gelernt habe. Also, wir hatten dann auch Förderkurse [in Deutsch], also extra für die ausländischen Kinder in ganz kleinen Grüppchen [...] es ging wie von alleine irgendwie.”

As opposed to other interviewees, we can see that acquiring the official language of the “country of arrival” was relatively easy for Malinka. On the one hand, she already had a new friend and was therefore not feeling like an “outsider” in class. On the other hand, she received additional support in the form of remedial courses within a small group of children who did not yet speak German fluently. Arguably, these two factors prevented Malinka from too much in the way of suffering. What is more, Malinka mentions that she did not encounter any discrimination in the classroom. The other German students perceived her as “normal” and no one teased her (II.180-184). While she continued speaking Polish at home (I.176), the process of integrating into Germany, in Malinka’s case particularly into the institution of elementary school, was rather unproblematic.

Generally, her everyday life was mainly determined by attending school and complementing her educational pathway. Malinka finished elementary school and continued to middle school (*Realschule*). By then, she had a lot of friends in her class, with whom she would have done many activities outside of school like attending a dancing academy and a swimming club (II.234). Most of her friends were German:

“My best friend at the time was also German. Then I got together with her brother [laughter]. So, all the time, I had no Polish friends, but not intentionally. It just didn’t happen.” (II.216-218)⁵⁹

Her social circle consisted of German fellow classmates: her best friend was German and her first boyfriend as well. However, she did not intentionally choose to befriend only Germans, but, rather it just happened that way. In the course of her life, Malinka overcame the “acclimatizing challenges” she had initially faced after relocating from Poznan back to Berlin. She learned the language relatively quickly and established social relationships with many fellow students. In a way, this evolvement of her life-course shows that she integrated into German society successfully, not least because her regret at not being in Poland decreased.

59 “Meine beste Freundin zu der Zeit, die war auch Deutsch. Dann bin ich mit ihrem Bruder zusammengekommen [Lachen]. Also, ich hatte die ganze Zeit keine polnischen Freunde, also gar nicht so bewusst. Es hat sich nicht so ergeben.”

Perceiving “Origin” in a Transnational Context

As stated above, Malinka is a German born of Polish heritage and thus she would be categorized as “second generation.” Interestingly, her reflections on her biographical experiences suggests another self-positioning. In this context, the geographical place of Poland is salient as a “space of meaning.” The categorization of first and second generation or the generation 1.5 commonly used in migration research is challenged by Malinka herself, indicating that belonging to a generation can be a lot more ambiguous and complex if we take into consideration the subjective evaluation of the individuals themselves. As we have seen, Malinka moved from Berlin to Poznan at a very young age, where she spent five years of her early childhood. She incorporates this early relocation of her center of life into her self-perception. As for the categorization of “migrant generations,” Malinka perceives herself as having been born in Poland:

Malinka: “Sometimes I say like well I’m a native-born from Poland [...]”

A.W.: “But interestingly enough, you were not born in Poland.”

Malinka: “Yeah, but I come from Poland. That’s right! [Laughter] It is a little complicated, because my parents and my whole family comes from Poland. I was born here, but I was in Poland and the first language I acquired was Polish. In fact, I started with German, but I quickly forgot it. It did not stick [...] Exactly, therefore I do say that I’m a native-born from Poland. Yes, indeed.” (ll.940-960)⁶⁰

This excerpt illustrates the ambiguity in Malinka’s self-perception about the place she was born. Usually, based on their “birthplace,” individuals are categorized in different “migrant generations.” Malinka perceives herself to be born in Poland. She does not realize that her statement of being born in Poland is factually incorrect. When I brought this incongruity to her attention, Malinka became irritated before acknowledging my point. She objectively agrees that she was not, in fact, born in Poland, but she subjectively does not distance herself from

60 Malinka: “Ja, manchmal sage ich so naja, also gebürtig bin ich aus Polen [...]”

A.W.: “Aber interessanterweise kommst du ja gar nicht gebürtig aus Polen.”

Malinka: “Ja, ich komme ja aus Polen. Stimmt! [Lachen] Das ist so ein bisschen kompliziert, weil meine Eltern und meine ganze Familie kommt aus Polen. Ich bin hier geboren, und war ja auch in Polen und die erste Sprache die ich gelernt habe war ja Polnisch. Ich habe zwar mit Deutsch auch angefangen, aber das habe ich schnell vergessen, das war noch nicht so manifestiert [...] Genau, deswegen sage ich schon dass ich gebürtig aus Polen komme. Ja, genau.”

her earlier statement. She rather defends her subjective perception about where she was born. She sees this statement as (subjectively) true, which is in line with the well-known Thomas-theorem: “If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences.” (Thomas/Thomas 1928; see also Merton 1995) “Being born in Poland” is true for her and she therefore defines her situation accordingly, making her biographical experiences rather comply with the experiences of the generation 1.5 (Rumbaut 2012), and not the second generation. In this sense, Malinka constructs a meaning of Poland not only as the country of her cultural origin and the country where her whole family lives, but also as the country in which she was born. Thus, she affirms her belonging to Poland: culturally and geographically. This re-positioning of the birthplace is strongly linked with her early experiences of bi-localism while living a transnational childhood.

Immigration or Mobility?

Malinka’s educational pathway was ordinary until her senior years, i.e., after she graduated middle school and pursued her *Abitur* in another school in Berlin. Though she does not mention which school she attended, in the German school system it can only be the *Gymnasium*, an academic high school, or the *Gesamtschule*, a comprehensive high school, in which students can acquire the *Abitur* certificate. These senior years usually take three years. For Malinka, this time of schooling leads to an interesting development:

“Then I continued with the senior years [laughter]. Oh, one year I was here and one year I was in the United States, right. I had a year abroad there. I thought it was really good.” (ll.260f)⁶¹

She immediately emphasizes how much she enjoyed her year abroad in the United States. She must have been about sixteen years old when she relocated her center of life from Berlin to Sacramento for a temporally-restricted amount of one year. Curious about how this experience came about, I asked Malinka to tell me more about it. Basically, she had set her mind to go there:

“I’m not sure whether I watched a movie about the USA or the exchange program, but at some point, I had it in mind to go to the USA at any rate, definitely to California. [...] We

61 “Dann ging es mit dem Abi weiter [Lachen] Ach, da habe ich ein Jahr hier gemacht und dann war ich ein Jahr in den USA. Da habe ich Auslandsjahr gemacht. Das fand ich richtig gut.”

watched those series ‘Beverly Hills’ and ‘Melrose Place’ [...]. Certainly, I knew I wanted to get away. So, for one year, so one year abroad.” (II.294-301)⁶²

Malinka cannot recollect how she came up with this idea. She indicates that her wish to go to California may have been influenced by the media. In this context, she mentions having watched popular fictional television series set in California. At this point in time, Malinka painted a picture of the United States, in particular of California, as a desirable place to live. Constructing such a positive imaginary on the basis of popular television series influenced her destination. Malinka conceived of doing a student exchange in the form of a “year abroad” as a realistic option to fulfil her desire to get away. In order to put this possibility into practice, she needed to organize it: “So there were organizations that organized this kind of thing. I applied to several of them and then I went with one of them.” (II.310ff)⁶³ Evidently, organizing a student exchange requires knowledge of the different channels and organizations that offer such services. Malinka gained all the necessary knowledge and completed the application process. She actively took care of these tasks in order to make her wish come true. However, her mother was a little skeptical about her daughter’s idea to go abroad at first, but she got “on board” quite fast. Malinka did not need to persuade her much (I.322): “Well, [my mother] has always let me follow my own path. So, she always supported me in what I wanted to do.” (II.323ff)⁶⁴ At this point in her life-course, Malinka had a boyfriend, whom she had been with for two or three years by then, but she wanted to go anyway (I.312ff). She was with him during the whole year abroad. It was thus a proactive decision on the part of Malinka, a self-initiated biographical experience, which would have far-reaching consequences for her life-path. The year abroad in Sacramento was “the best year” for Malinka:

62 “Ich weiß nicht ob ich mal ’nen Film über die USA gesehen habe oder über das Austauschprogramm, aber irgendwann hatte ich den Gedanken: ‘Ich fahr auf jeden Fall in die USA, auf jeden Fall nach Kalifornien.’ [...] Man hat ja damals auch diese Serien geschaut ‘Beverly Hills’ und ‘Melrose Place’ [...]. Auf jeden Fall wusst’ ich, ich will weg. Also, ich will ein Jahr also ein Austauschjahr machen.”

63 “Es gab also Organisationen, die es organisiert haben. [...] Ich habe mich bei mehreren beworben und dann [...] bin ich mit einer gegangen.”

64 “Also, [meine Mutter] hat mich, glaube ich, auch immer schon so meinen Weg gehen lassen. Also, immer indem auch unterstützt was ich dann machen wollte.”

“And then I was there, yes and it was great. It was really one of my best years. I thought it was awesome in the USA. I was with this host family and I met new friends quite fast [...] and then I did a lot of things. Right from the beginning, I did a lot with the people there, right, after school and on the weekends and it was really a great year [...] for me. It was a great year.” (ll.314-318)⁶⁵

She enjoyed the mobility experience in Sacramento very much. She especially liked having made many new friends, establishing good relationships with her host family and fellow students at the high school. For her, this experience was *exceptionally* positive. One reason might be that Malinka did not face strong language barriers. Learning English at school provided her with a good basis on which she was able to build. Again, Malinka improved her foreign language skills “automatically” as she likes to say. She reflects about her experiences of learning languages and concludes that she does not put herself under pressure: “I’m this kind of a person who does not stress myself or I don’t think about it so much. It simply happens, and it was exactly the case with my English, so it happened that I improved it and it was [...] good.” (ll.347ff)⁶⁶ However, Malinka’s “best year” eventually came to an end. The mobility experience to the United States was temporally-restricted. It is institutionally predetermined for high school students to go abroad for one year at the most so that they are able to return and graduate at their home institutions. This is exactly what Malinka did. She returned to Berlin and attained her *Abitur*. She remembers that coming back to Berlin was difficult for her:

“It was difficult. It is always difficult for me to return and settle down again when I’ve been abroad for a long time. Perhaps there is something a bit like a red thread, which hooks somehow. When I was coming back from Poland, well, it was also difficult. It was also the school, being there again, it was difficult. At the beginning, I had difficulty getting on track there and the people [...] I have good friends in Berlin, but somehow, I

65 “Und dann war ich da und es war toll. Es war echt mit das beste Jahr. Also, ich fand’s super in den USA. Ich hatte auch diese Gastfamilie und ich habe auch recht schnell Freunde getroffen und [...] ich hab’ dann auch recht viel gemacht. Also, von Anfang an immer viel unternommen mit den Leuten, also nach der Schule und auch am Wochenende und es war echt ein tolles Jahr [...] für mich. Es war ein super Jahr.”

66 “Ich bin auch ein Mensch, ich mache mir nicht so viel Stress oder nicht so viele Gedanken. Es kommt dann einfach und genauso war das mit dem Englisch, also es kam halt und es war [...] gut.”

missed the USA. It then got into my head, well, I want to go back to the USA.” (Il.337-344)⁶⁷

Malinka points out that she struggled to reintegrate in Berlin. She had difficulties keeping up with classes and she missed her friends in the United States. Intriguingly, she not only reflects on the difficulties of returning back to Berlin from the United States, but she relates it to her first move from Poland to Berlin. She clearly sees parallels between these two life situations of “being away and coming back.” It constitutes a red thread in her life, which she describes as “hooking.” Here, a striking similarity comes to the fore: she always seems to miss something. She seems to regret not being where she was before. Painting the image of a “hooking red thread” going through her life, Malinka stresses not knowing how to deal with these repetitive situations of struggling to reintegrate. For this mobility experience, Malinka coped with this situation by developing the idea of going back to the United States eventually. However, another reason for facing difficulties once back in Berlin may be related to her former boyfriend. As mentioned earlier, the relationship was still going on when Malinka left for the United States, yet it abruptly ended when she came back and found out that her former boyfriend maintained a close relationship with another girl:

“Because in the end when I came back, I found out that my boyfriend somehow, sometime his/ just before departure to the USA or so that he was with a friend of mine, or acquaintance or someone from school with whom I was friends. Anyway, then I broke up. Right, we had seen each other after I returned and then I found out about it. It was, of course, a big drama and then [...] we broke up. That was a good thing. That was a good thing.” (Il.352-358)⁶⁸

67 “Das war schwierig. Für mich ist es immer schwierig wenn ich eine längere Zeit im Ausland bin und wieder zurück komme, mich dann wieder so einzuleben. Also, irgendwie ist da vielleicht auch ein bisschen so ein roter Faden, der hakt irgendwie. [Als ich] aus Polen wiedergekommen [bin], war es auch schwierig. [...] Die Schule fand ich dann wieder auch schwierig. Da hatte ich auch anfangs meine Schwierigkeiten da wieder reinzukommen und die Leute. [...] Ich hatte [...] gute Freunde in Berlin aber irgendwie hab’ ich dann auch schon die USA vermisst. Es hat sich dann schon so in mein Kopf reingesetzt, also ich will wieder nach USA.”

68 “Weil im Endeffekt als ich dann wiedergekommen bin, habe ich rausgefunden, dass mein Freund dann, kurz bevor ich in die USA gegangen [...], dass er mit einer Freundin von mir, oder Bekannten oder also jemand aus der Schule mit der ich auch befreundet war. Wie auch immer und dann habe ich Schluss gemacht. Also, wir haben

Malinka's former boyfriend engaged in another relationship, but already before Malinka's actual departure. She, however, only learned about it when she came back from the United States; one year later. She subsequently ended the relationship, which had been—to use her words—a “drama.” In a way, the mobility experience to the United States made it possible for this relationship to last longer. Malinka, however, emphasizes *post hoc* that ending the relationship was a good thing to do.

Having had a great time abroad and facing struggles with her life in Berlin reinforced her desire to go back to the United States. In fact, her mobility experience to the United States triggered further mobility orientations that Malinka was eventually to put into practice:

“[The year abroad in the USA] was somehow really great and then I came back, and I graduated. And I was thinking because I enjoyed the year in the USA so much that I somehow want to live there [laughter]. It was kind of my goal. But right after graduation, I guess I was working for a year or so and I think I started studying economics and then I told myself: ‘Nope, I want to give it a shot in the USA’ and I had such a good relationship with my host family and they said: ‘Yes, if you come, you can live with us and attend the city college’ and that was what I did.” (ll.280-287)⁶⁹

In this quote, Malinka presents the consequences of her stay abroad in respect to her future plans: she wanted to go back to the United States in order to live there without having a pre-determined restriction on the time of her stay, or, to put it differently: she wanted to immigrate there. Malinka creates a positive imaginary of the United States, which was enhanced by her positive mobility experience there. Indeed, it was so powerful that it promoted a desire to immigrate and live

uns dann halt noch gesehen als ich wiedergekommen bin und dann habe ich das rausbekommen. Es war natürlich auch so'n Drama und [...] dann habe ich Schluss gemacht. Das war auch gut so. Das war auch gut so.”

- 69 “[Das Auslandsjahr in den USA] war irgendwie ganz toll und dann bin ich wiedergekommen und dann habe ich hier das Abi zu Ende gemacht. Ich dachte ja weil ich die USA so toll fand’, dass ich irgendwie in den USA leben will [Lachen]. Das war irgendwie so mein Ziel. Aber gleich nach dem Abi, ich glaube, ich habe dann ein bisschen gearbeitet dann so ein Jahr oder so habe ich gearbeitet und ich habe dann auch mit BWL angefangen und dann habe ich aber gesagt: ‘Nee, ich will’s jetzt doch in den USA versuchen’ und hatte so guten Kontakt zu meiner Gastfamilie und die meinten so: ‘Ja, wenn du kommst, kannst auch bei uns leben und da in der Stadt auf’s College gehen’ und das habe ich dann auch gemacht.”

a life there. However, she did not return there immediately after graduation, but first she spent time working at temporary random jobs in Berlin until she began to study economics. It took her about a year to return to the United States. We could assume that, for Malinka, it was a time for getting things into place making up her mind about immigrating and taking the necessary steps. For her, the decision to finally move there was realistic: she was able to arrange her accommodation through networks she had established during her first stay, in which her former and to-be host family played a major role. They gave her pragmatic courtesy, encouragement, and initial security. However, Malinka not only decided to immigrate to the United States because she enjoyed her mobility experience so much, but her quotidian life circumstances in Berlin at that time played a crucial role in the decision-making process. As for her professional future, Malinka wanted to study psychology, but she was not admitted to a program:

“But it didn’t work out [...] to get admission [into psychology] and then I was thinking: ‘OK, I have worked and then I studied economics.’ And then I was thinking, because I wanted to go to the USA anyway, I was thinking: ‘OK, I will study there.’ I guess it was like that.” (II.372-375)⁷⁰

Malinka was not admitted to study in the field of psychology, her desired field of study. Generally speaking, admission into the field of psychology in Germany is restricted: universities contain a *numerus clausus*. The fact that Malinka did not get into psychology right away indicates that her final grade of the *Abitur* did not match the *numerus clausus*, so she had to face a waiting period. Malinka saw immigration as a way to solve the problems she was facing: she was not able to study psychology in Germany, so she made up her mind to do so in the United States. Retrospectively, Malinka admits that she might have decided otherwise had she been permitted to study psychology in Germany:

“I know for sure that I already had the idea to return when I came back from the USA. And I don’t know if this idea would simply have gone away if I had gotten a place in psychology at university here. I don’t know to what extent this has played a role, but I think it

70 “Es hat aber nicht geklappt [...] da reinzukommen [in Psychologie] und dann dachte ich: ‘Ok, du hast dann gearbeitet und dann mache ich halt BWL.’ Und dann dachte ich, weil ich sowieso in die USA wollte, dachte ich: ‘Ok, dann fange ich da an zu studieren’. Ich glaube so war das.”

was a little bit of both, because I definitely already toyed with this idea when I graduated from high school.” (II.382-387)⁷¹

Under different circumstances, Malinka might have made another decision. Yet, she emphasizes that she had toyed with the idea of living in the United States for a long time. Until then, there were no incidents that demolished the constructed imaginary. Quite the opposite, the idea of moving became a more concrete possibility in view of her situation after graduating high school: an obviously unfulfilling professional outlook in Germany. In other words: the initially vague idea of immigrating was nourished by unsatisfying life circumstances. Ultimately, Malinka put her life project of immigrating into the United States into practice. Having taken this step, it turned out that she did not like it there as much as she assumed she would:

“I was a little older when I went there for the second time. [...] I was simply confronted with things I had not faced before, because if you want to stay there for longer, you face many difficulties, right. Things like: ‘Do I get a work permit later?’ and so on. It’s not so sure. [...] Suddenly I found a lot of things negative. They struck me in a negative way. I also thought the people to be more superficial. Well, I still had the old friends from school, but many of those were indeed no longer in Sacramento, because they had gone away to study some place else.” (II.408-416)⁷²

The expectations that Malinka had for her life in the United States did not correspond with the reality she encountered on site. This experience was more nega-

71 “Ich weiss auf jeden Fall, dass ich den Gedanken schon im Hinterkopf hatte als ich dann aus den USA wiederkam, wieder in die USA zu gehen. Und ich weiss nicht, ob dieser Gedanke nicht vielleicht eher weggegangen wäre, wenn ich hier einen Studienplatz bekommen hätte in Psychologie. Ich weiss jetzt auch nicht, inwieweit das noch eine Rolle mitgespielt hat, aber ich glaube es war so ein bisschen beides, weil mit dem Gedanken habe ich auf jeden Fall schon gespielt als ich das Abi gemacht habe.”

72 “Als ich das zweite Mal dort hingegangen bin, da war ich dann ein bisschen älter. [...] Ich war dann einfach mit Sachen konfrontiert, mit denen ich vorher nicht konfrontiert war, weil wenn man da länger bleiben will, [...] steht man dann schon vor vielen Schwierigkeiten. Sowas wie: ‘Bekomme ich dann später eine Arbeitserlaubnis?’ usw. Ist auch nicht so sicher. Auf einmal fand ich viele Sachen negativ. Die sind mir negativ aufgefallen. Ich fand auch die Leute oberflächlicher. Also, ich hatte zwar noch die alten Freunde von der Schule, aber viele von denen waren ja auch nicht mehr in Sacramento, weil die weggegangen sind zum studieren.”

tive than positive. She was faced with administrative challenges related to her foreign-born nationality, the insecurity resulting from it, and the fact that some friends she knew from last time had left Sacramento. Through this accumulation of factors, the positive imaginary she had constructed began to crumble. Generally, what was different the second time is that Malinka intended to stay in the United States “for good”:

“I left with the idea of staying there for good, right? I remember missing [my boyfriend at that time] very much and I also really missed my friends. And then at once I made the decision: ‘No, I come back. I don’t want to live here.’ Well, consciously saying: ‘OK, the USA is not for me.’ The whole lifestyle, the attitude, those people, that’s just not for me. [...] I like the culture here and so on.” (II.397-402)⁷³

She could not continue with her plan of immigrating for good, because she missed the people she had left behind in Germany. Apparently, Malinka left behind another boyfriend when she went to the United State in addition to her good friends. It took time to admit to herself that living in the United States was not how she wanted to live her life. Deciding to return to Berlin was a deliberation process. With regard to her boyfriend at that time, Malinka reflects about her experience:

“Ah, right. At that time, I had another boyfriend, a new one [laughter]. True, that was also such a big love. I was with him for a long time and how was that? I think I had just left him again. Well, I did not leave him, but I went away, and we were still together [...] I mean such a young love is passionate and unrealistic anyway. So, I thought: ‘Yes of course, I go to the USA, but let’s stay together [laughter].’ Then we broke up while I was in the USA. [...] now, from today’s point of view, we were just too young, and I had left with the idea of staying there forever.” (II.390-398)⁷⁴

73 “Ich bin ja auch mit dem Gedanken gegangen da für immer zu bleiben. Ich weiß, ich habe [meinen damaligen Freund] auch sehr vermisst und ich habe auch meine Freunde sehr vermisst und dann habe ich auf einmal den Entschluss gefasst: ‘Nee, ich komm zurück. Ich will da nicht leben.’ Also auch bewusst zu sagen: ‘Ok, nee, USA ist nichts für mich.’ Der ganze Lebensstil, diese Einstellung, die Leute. Das ist halt nichts für mich. [...] Ich mag hier die Kultur, usw.”

74 “Ach stimmt, da hatte ich wieder ’nen Freund, ’nen Neuen [Lachen]. Stimmt, das war auch so eine große Liebe, mit dem war ich auch lange zusammen und wie war das? Ich glaube, schon wieder, den habe ich einfach verlassen. Also, nicht verlassen, aber ich bin dann einfach gegangen und wir waren noch zusammen [...] Ich meine, so eine

Malinka remembers that she had another boyfriend when she was about to leave for the second time to the United States. It seems as though she was not fully aware of it at first. She describes this relationship as having been “another big love,” signaling that it was biographically relevant for her. Malinka had left (another) boyfriend, not in the sense of ending the relationship, but of leaving him behind. She underlines her naiveté to believe that this relationship would last in spite of the distance, but it eventually did not. Clearly, Malinka’s mobility experiences affected her romantic relationships. The experience of dissolving this romantic relationship was a bitter one. What is more, Malinka tells me that it was exactly the point in her life when she began to be more independent. Before leaving for the United States, she worked in Berlin and she was able to earn money on her own, yet this possibility remained closed to her in the United States, not least because she lacked a work permit. She also could not move “so freely,” for two reasons. First, Malinka believes that one needs a car in Sacramento, which she did not have (II.456-463). Second, her host parents wanted to know what she was up to:

“I believe it bothered me a bit [to stay at my host parents’ place]. So, in high school I had a great relationship with them, but then I realized: ‘No, I need a bit more freedom,’ because [...] they were worried. They always asked me: ‘Where are you?’ and I was at such age where I no longer wanted it. I just didn’t want to say where I was going.” (II.465-470)⁷⁵

Malinka felt that her host parents exercised a kind of “social control.” She assumes that they were worried, but, at the same time, she did not want to justify herself. She basically needed more freedom as, according to her point of view, she had entered a phase in her life cycle, where she wanted more independence.

junge Liebe, ist Leidenschaft wie auch immer und realitätsfern. Also, ich dachte: ‘Ja klar, ich geh nach USA, aber wir bleiben zusammen [Lachen].’ Dann ist es auseinander gegangen während ich in den USA war. [...] Also jetzt vom heutigen Standpunkt, wir waren einfach zu jung und ich meine ich bin ja auch mit dem Gedanken gegangen da für immer zu bleiben.”

- 75 “Ich glaube das hat mich auch so ein bisschen gestört [bei meinen Gasteltern zu wohnen]. Also, in der Highschool hatte ich ein super Verhältnis, aber danach habe ich dann gemerkt: ‘Nee, ich brauch’ schon bisschen mehr meine Freiräume,’ weil [...] die haben sich Sorgen gemacht. Die haben immer so nachgefragt: ‘Ja wo bist du denn?’ und wie auch immer. Und da war ich schon in so einem Alter, wo ich das nicht mehr wollte. Ich wollte halt nicht mehr sagen, wo ich hingehe.”

It was hard to fulfill this need for independence under these circumstances. In addition, Malinka was not happy with how the classes were structured in college. She started to study psychology there—her desired field of study—but it was not how she had imagined it:

“I started to study psychology there, but it’s different there. The first two years in college are very general. You specialize a little bit, but it’s just very general and I didn’t like to study so many different subjects, [...] which I no longer wanted to have. I thought: ‘Yeah, I already have the *Abitur*.’” (II.473–477)⁷⁶

Malinka was able to study psychology in college in Sacramento, but she encountered a way of studying and teaching there that she describes as “very general.” By that, she means that she was not learning much about psychology, but instead needed to take a number of other subjects that she felt she had already studied in order to attain her *Abitur* in German school. Educational institutions are nationally structured. Therefore, educational experiences gained in institutions of one “national container” are not always easily adaptable or transferable to institutions of another “national container.” As for Malinka, she felt that she was repeating her *Abitur* in the college in Sacramento. Her narrative reveals that she disliked basically everything she encountered, because things were different from what they would be in Germany. She realized that she preferred life in Germany over life in the United States and particularly she learned to appreciate Berlin more: “I realized [...] for the first time [...] Berlin is really cool.” (II.489f)⁷⁷ However, the most salient factor was probably her intention to stay there forever. The thought of “immigration” transformed her outlook on life there. Immigrating would just be too much:

“I began my studies and I went through one semester and then [...] I couldn’t do it anymore, especially for good. I don’t have a problem with going abroad for a year or so, but going away with the idea of staying there forever, to somehow build my life there is very different, I discovered.” (II.480–484)⁷⁸

76 “Psychologie habe ich da angefangen, aber da ist es ja anders. Da ist ja diese ersten zwei Jahre College macht man sehr allgemein. Man spezialisiert sich schon so ein bisschen, aber es ist halt sehr allgemein und ich fand es auch nicht mehr so toll, dass ich auf einmal so viele Fächer haben muss, [...] die ich irgendwie gar nicht mehr haben will. Ich dachte: ‘Ja, ich habe ja schon das Abi.’”

77 “Da habe ich auch gemerkt [...] zum ersten Mal [...] Berlin ist echt cool.”

78 “[Ich] habe angefangen zu studieren und habe das eine Semester durchgezogen und

Malinka could not put up with the thought of staying in the United States forever and to do what it took to establish a new life there. The temporal dimension apparently affected the perception of her experience abroad. Malinka points out that a temporally restricted relocation would not be a problem as opposed to a stay *ad infinitum*. At that point of her life, she realized that “immigration” was the wrong choice for her, but that she rather prefers mobility experiences that are temporally limited. Her “immigration project” thus failed and Malinka returned to Berlin. This was a significant life lesson, which influenced her further life-course. Up to this point, Malinka’s mobility experiences can be understood as transnational ones, which evolved as such only in the course of time. In her early childhood, she practiced bi-local transnational circulation flows between Germany and Poland, while she broadened her “scope of destination” towards multi-local transnational mobility later on, including cross-border connections and spatial movements between Germany and the United States. However, her story is not over just yet. In the next empirical section, we will witness another striking evolution. As for now, we can note that the attempt to immigrate to the United States symbolizes a turn-away from the thought of living a life someplace else “forever.”

4.4 TRANSMOBILITY: CROSS-BORDER TIES AND BI-OR MULTILocal MOBILITY

The analyses of (parts of) Janusz’s, Oscar’s and Malinka’s biographical experiences serve to illustrate the transnational pattern of mobility, or transmobility. Practicing post-migration transnational mobility is not a given, but it rather evolves on the basis of specific biographical constellations at certain points in the lives of my interviewees. The analyzed discourses center around the topics of *language acquirement* (of multiple languages), *social networks and family structures*, as well as *the construction of belonging or boundary-making*. We have seen that the very same issues are also relevant for the biographical experiences of post-migration sedentariness, yet the (biographical) configurations are different. It is safe to say that language (acquirement) has a significant impact on the transnational experiences and border-crossing mobility practices in the life sto-

dann [...] ging’s auch nicht mehr irgendwie, vor allem für immer. Ich habe kein Problem ins Ausland zu gehen, so für ein Jahr, aber so mit dem Gedanken wegzugehen da irgendwie für immer zu bleiben, mir da irgendwie ein Leben aufzubauen ist ganz anders, habe ich festgestellt.”

ries of my interviewees. First, knowledge of the heritage language is a *precondition* for relocating one's life center to Poland for a specific amount of time. In turn, mobility is central to improving those language skills. Certainly, such a constellation is similar to the need to acquire other foreign languages to practice multi-local transnational mobility. What is more, the narratives of my interviewees reveal that the *lack of (a necessary) language* at a given point in time and space and the *process of language acquirement* are often experiences of suffering. As we have seen in the former chapter, languages are not only relevant for being mobile *per se*, but also for integration into the "country of arrival," or the other "country of origin," as well as for processes of upward social mobility.

Janusz's life story strongly emphasizes the role of the Polish language in his life-path: lacking the ability to speak Polish came with a share of suffering while desired developments came about once he acquired the language. I pointed out that learning the Polish language marked a *key moment* in Janusz's life-path. His motivation was initially a personal one, to re-connect with his Polish side of the family. It, however, gained relevance in his professional life, too. Mastering the Polish language, he says, enabled him to set another focus on his academic work, which allowed him to link bi-local mobility with his educational and professional aspirations. Then again, being able to communicate in Polish was a *precondition* for his mobility experiences to Poland, while these mobility experiences became a *precondition* for improving his Polish language skills and thus for his future professional or academic success and upward social mobility. Janusz launched a "mobility circle," making bi-local mobility *integral* to his profession, and profession or work is integral for the contemporary "institutionalization of the life-course." (Kohli 1985) Oscar's narrative emphasizes the acquirement of languages as well, but in a different context, culminating into slightly different biographical experiences. In contrast with Janusz, Oscar was faced with the acquirement of three different languages. Polish is relevant to his familial relationships and networks, the maintaining of his heritage and later on for his educational phase in Poland, while French is central to his integration into Quebec society and its institutional public sphere. Acquiring English is also important for Oscar's life in Montreal. It encompasses the social realm, i.e., communicating with his cousins and other English-speakers, and the public realm, i.e., studying in the institutions of higher education. The results of analyzing his narrative show that getting fluent in three languages demanded a lot from him, evolving into a "suffering structure" for a long phase of his life. After having acquired all these languages, Oscar is still perceived as "the other" wherever he is. Conversely, his multilingual knowledge enables him to be multi-locally mobile. Besides living in Montreal, he has relocated his life center to Poland, he has spent a sig-

nificant phase of his life in Scotland, and he plans to relocate to New York or Toronto in future. Language acquirement is also important in Malinka's narrative of her life, yet she does not emphasize it as much as the others. Once she moved back from Poland to Germany, she certainly had to learn German, which made the process of "acclimatizing" into German society more difficult, but without much difficulty. In her youth, she first relocated to the United States for a year. However, she already had a basic knowledge of English due to language classes in German school. Generally, it seems as though Malinka acquires the language or improves her skills "automatically" when she is on site in a particular place. In her case, mobility is more strongly linked to other issues, such as *family structures* and her search for a sense of *belonging*.

The specific family structures at play in Manlinka's life-course evolved into a "transnational childhood" for Malinka and a "transnational motherhood" for Malinka's mother, as both were living spatially separated for a specific period of time. Her early relocation from Berlin to Poznan at the age of three strengthens her sense of "being Polish." This becomes especially apparent in her self-perception as being born in Poland, while she was *factually* born in Berlin. Such a self-positioning reverses her categorization from "second generation" to "generation 1.5." In Janusz case, his bi-ethnic origins and the fact that one part of his family is Polish and lives in Poland certainly contributed to and sometimes facilitated his language acquirement and his mobility practices. In the course of his life, he "transnationalized" his social relationships, so that he established networks in both countries Germany and Poland. His father is an especially central figure: he not only connects Janusz with the Polish part of his origins, but he practices bi-local mobility between Germany and Poland himself. Transnational mobility is therefore something that Janusz grew up with. Thus, the social practice of mobility was familiar to him, practiced as it was by his father, even if he himself refused to have anything to do with his Polish cultural heritage, let alone practicing mobility towards Poland, for many years. Yet, Janusz grew out of his aversion to speaking Polish or even "being Polish" and he now perceives "Polishness" not only as being integral to his work endeavours, but to his very self-understanding through which he is able to construct a sense of belonging. Speaking the language, maintaining ties to his family, constructing a sense of belonging to Poland, and especially being there leads to expectations of adapting to the society and its social and cultural values. Though Janusz cannot identify with all social norms, he still pursues a project of *multiple integration* into both German and Polish contexts. Family structures play a significant role in Oscar's life story as well. Not only is he part of an aristocratic network, which has been mobile for generations, but he also uses it as *mobility capital* when he relocates to

Poland. He is not a stranger to mobility either: both of his parents have practiced mobility themselves. His life experiences lie somewhere between “cultural learning” and “integration,” which are intensified by his transnational multi-local mobility experiences. Interestingly, in Oscar’s narrative, *belonging* is often linked with *boundary-making*. He often experiences the role of “cultural other” by being excluded, but at the same time, he himself establishes differences between himself and others: “the Québécois culture” and later “the Polish Polish.” This paradoxical constellation creates a contextual belonging that develops into a rather “cosmopolitan” self-understanding. All in all, the three interviewees mobilize their family relationships and networks in Poland in order to practice transnational mobility. Bi-or multi-local transnational mobility is often linked with educational or professional aspirations. The young adults, whose life narratives I have examined in this chapter, all have completed certain educational stations of their lives in Poland or another destination. Janusz spent one semester abroad, did an internship there and is now doing archive work there for his research. Oscar earned a degree in film school there, and Malinka attended the first two years of elementary school in Poland, a high school year as well as one semester of college in the United States. Their mobility is embedded in an educational framework. We can assume that these individuals will remain mobile in their further life-course.

As for Malinka, we will see how her mobility practices evolve in the further path of her life in the next section. However, her mobility experiences differ from those of Janusz and Oscar, not least because she has been mobile from a young age. The circumstances under which her mobility experiences emerge—not for all, but for some of her mobility practices—indicate that she uses mobility as a coping strategy to get away from unsatisfying life circumstances. From my point of view, her first relocation from Berlin to Poznan can be seen as an attempt to leave behind her illness and emotional discomfort in kindergarten in Berlin. Her first relocation to the United States could be more a thirst for adventure, yet her second relocation to the United States, her immigration project, were also a way to evade certain challenges she faced in Berlin at that point of time, like the non-admittance to a university psychology program. While for Janusz and Oscar, mobility is relevant to “move on” in the sense of pursuing educational and professional aspirations, for Malinka mobility is sometimes used to “move away” from the personal challenges she encounters at given points in time. We have seen how her transnational mobility changed from bi-local mobility between Germany and Poland to multi-local mobility, gaining another destination, the United States. At that point in her life, her mobility orientation reaches a climax, where she constructs an idea of mobility as immigration. Malinka’s

“immigration project” eventually failed, constituting a *key moment* in her life, which brings about a change in perspective toward her life, in which she re-orientates her mobility practices. Since Malinka refuses to be mobile in the sense of a “one-way ticket immigration,” she is left—as I see it—with two possibilities: either she stays sedentary or she practices temporally-restricted mobilities. In the next empirical section, we will see how her mobility practices evolve from the pattern of “transmobility” to the pattern of “cosmobility.”

5 Cosmobility:

The Cosmopolitan Pattern of Mobility

In this section, I will discuss the second part of Malinka's life story and the life story of another of my respondents, Francis. Presenting these two narratives serves as illustrations for the pattern that I call *cosmobility*. Certainly, the cosmopolitan pattern of mobility contains heterogeneous life and mobility experiences. We will see that the mobility experiences to be analyzed here follow a different logic than the other patterns, particularly when it comes to the destinations: the places to which my respondents direct their mobility experiences. What is more, we will look at the circumstances under which mobility to various destinations come about and how these two individuals construct meaning around their movements. Malinka's life story is important in two respects: (1) her life story includes mobility practices that shift from one pattern to another (from transmobility to cosmobility), and (2) it is exceptional insofar as it incorporates mobility as part of a lifestyle, by putting value on mobility as such, regardless of the destination. We will see that some biographical moments triggering mobility are specific to the German or rather the European context. Francis's case, on the other hand, is symptomatic—almost ideal-typical—for the construction of the pattern of cosmobility and provides space for contextual comparisons between other Toronto-based life stories (such as Anja's, ch. 3.1) and Montreal-based life stories (such as Oscar's, ch. 4.2). Examining these two life stories in depth will shed light on the cosmopolitan experience of mobility and on the differences between it and the two other patterns.

5.1 MALINKA, PART II: “THE ONE WHO DOES NOT WANT TO EMIGRATE”

In the previous chapter, I analyzed the first part of Malinka’s narrative about her life. I have divided the analysis into two parts, identifying a key moment in her life that changed her outlook on the future and subsequently her (mobility) practices. While I described her life-changing experience in the previous chapter, I will now analyze the consequences of the key moment, Malinka’s failed “immigration project” and the realization that she, in fact, no longer wanted to emigrate. That being said, Malinka continues to be on the move, but has changed her mobility practices from “transmobility” to “cosmobility.”

Mobility as a Strategy for Disappearing

In 2003, Malinka came back from her second stay in the United States as she re-evaluated her “immigration project.” (I.503) She would have been about twenty-four years old at the time. Being back in Berlin, Malinka needed to reorganize her life and rethink her plans. On an everyday basis, this became manifest in the changing of apartments: she moved out of her mother’s place and moved in with a friend. She enjoyed being back in Berlin:

“It was good. I moved in with my friend right away [...]. She had an apartment and I moved in there [...]. She visited me at that point of time, I think. At some point, she was [in the United States] for a few weeks.” (II.504-507)¹

In the United States, Malinka was already striving for a more independent way of life, which she found difficult to attain there. Leaving her mother’s place and moving in with a friend in Berlin was a first step towards this goal, not least because she diminished the possibilities of “social control” on her mother’s part. Having her own place, Malinka started studying in Berlin again. In her narrative, she is not specific about the field of study, though she mentions gaining psychology credits while simultaneously making it clear that psychology was not the field she was enrolled in. Malinka was still not admitted into her desired field

1 “Das war gut. Ich bin dann, glaube ich, auch gleich mit meiner Freundin zusammengezogen. [...] Sie hatte eine Wohnung und ich bin dazu gezogen [...] Sie hat mich dann auch besucht zu diesem Zeitpunkt glaube ich. Irgendwann war sie auch da für paar Wochen [in den USA].”

of study (ll.550-553). Soon she unexpectedly needed to look for another apartment:

“Hold on, I had lived with my friend for some time, right, with the one friend of mine. [...] And one day I moved in with another friend. Well, I know that her boyfriend wanted to move in with her and then I moved in with another friend, in ****[district in Berlin, A/N], too. However, it didn’t work out well. After one year, [...] we gave up the apartment and I thought to myself OK, before looking for another apartment and so on, I’ll go abroad again [laughter].” (ll.511-520)²

Malinka had not yet found her academic way at that point in her life and her living situation turned out to be complicated as she faced a third move within Berlin in a short period of time. Having to find—yet again—another place to stay played a major role in her decision to go abroad. In fact, Malinka presents these biographical circumstances as triggers for another mobility experience. She lived approximately two years in Berlin before leaving Germany, this time for Cuba. This decision appears to be another coping strategy, to avoid the challenges of looking for another apartment in Berlin (where the housing situation is quite challenging) and, importantly, not being able to study what she wanted to study:

“Yeah, I didn’t have a place at university and I thought OK, perhaps I first/ and somehow, I wanted to go to Cuba. I had wanted to go to Cuba for a long time already by then and it was a rather spontaneous idea and I thought Oh. Hold on. I had already worked a lot by this time. I thought no, you go abroad for half a year and then you apply for a place at university just afterwards.” (ll.554-557)³

-
- 2 “Wart mal, ’ne Zeit lang habe ich mit meiner Freundin, also mit der einen Freundin zusammengewohnt [...] und irgendwann bin ich dann umgezogen mit einer anderen Freundin. Also, ich weiß sie hatte dann irgendwie einen Freund und er wollte mit ihr zusammenziehen und dann bin ich mit einer Freundin auch in [Berliner Stadtteil, eig. Anm.] zusammengezogen und das hat aber dann irgendwie nach einem Jahr doch irgendwie nicht so gut funktioniert und dann haben wir [...] die Wohnung gekündigt und ich dachte OK, bevor ich mir dann eine neue Wohnung suche usw. gehe ich nochmal ins Ausland [Lachen].”
 - 3 “Ja, ich hatte keinen Studienplatz und ich dachte naja ok, dann mache ich vielleicht erstmal/ und ich wollte irgendwie nach Kuba. Ich wollte schon länger nach Kuba und es war eine recht spontane Idee und ich dachte ach Moment mal, ich habe ja auch zu dem Zeitpunkt schon viel gearbeitet. Ich dachte nee, dann gehst du nochmal für ein halbes Jahr weg und bewirbst dich für das Semester halt danach.”

This stay is restricted in time due to *a posteriori* reasoning. Malinka obviously learned a lesson from her former mobility experience when it comes to deciding on a time frame for her stay. She basically used her “free time” to go abroad with the intention of applying for a psychology program in Germany the following semester. And yet, it was a spontaneous decision. In order to highlight this spontaneity, Malinka narrates the circumstances:

“Above all, I organized my accommodation just in the last evening, because I had still so much to do and my mum asked me: ‘Where are you sleeping there?’—‘Yeah, no idea’ [...] but in the plane, I met two Englishmen and they suggested that I come with them, as they already had an accommodation. There might be something available there and it was just like that.” (II.564-571)⁴

Malinka did not plan or organize her stay in Cuba in so much detail as she had done for her two previous stays in the United States. She approached this mobility experience in a rather carefree manner. She did not even know where to sleep, which, arguably, indicates a certain fearlessness and thirst for adventure. Departing under such circumstances may have resulted from Malinka’s previous mobility experiences insofar as she knew she was able to deal with situations as they came up. Malinka’s choice to move to Cuba was also motivated by her wish to learn a foreign language:

“I’ve always wanted to learn Spanish. [...] I had somehow worked a lot in order to save money. [...] I also lived with my mum again for some time in order to save money and to prepare everything and then I went to Cuba for two months [...] and then went to Argentina. [...] I was gone for five months.” (II.522-534)⁵

-
- 4 “Ja, vor allem ich habe mir die Unterkunft noch am letzten Abend organisiert, weil ich einfach noch viel zu tun hatte und meine Mama fragte mich: ‘Ja, wo schläfst du denn da?’—‘Ja, keine Ahnung’ [...] aber im Flugzeug habe ich zwei Engländer kennengelernt und die meinten halt: ‘Komm erstmal mit uns. Wir haben eine Unterkunft. Da wird sich bestimmt ein Zimmer finden’ und so war das auch.”
 - 5 “Ich wollte ja schon immer Spanisch lernen. [...] Dann hab’ ich irgendwie noch ganz viel gearbeitet um Geld zu sparen. [...] Dann [habe ich] ’ne Zeit lang wieder bei meiner Mama gelebt, also ich glaube ein paar Monate um auch Geld zu sparen und alles vorzubereiten und dann bin ich nach Kuba gegangen für 2 Monate [...] und dann war ich in Argentinien [...] Da war ich 5 Monate weg.”

Her desire to learn Spanish determined the destination she went to. Fulfilling this wish was a priority in her approach to going abroad. However, in order to pursue this mobility experience Malinka needed to prepare, most importantly with regard to finances. From the quote, it becomes clear that Cuba was not to be her only destination. She combined a two month stay in Cuba with a three month stay in Argentina. Malinka was taking Spanish lessons in Cuba (ll.638f), yet her stay there was more a matter of private interest as she really wanted to see and experience this country. The purpose of her stay in Argentina, however, was to be more “meaningful.” (l.653) That is why she organized an internship in Argentina (ll.652ff):

“And there I had an internship in a medical practice [...] and they were specialized in phobias, right [laughter]. [...] They rather worked in the field of behavioural psychology, which I liked very much and there I learned a lot of Spanish, too. Simply through listening I have learned a lot, right, because I could [...] attend the meetings, the group sessions.” (ll.522-534)⁶

For Malinka, a meaningful stay is apparently one in which she is able to gain additional qualifications. Her goal was to acquire the Spanish language and to acquire professional experience in the field of psychology. Malinka, obviously, combined the acquisition of so-called “soft-skills” with her mobility experiences. She shapes her experiences in such a way as to also be valid in professional terms. In both places, Malinka met new people and enjoyed her stay very much (ll.549f). Her stay in Argentina, however, was particularly insightful:

“Well, I learned a lot and I also met some other Germans who were doing internships as well, yet not in my area but in other areas. Oh, I attended language school. I made this internship through an organization and through it I somehow met new people.” (ll.612-622)⁷

-
- 6 “Und da habe ich ein Praktikum gemacht in so einer Praxis [...] und die sind dann spezialisiert auf Phobien [Lachen]. [...] Die haben auch mehr gearbeitet in Richtung Verhaltenspsychologie und das hat mir ganz gut gefallen und da habe ich auch noch viel Spanisch gelernt. Auch einfach durch's Zuhören habe ich viel gelernt, genau weil ich konnte [...] an den Sitzungen teilnehmen, an den Gruppensitzungen.”
- 7 “Also, ich habe viel gelernt. Das war gut und da habe ich auch andere Deutsche kennengelernt, die da auch ein Praktikum gemacht haben, also nicht in dem Bereich aber in anderen Bereichen. Ach, [ich] hatte ja Sprachschule. Es war durch so eine Organisation habe ich das Praktikum gemacht und irgendwie habe ich die Leute dadurch kennengelernt.”

In Argentina, Malinka expanded her knowledge, most importantly through the internship she completed there. What is more, the stay in Argentina seems to have been much more planned than the stay in Cuba. It was institutionally structured as Malinka was embedded in a larger organization that offered additional language classes and other activities. When the five months were over, Malinka returned to Berlin. She finally got admitted into a psychology program, though not in Berlin but in Greifswald (I.577).

Studying, Commuting, Going Abroad, and Travelling

Once Malinka was admitted into a psychology program, she was able to follow her desired professional pathway. She had studied in other disciplines before, but had not pursued these studies seriously. She never completed a degree, but the official status as a student was advantageous; it facilitated everyday life by providing reductions, for instance, for public transportation and for various cultural activities like visiting museums or going to the theatre. Malinka was happy to be admitted into the program, but it implied an internal (non-border-crossing) relocation of her center of life from Berlin to Greifswald, where she moved into a dormitory (I.677). At that point in time, she must have been around twenty-six or twenty-seven years old. This is—from a comparative perspective—relatively late to begin studying. Most students in Germany begin their studies at around the age of twenty. Malinka could finally pursue her desired studies, but she was not thrilled about the city:

“I found Greifswald not to be so exciting and that’s why I always arranged my classes in such a way as to be in Berlin often. [...] I didn’t have many contacts with the people there, simply because I was in Berlin very often and just because I wasn’t looking for it. Later in my advanced study period, I decided, no, I have to stay here for a while so that I can do my studies well. Right, to make it well, yeah. [...] I also told myself OK, you need to try harder to make friends here and so on, establishing contacts and that’s what I did. That was good.” (II.680-687)⁸

-
- 8 “Ich fand Greifswald nicht so spannend deswegen habe ich mir am Anfang die Kurse immer so gelegt, dass ich irgendwie ganz viel in Berlin bin. [...] Ich hatte da auch nicht solche Kontakte zu den Leuten, einfach, weil ich oft in Berlin war und, einfach, weil ich sie nicht gesucht habe. Später im Hauptstudium habe ich beschlossen, nein ich muss schon ein bisschen hierbleiben damit ich das Studium auch gut machen kann. Also, gut machen ja. [...] Dann habe ich mir auch bewusst gesagt: ‘Ok du musst

Malinka had mixed feelings about living in Greifswald. Therefore, she practiced mobility again, but this time in the form of internal bi-local circulation flows. Interestingly, Malinka presents temporal immobility as a coping strategy. She associates this immobility with the establishing of social contacts in a particular place. After four semesters, she stopped commuting to Berlin and stayed most of the time in Greifswald to focus on her studies and to engage in the student life there. Not long before finishing her studies, Malinka decided, yet again, to go abroad. She again chose a Spanish-speaking country as a destination as she went to Granada, Spain. She wanted to improve her Spanish language skills (l.717) and used the Erasmus-program in order to make a student exchange there (l.729). Using the Erasmus-program is, certainly, a typical mobility experiences as far as my German-based interviewees are concerned. For going abroad, Malinka chose a point in time which best corresponded with her workload at university, meaning that she—as we have seen earlier—takes into account *when* to go. I asked her again about her motivations for going abroad. Her answer is instructive:

“Yes, I thought I want to go abroad [...] Every few years I get kind of a craving, because I think I need to get away again and I simply considered this possibility. Well, I can take it, yeah [laughter].”(ll.735-793)⁹

Malinka points out that she feels an inner urge to go abroad from time to time, and this time she figured out that doing Erasmus would be a good option to do so, not least because she could combine her mobility experience with her studies. Malinka compares such “craving” moments with an addiction:

“It’s just such a restlessness? I think it’s a bit like an addiction. When you begin to travel and you like it, then I think it’s like an addiction. Right, as if you would miss something, because you don’t experience so much here. You experience so many new things abroad, you get to know so many new people [...]. I think it enriches you enormously and [...] I have also noticed that simply nothing changes here. So, that my friends are still here when

dich hier mit den Leuten ein bisschen besser anfreunden usw. Kontakte knüpfen’ und das habe ich auch gemacht. Das war auch gut, ja.”

- 9 “Ja, ich dachte ich will ins Ausland gehen. [...] Ich bekomme alle paar Jahre irgendwie so ein Jieper, weil ich denke so ich muss wieder weg und ich dachte einfach an die Möglichkeit. Also, ich kann das nochmal mitnehmen, ja [Lachen].”

I get back. Right, I've been in touch with them. There's just little changes and being abroad, there you experience so much." (ll.749-756)¹⁰

Interestingly, Malinka does not relate her motivation with her CV or new "soft skills" anymore. She talks about being "addicted" to experiencing new things, getting to know new people, and learning. She feels enriched through her mobility experiences as opposed to always remaining in one place, because—as she points out—nothing ever changes there. In fact, being mobile prevents her from becoming dull:

"But always when I come back, I think I'm kind of more open, perhaps you can get a little dull/ maybe if you are in such an age that you get dull a bit, etc. And I think you appreciate many things more." (ll.770ff)¹¹

During the interview, I asked her if she was aware of the fact that she was very mobile, probably more so than others. She answered that she is, indeed, aware of it. She thinks that other people may be afraid; they especially fear losing their social relationships at home (ll.762ff). Malinka is not afraid of that anymore. She realized that "the good friends that I have here, those who remain, they are there and my family as well." (ll.765ff)¹² She conceives of the maintenance of her long-established social relationships as relatively unbound from any specific location. To go abroad is a practice for Malinka in which she only gains new experiences rather than losing things, except for a few birthdays with friends (ll.768f). Although her friendships and familial relationships are more stable and

-
- 10 "Es ist halt so eine Unruhe? Ich glaube, es ist so ein bisschen wie so eine Sucht. Wenn man angefangen hat zu reisen und es gut findet, dann ist es—glaube ich—wie so eine Sucht. Also, als ob man wieder etwas vermisst, weil man erlebt hier nicht so viel. Man erlebt so viel Neues, man lernt so viele neue Leute kennen [...]. Ich finde es bereichert einen enorm und ich habe auch festgestellt, dass sich hier halt einfach nichts ändert. Also, dass meine Freunde immer noch da sind, wenn ich wiederkomme. Also, ich habe mit ihnen ja noch Kontakt gehalten. Es ändert sich einfach so wenig und man erlebt da so viel."
- 11 "Aber ich fand immer, wenn ich wiederkam, war ich irgendwie viel offener. Man stumpft vielleicht so ein bisschen/ also, vielleicht, wenn man in so einem Alter ist, dass man so ein bisschen abstumpft usw. Und ich glaube man weiß viele Sachen viel eher zu schätzen."
- 12 "Die guten Freunde, die ich hier habe, die bleiben, die sind da und meine Familie ist halt auch da."

less affected by her mobility experiences, this is not necessary the case when it comes to her romantic relationships. Earlier in this analysis, I indicated that Malinka left her boyfriends behind when she went abroad. In leaving for Spain, she again practiced the “leaving behind boyfriends” -principle: “Funny, I had another boyfriend then. Somehow I always have a boyfriend when I go abroad.” (Il.644ff)¹³ Malinka notices that it seems to be a recurring pattern in her life. This, in turn, triggers a reflection about this matter. It is obviously not the first time she has thought about it:

“But I think it’s also because when I know that I’m about to go away at that time, I can imagine/ I’m perhaps just more open then, maybe the idea of not needing to find the perfect man and then it may work out [...]. I also talked about it with my supervisor when I was doing an internship in psychology. I had a good relationship with her and she was saying ‘Yeah, you are simply more open then’ and I thought yeah, it’s true because always before I go abroad, I meet someone who I suddenly like and it just has to be me and that I have a more open approach then.” (Il.648-656)¹⁴

In her self-reflection about the connection between her romantic relationships and her mobility experiences, Malinka suggests a causal relationship between these two occurrences. She assumes a psychological mechanism, which lies in herself: “it just has to be me.” Malinka’s mobility experiences have both positive as well as negative impacts on her romantic relationships. On the one hand, Malinka feels more open to beginning a relationship before she leaves; on the other hand, the relationship may fall apart due to distance. Malinka is no longer with the man she was with when she was about to leave for Spain. Whether this relationship ended because of her mobility experience is left unmentioned. At the time when I interviewed her, she was single.

13 “Witzig, da hatte ich irgendwie auch einen Freund. Irgendwie habe ich immer einen Freund, wenn ich ins Ausland gehe.”

14 “Aber ich glaube es liegt auch daran, ich kann mir auch vorstellen, dass ich in der Zeit, wenn ich schon weiß, dass ich weg gehe/ ich bin dann halt einfach offener vielleicht, also vielleicht auch dieses ich muss nicht den perfekten Mann finden und es entwickelt sich dann [...]. Ich habe auch mal darüber mit meiner [Praktikums-] Betreuerin [in Psychologie] geredet, also ich hatte mit ihr auch so ein ganz gutes Verhältnis und irgendwie meinte sie so: ‘Ja, du bist dann auch einfach offener’ und ich dachte so, ja stimmt, weil immer bevor ich ins Ausland gehe, lerne ich irgendjemand kennen den ich dann auf einmal mag und es muss einfach an mir liegen und dass ich offener rangehe an manche Sachen.”

Eventually, Malinka returned to Greifswald. It took her another three years to finish her studies there. She graduated in 2013 (Il.795) when she was around thirty-two years old. After her studies, Malinka came across yet another mobility experience. This time we cannot say that she relocated her center of life as she was rather travelling, on a journey around the world. All in all, this journey lasted five months, but she did not establish a new everyday life at another place. She travelled as a leisure activity. She did not plan this world trip; it came out of certain opportunity structures she encountered at a specific point in time. She tells me about it:

“I didn’t plan the world trip like that, but a friend of mine with whom I studied, and who also graduated at the same time as I wanted to travel again. She also likes to travel and asked me if I’d accompany her, but at that time I couldn’t commit myself to it. And then she found on the internet/ she was looking for a travel companion in an online forum and found a girl from Switzerland and they had planned the trip together and then at the last minute I said, ‘oh no, I’ll come with you after all’ and then I joined in.” (Il.738-744)¹⁵

Malinka did not plan and organize the trip because she did not want to commit to this project at first:

“I think I just didn’t know if I was going to finish my master’s thesis, would it work out or not? I didn’t want to commit myself. So, then I thought perhaps I will somehow get a job right away, or whatever. So, somehow, I didn’t have a clear mind. Well, I was in the middle of my thesis and I just didn’t know what would happen if I failed. Then I’d have to rewrite it.” (Il.746-751)¹⁶

15 “Ich habe die Weltreise nicht so geplant, sondern eine Kommilitonin von mir mit der ich zusammen studiert habe und die auch zur gleichen Zeit ihren Abschluss gemacht hat, wollte nochmal verreisen. Sie reiste auch gerne und sie hat mich erstmal gefragt, ob ich mitkomme aber zu dem Zeitpunkt konnte ich mich noch nicht festlegen und dann hat sie im Internet, also im so einem Forum nach einer Reisebegleitung gesucht und auch ein Mädels aus der Schweiz gefunden und die haben zusammen die Reise geplant und ich habe dann im letzten Augenblick gesagt, ach nee, doch, ich komme doch mit und dann habe ich mich angeschlossen.”

16 “Ich glaube ich wusste halt nicht, bin ich dann fertig mit meiner Diplomarbeit, klappt das oder nicht? Ich wollte mich nicht festlegen und dann dachte ich ja vielleicht werde ich dann doch irgendwie gleich danach anfangen zu arbeiten oder wie auch immer. Also, irgendwie hatte ich da den Kopf noch nicht so frei. Also, ich war da mitten in

The reason to not be able to commit herself and to plan the world trip lied in the future uncertainty that usually arises during the final stages of graduating from university. Malinka recalls that she did not have a “clear mind,” which indicates her worries about the future and her inability to foresee what would come next in her professional pathway. At the end of the day, Malinka graduated and she did not get a job right away, so she decided to do this world trip after all. It seems as though she only took this mobility opportunity because she had no other opportunities or responsibilities that could have required her to be somewhere specific. Deciding to take a trip around the world spared her from looking for a professional position right away. Through the world trip, she postponed her search for employment.

The Exceptionality of Malinka’s Mobility

Malinka’s mobility practices are extensive and they require temporal and financial resources, though travelling costs have become cheaper. Her professional situation was on “stand-by” for a long time as she was only later admitted into the psychology program at a German university. However, she not only practiced mobility because she had time to do so, but also because she values it *as such*. Her mobility experiences are exceptional, I argue, for both contexts of Germany and Canada, but the biographical constellation under which her mobility experiences arose is specific to Germany, and even more so to Berlin for various reasons. First, Malinka mainly practiced mobility while she was enrolled as a student in Berlin. Despite her studies in psychology in Greifswald, she did not pursue her other studies seriously, so she used her time for earning money in different (temporary) jobs rather than attending classes. Following such a strategy was, at that time, possible in the German *Bundesland* Berlin, because it did not charge tuition fees for students in university, unlike most of the other German *Bundesländer*, which charged tuition fees (approx. 500€ plus social contribution approx. 300€ per term) from the mid-2000s until they were completely abolished in Germany ten years later.¹⁷ In contrast, there are high tuition fees in Canada (on average 6.000 C\$ per year, the highest rates are in Ontario with 7.868 C\$ and the lowest in Newfoundland with 2.660 C\$ and Quebec 2.799 C\$). The rates get even higher for

der Diplomarbeit und ich wusste halt nicht, was ist, wenn ich durchfalle. Dann muss ich nochmal schreiben.”

17 For further information, see the homepage of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research in Germany: <https://www.bmbf.de>

postgraduate programs (though more funding packages are available for graduate students).¹⁸ In order to pay the high tuition fees and everyday life expenses, most students in Canada get into high debt by taking out student loans and credit cards. In both Germany and Canada, students usually work during their studies to support themselves, but while students in Germany may be better able to save money, students in Canada usually try to keep their debts as low as possible, not least, because most are not financially supported by their parents. What is more, many of my interviewees, such as Malinka, use the possibility of Erasmus for doing a semester or a year abroad at another university. The mobility stipends of Erasmus cover the tuition fees of the universities abroad, but the students need to cover the living expenses by themselves. Erasmus is, certainly, a moment, in which the EU becomes visible in students' everyday lives. Although Malinka does not explicitly state how she financed all her mobility experiences, she mentions having worked a lot during her "stand-by" period, and that she lived at (or moved back to) her mother's in order to save money, and arguably, her mother also supported her financially. Malinka's case is generally uncommon for both Germany and Canada, while the contextual differences in how students are financially supported or support themselves, makes Malinka's mobility experiences rather improbable—not to say almost unthinkable—in Canada.

Slowing Down: From Hypermobility back to Sedentariness?

In the course of her world trip, Malinka travelled to Asia, Australia, and the United States (II.819-823). She had not been back from her world trip for a year when we met in Berlin. Despite being glad to be back in Berlin, Malinka faces challenges as she is not able to find a job and has yet to make up her mind about what she wants to do professionally. Her current situation is characterized by uncertainty and doubt:

"Yeah, then I returned to Berlin and it was somehow difficult, too, because during my studies I had some doubts. Ah, psychology, is it the right thing to do and so on? I think it was rather because of the studies and then I have also considered, OK, am I going to do

18 For further information, see the homepage of Statistics Canada: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/150909/dq150909b-eng.htm>

the training, the psychiatric-therapeutic training? This is certainly not regulated very well; I find. (II.829-833)¹⁹

Malinka struggled to decide if she should pursue an additional psychiatric-therapeutic training which would be important in case she wants to be professionally active in the realm of psychology. The institutional arrangements for this additional training are not very attractive. She tries to balance its advantages and disadvantages. A major drawback is the low income during the training (1.836). What is more, Malinka wishes to stay in Berlin. She applied for other jobs in Berlin, but had little success, not least because the labour market in Berlin is dense and competitive since many people apply from everywhere as Berlin is commonly appreciated for its diverse social life, making it a desirable place to live for young adults. She eventually made up her mind to apply for the training after all in order to stay in Berlin. She clearly sees her future in Berlin, although she did not always like it there:

“I know that for a very long time, I didn’t even like Berlin. I was also a little bit like yeah, I want to get away from Berlin. I only really started to like Berlin when I returned from the United States for the second time. That was like oh Berlin is awesome. I was kind of searching for another city to live in, because when I was in the United States for the first time, because I knew I didn’t want to go to Poland either, because where we live, it’s very small and that was just nothing.” (II.902-907)²⁰

Apparently, Malinka combined her search for a “city to live in” with her mobility experiences. At that time, she did not want to live in Berlin. The geographical space of Poland has evolved into a place she does not want to live in either. Here we notice that her perceptions about Poland changed: while she really wanted to

-
- 19 “Ja dann bin ich halt nach Berlin [zurück] und das war irgendwie auch eh schwierig, weil ich auch im Laufe meines Studiums ein bisschen Zweifel hatte. Ah, Psychologie ist das nun das Richtige usw.? Ich glaube es lag halt mehr so am Studium und dann habe ich auch überlegt, ok, machst du diese Ausbildung, die psychiatrisch-therapeutische Ausbildung. Das ist natürlich aber auch nicht so glücklich geregelt, finde ich.”
- 20 “Ich weiss auch eine ganz lange Zeit mochte ich Berlin nicht. Ich war ja auch so ein bisschen, ja ich will weg aus Berlin. Ich mochte erst richtig Berlin als ich das zweite Mal aus den USA wiederkam. Das war so hoo, Berlin ist voll toll. Ich war ein bisschen auf der Suche nach einer anderen Stadt für mich zu leben, weil ich das erste Mal in den USA war, weil ich wusste nach Polen will ich auch nicht, weil da wo wir leben, das ist halt ganz klein und das war halt irgendwie nichts.”

live in Poland in the early years of her life, it has become, for her, an undesirable place to live. This is, certainly, reflected in her evolving mobility practices, too: “It was not on my mind, even though Poland, certainly, has great cities like Krakow, etc. It somehow did not attract me so much.” (I.915)²¹ For Malinka, Poland is not an eligible place to live. Her mobility orientation thus developed beyond her “country of origin.”

Meanwhile, however, Malinka’s mother had moved back to Poland. It was about that time when Malinka came back from Cuba and Argentina in her mid-twenties (II.886ff). Malinka implied that her mother separated from her Berlin-based husband and was now back with Malinka’s father in Poland (II.16f). Despite her early childhood, Malinka did not direct her mobility practices to Poland, although she now travels there four or five times a year to see her parents following her mother’s return (II.891). Other than that, she had not much “to do with Poland.” (I.919) Her friends in Berlin (and elsewhere) are not Polish either—until recently, when Malinka started to be in touch with more people of Polish background. Malinka has a friend, one of my interviewees, through whom she got in touch with more Polish people:

“I like it. I think I’ve also noticed that it is good for me, a little like back to the roots. [...] I then realize, yes OK, the older I get the more important it is for me. Maybe a little bit of this aspect.” (II.996-1000)²²

The fact that Malinka got in touch with other Germans of Polish background was rather random (II.1002). Only then she realized that not forgetting her roots may become more important to her as she gets older. Like many of my interviewees, she reflects on the differences between the Polish and the German cultures. She mentions that family life is more important in Polish than in German families. While German culture is more individualistic, Polish culture is more family-oriented, which—according to Malinka—may be related to the former Communist system (II.1061-1081). She also sees differences with respect to religion. Malinka stopped going to church after her first communion and is very skeptical about the Catholic Church; she strongly separates faith from the church as an in-

21 “War nicht bei mir auf dem Zaun, obwohl Polen natürlich tolle Städte hat also wie Krakau usw. Irgendwie hat es mich da nie hingezogen.”

22 “Es gefällt mir gut. Ich glaube, ich habe auch so gemerkt es tut mir auch ganz gut, so ein bisschen zurück zu den Wurzeln. [...] Ich merke dann ja ok, vielleicht auch so ein bisschen je älter ich werde desto wichtiger ist das für mich. Vielleicht so ein bisschen dieser Aspekt.”

stitution (I.1089f). Her critical stance on the Catholic Church is not well received within her family in Poland:

“I am very critical, and I express it, also in front of my family and also in front of my grandmother. For her it is, of course, very bad. She is ninety-six. Once I said, accidentally, that I would not want my children to be baptized. That was bad. Perhaps, I shouldn’t have said that. It just slipped out. But I cannot do much with the church, especially with the Catholic Church. [...] I think the church is just outdated and not very timely and I don’t like the celibacy.” (II.1107-1119)²³

All members of her family in Poland go to church regularly. Malinka sometimes talks with her mother about the Catholic Church. Although she understands Malinka’s objections, Malinka’s mother nevertheless goes to church as—according to Malinka—it is so much part of her everyday life. 1105). This, Malinka believes, keeps her from thinking critically about certain matters pertaining to Catholicism (I.1100). Apart from religion, Malinka also mentions aspects of Polish culture that she evaluates more positively. She, for instance, believes that Polish people are more open and “come out of their shell faster” than Germans. The latter are more restrained and need more time to “break the ice.” (II.992-995) Since Malinka juggles with (at least) two sets of cultural repertoires (as do most of my interviewees), her self-understanding is complex. For her, it is difficult to put how she feels into words (I.1005). In an attempt to explain, Malinka refers to her mobility experiences:

“When I am abroad, and someone asks me I realize I say, well I’m from Berlin. I don’t say I come from Poland. I say, I’m from Berlin. When I did Erasmus, I know my roommate didn’t know for a long time that I come somehow from Poland. He thought I was German because I said I was from Berlin. (II.1008-1012)²⁴

23 “Ich bin sehr kritisch und ich äußere das auch, auch vor meiner Familie und auch vor meiner Oma. Die findet das natürlich ganz schlimm, die ist 96. Das war eher zufällig, als ich mal meinte, nee also meine Kinder, die will ich nicht taufen lassen. Das war schlimm. Das hätte ich vielleicht nicht sagen sollen. Das ist mir so rausgerutscht. Aber ich kann damit nicht so viel anfangen mit der Kirche. Also, an sich, also vor allem mit der katholischen [Kirche]. [...] Ich finde die Kirche ist halt veraltet und wenig zeitgemäß und mir gefällt das auch nicht mit dem Zölibat.”

24 “Wenn ich so im Ausland bin und mich jemand fragt—merke ich—ich sage, ich komme aus Berlin. Ich sage ja nicht ich komme aus Polen. Ich sage ich komme aus Berlin. Als ich Erasmus gemacht habe, ich weiss der eine Mitbewohner, der wusste

Interestingly, Malinka cannot think of a way to describe her self-understanding other than to refer to situations when she is abroad. Obviously, her self-understanding in Germany is not so much challenged as opposed to when she is abroad, because then she needs to reflect more on the commonly asked question: “Where do you come from?” Malinka usually follows her feeling and refers to Berlin. In doing so, she does not refer to Germany as a whole, but to Berlin *specifically*. This city affiliation also signals that she does not necessarily see herself as “German,” even though she describes herself as a “Berliner.” Earlier we saw that Malinka insisted on her Polish origin, which intensified her belonging to Poland; once she is abroad, this belonging to Poland as one of her countries of origin fades into the background. This is what I have referred to earlier as a *contextualized self-understanding*. In this sense, she situationally constructs her “place of origin” which shifts from Poland to Berlin depending on where she is (“travelling origins,” ch. 5.2). Malinka nevertheless sees herself as having a “Polish side,” but she cannot really describe her feeling of belonging in words, so she relies on the perceptions of others, who would say to her: “You are not typically German.” (l.1025)²⁵ We can assume that the regional affiliation she often puts forward provides a kind of solution for “not being typically German” because Berlin is also commonly known as not being a typical German city. As Germany’s capital, Berlin is exceptionally cosmopolitan and international, attracting many people from Germany and everywhere else in the world. Compared to other cities, Berlin does not have the largest number of people with a migration background, but tourism in Berlin is far greater than in any other city. What is more, Berlin records a significant influx of mostly young and well-educated people who rejuvenate the city. At home and abroad, Berlin is popularly known as “cool” and “hip,” promoting the regional identification: the vast majority identify as Berliners (Anheier/Hurrelmann 2014). The issue of language in Malinka’s life story might also be brought to bear on this matter of “not being a typical German.” Interestingly enough, Malinka met my other interviewee at the community college (*Volkshochschule*) where both women attended phonetics classes in order to get rid of their accent (the rolling “r”) when speaking German (ll.926). Having an accent bothered her: “I think because it just bothered me so much [...] Certainly, I can speak German better than Polish, but in German, I

ganz lange nicht, dass ich irgendwie aus Polen komme. Der dachte ich bin Deutsch, weil ich sage ich komme aus Berlin.”

25 “Du bist nicht typisch Deutsch.”

have, of course, this accent.” (ll.954ff)²⁶ Learning that some of my interviewees attended phonetic courses in order to get rid of their accents came as a bit of a surprise. I did not imagine that an accent could bother people so much. Yet, the way you speak immediately tells others something about where you come from and since German immigration policies dictate assimilation as the ideal of integration and German society has come to expect this. As for the impact such policies and expectations may have on individuals, it is therefore not altogether surprising that only German interviewees attended phonetics courses to get rid of their accents. I have not encountered this phenomenon with my Canadian-based interviewees. Then again, having an accent when speaking the language of a current place of residency is a major topic in the narratives of almost all my interviewees. Oscar, for example, speaks three languages fluently, but none of them accent-free. While he did not encounter a general expectation of accent-free language proficiency in Canada, he complains that people cannot make out where he comes from whenever he speaks. Eventually, he accepted this trilingualism and incorporated it into his cosmopolitan identity. Malinka is still struggling with this situation:

“Yes, and I also have an accent in Polish. Somehow it bothers me, because I thought I have to speak at least one language [accent-free]. Well, it bothered me, but I think, because of this class, I thought, oh no, I just need to deal with it in a more relaxed way. It is like that. It is part of me. In a way, it is my story.” (ll.958-961)²⁷

Malinka tries to find a way to accept this “imperfection.” This imperfection, however, is only an imperfection as far as the social expectation of assimilation is concerned. For Malinka and for others, it is, inevitably, part of their story. The fact that Malinka attends a phonetics class at that particular point of her life may also be related to her future plans, in which she, contrary to her past experiences, pursues a “life of immobility”:

26 “Ich glaube, weil es mich einfach so gestört hat [...] Ich kann natürlich Deutsch besser als Polnisch, aber im Deutschen habe ich natürlich schon so einen Akzent.”

27 “Ja, und im Polnischen habe ich auch einen Akzent. Irgendwie stört mich das, weil ich dachte ich muss doch mal eine Sprache [akzentfrei sprechen]. Also, es hat mich gestört aber ich glaube gerade durch diesen Kurs dachte ich so, ach nee, ich muss einfach ein bisschen relaxter damit umgehen. Es ist halt so. Es gehört irgendwie auch so zu mir. Es ist auch so meine Geschichte.”

“Let’s just say, I really want to stay in Berlin. I’m already thirty-four and I have this like factor of OK, I really want to have a family and I also want to settle my life, so like getting an apartment and a job and then that I might hopefully find the right man and I think I want to stay in Berlin. It may, of course, be that something comes along, and I’d say ‘Hey, let’s go abroad again before planning a family is becoming more serious’ [laughter]. But first, many areas of life are still to be worked on, especially getting a job and then we’ll see for everything else.” (II.1153-1160)²⁸

Malinka made up her mind about Berlin as a desirable place to dwell; the geographical space of Berlin changed meanings: from being the place she wanted to get away from at any cost during her childhood to being *the place she always comes back to*. She sees Berlin as the place she will remain. She now chooses to live an immobile life. In consideration of her life phase, Malinka would like to start a family soon. For her, living a settled life implies immobility. Truth to be told, she does not categorically refuse the possibility of further mobilities, but she does not want to be mobile alone anymore. In conclusion, we can say that her relocation from Greifswald to Spain and back to Berlin was the latest mobility experience, maybe not the last one. Similar to Malinka, Francis—whose life story I will introduce in the next section—is also an individual who started to be mobile early in life and is likely to continue practicing mobility.

5.2 FRANCIS: “THE ONE WHO JUST DOES NOT LIVE IN THE SAME PLACE”²⁹

Francis’s life story is the last one to be analyzed in depth in this chapter. He is a young adult of Polish descent whom I met in Toronto. When I interviewed him, he was twenty-five years old. Getting in touch with Francis is the result of a

28 “Ich will schon in Berlin bleiben. Ich glaube ich bin jetzt auch schon 34 und habe auch ein bisschen so den Aspekt, OK ich will schon eine Familie haben und ich will schon irgendwie mein Leben dann auch regeln, also halt eine Wohnung und dann einen Job und dass man vielleicht dann hoffentlich dann den passenden Mann kennenlernen und ich glaube ich will schon in Berlin bleiben. Es kann natürlich sein, dass sich halt immer wieder was ergibt und man sagt: ‘hey, wir gehen dann doch nochmal ins Ausland bevor dann die Familienplanung nachher irgendwie ernst wird’ (Lachen). Aber erst mal sind das ja Baustellen, vor allem der Job und dann alles Weitere: Mal schauen.”

29 Parts of this chapter draw on Wieczorek 2016.

“snowballing procedure,” that is, one of my other interviewees suggested I interview him. I subsequently contacted him, and we made an appointment right away. I interviewed him in his apartment in downtown Toronto on January 26, 2014. By inviting me into his home, Francis established an interview setting that is framed by his own life, allowing me to take a peek into one part of his current biographical experience. Francis was very courteous. Before I posed my initial question, we spoke about his friend from Montreal (Oscar, see ch. 4.2) and about my study. After I posed my initial question, Francis immediately fell into a narrative mode and started to tell me his story. The encounter with Francis comes close to an “ideal typical” autobiographical-narrative interview, or to put it differently: Francis made it easy for me to interview him. The interview lasted for one hour and 45 minutes.

Francis provided me with a detailed account of his life. We will see that the issue of mobility is of high biographical relevance to his life trajectory. Similar to Malinka, experiences of mobility arose early in his life course. Francis partly passively underwent and partly actively undertook several geographical movements, including various relocations of his center of life, and other mobility experiences such as travelling. These mobility experiences emerged under specific biographical occurrences at certain times in his life that are linked to familial networks and other social relationships. His biographical experiences need to be viewed with regard to his family history as he is a member of the same Polish diaspora of former aristocrats like Oscar. Being part of this network enables mobility experiences, but Francis’s mobility practices differ from those of Oscar. This difference is due to the matter of language and, in particular a different sense of belonging to the Polish heritage culture. These are not as pronounced as they were in Oscar’s life story, making Francis mobility experiences typical for the pattern of cosmobility.

Roots of Mobility in an Aristocratic Diaspora

If Francis cultural roots lie in Poland, no member of his core family including himself has ever lived there. He was there merely as a visitor a “handful of times.” (1.565) Poland is thus not a significant geographical reference point for him as he has not been living there, nor does he intend to. Poland is nevertheless relevant to his story, because he uses it as a symbolic reference. In order to understand his life trajectory, we need to learn about Francis’s family history and how it is related to the mobility experiences of past generations.

At the beginning of his narration, Francis frequently highlights the fact that his parents are of Polish origin, but that “neither grew up in Poland.” (1.5) His

mother was born in Kenya to “two Polish parents” (1.6) and his father was born in Hungary to “a Polish father and a Hungarian mother.” (ibid.) The precision with which he describes his grandparents’ cultural roots legitimizes his description of his family and thus himself to be “of Polish origin.” He is aware that the fact that no one in his core family was actually born in Poland distinguishes his family from others who would be characterized as “being of Polish origin,” yet he does not see this as a contradiction and highlights this position. Francis does more than mention his family’s migration background. He describes the members of each generation according to their *birthplace(s)* and their relevant Polish origins. His parents moved to Canada before Francis was born; they are, in a way, first generation “migrants” to Canada while his mother simultaneously belongs to the second generation in matters of her Polish origins as she was already factually a second generation “migrant” in Kenya, the place she was born. The example of Francis’s mother shows how mobility, which has been ongoing for several generations, complicates classification by generation. Similarly, Francis’s own story is a rather complicated one, refusing a simple categorization along the established concept of “generation.” Factually, he belongs to the third generation of Polish “migrants” in respect to his cultural origin. However, he also belongs to the second generation of “migrants” in Canada as his parents were the first generation to move to Canada, but—remarkably—not out of Poland. The status of “migrant generation” in Francis’s family is ambiguous due to a variety of practiced “secondary movements” (Moret 2015) or “onward migration.” (Jeffery/Murison 2011) We see that experiences of mobility contain a history of their own since mobility reaches back a few generations in Francis’s family history: Francis’s father fled Hungary during World War II and came to Toronto, Canada, probably in 1943 with his family (1.8). His mother’s family, i.e., Francis’s grandfather and grandmother, fled Poland shortly after World War II:

“They fled the war or they fled [...] Poland after the war, because the Russians would have locked them up [...] my grandfather [...] didn’t go back to Poland until ’88, so he left everything he had in Poland, his family, well his family left as well, but [...] he left Poland after the war with his bride at the time, my grandmother, and they went to Kenya to start a new life [...] then they had three daughters that were born in Kenya.” (II.31-36)

In order to conclude the story, Francis states that his parents met while his father was visiting Africa, once the couple got engaged, Francis’s mother moved to Canada with her fiancé (1.36f). However, the maternal side of Francis’s family did not actually leave during World War II, but right after it since “the Russians would have locked them up.” (1.32) This is a clear reference to Francis’s mater-

nal family's former aristocratic status. Here, Francis distinctively underlines his Polish roots by referring to his large-scale family network. This network consists of aristocratic families living in Montreal who are interrelated:

"What I noticed is that [...] there were these Polish families, [...] aristocratic families from Poland, that kind of all were interrelated [...]. They all married and [...] hung out with each other as well, it's kind of bizarre, so that's why we had so many relatives. It's just there is so many of them in Montreal. And then, truth be told, a lot of them, when they moved to Montreal, all married each other's cousins and friends and so that's how all the families became related." (II.107-112)

These intermarriages led to a large network of Polish aristocrats living in Montreal, of which Francis is a member. I assume that this is the same network of Polish aristocratic families that Oscar mentions in his narrative, especially because Oscar arranged my contact with Francis.

Polish Nobility in Quebec

The noble class of Poland (the *Szlachta*) formed during the Middle Ages. It is commonly assumed that the *Szlachta* was different from the aristocracy in most of Europe, because in Poland a relatively high percentage of the population was considered to be noble (about 10%). The *szlachta* can be determined by socio-economic position, land ownership and titles. While there were noble landowners (*ziemiańskie*), who were wealthy and owned huge tracts of land, there also were some members of the nobility who were poor with little or no land (e.g., *szlachta zagrodowa*), but the latter eventually lost their right to be called noble. As members of the noble class, the aristocracy (*arystokracja*) was to be distinguished from the rest due to their titles and wealth. Later on, a small percentage of Polish aristocracy accumulated so much wealth, real estate, and land as to be considered magnates (*magnaci*), being more powerful than other noble families (Sanford 2003, Zmuda 2004, Zolyna Memorial 2005). In addition to privileges like freedom from taxation and the inviolability of persons and property (Sanford 2003: 63), the Polish nobility had rights and immunities that were not common in other countries, e.g., the power to meet and elect the Polish king. They thus possessed and exerted significant political influence (Zmuda 2004: 26f).

As for the context of this study, significant emigration of the Polish aristocracy mainly occurred during, but more often soon after, World War II. Both Nazi Germany and the Soviets persecuted Polish aristocrats. In the part

of Poland annexed by Germany, they were expelled from their estates and sent to labour and concentration camps, while in the German occupation zone of the General Government, aristocrats and landowners were allowed to remain on their estates, but not without regular payments and the presence of German overseers on their properties. Although under constant surveillance by the Nazi regime, many aristocrats were able to aid the guerrillas of the Home Army (AK) persecuted by the Gestapo and to hide Polish Jews. On the Russian-occupied eastern territories, aristocrats and landowners were also expelled, and a lot of them were sent to the so-called Siberian Gulags; the Soviet forced labour camps. After the war, the Communist regime forbade them from settling on their former estates and barred their children from attending colleges and universities (Gołmbiowska 2014a: 2ff, my pagination). Facing such conditions, some Polish aristocrats decided to leave their home country mostly to other European countries, but “a small group of these chose multi-national, immigrant-friendly Canada as their second homeland.” (ibid.)

Canada was obviously a destination for this group, but numbers and estimates about the size do not exist. During my fieldwork, I encountered some of the descendants of Polish aristocrats in Montreal. There is almost no literature on this topic, except a book written in Polish by Beata Gołmbiowska entitled *W jednej walizce: Polska arystokracja na emigracji w Kanadzie* (2011), which could be translated as *In One Suitcase: Polish Aristocracy in the Canadian Exile*, consisting of short personal recollections of emigrated Polish aristocrats and their descendants who live in Montreal, Rawdon, as well as Vancouver and Ottawa. Many aristocrats settled in the province of Quebec; most often in Montreal, because they usually already had a knowledge of the French language prior to arrival in Canada. In one of Gołmbiowska’s portraits about a former Polish count, she states—in the count’s narrative perspective—that his family chose Montreal in Quebec as their emigration destination because all family members already had good knowledge of French (2014b: 4, my pagination). In fact, former aristocratic circles of the eighteenth century in Poland were significantly influenced by some aspects of the French Enlightenment and the Polish Szlachta adopted French high culture, including reading, writing, and speaking in French:

“Under the Dutchy of Warsaw, French elite culture flourished still further as virtually all Polish aristocrats began to write poetry, take personal notes, and read political treatises in French rather than their native Polish.” (Blackburn 2004: 6)

For those Polish aristocratic immigrants who left for Canada, we can assume that Quebec, and more so, Montreal was a favourable destination. Upon arrival in Quebec, the aristocrats, deprived of their belongings and their legal privileges, struggled, as they needed to build a new life right from the scratch. A former count, who immigrated with his parents to Montreal as a child, recounts: “It was very hard in the beginning. My father was a clerk in a large shop, my mother worked as a draughtswoman for engineers.” (Gołombiowska 2014: 5, my pagination) For their retirement, many of them bought cottages in Rawdon, in a little city in Quebec located not far from Montreal, which has since developed into the biggest cluster of the former Polish aristocrats in North America (Gołombiowska 2011). It is thus not surprising that I came across particularly the younger generation of this group of immigrants in the popular metropolitan city Montreal.

This aristocratic network, however, is not only to be found in Montreal; by now members are dispersed all over the world. His grandfather in Kenya, for instance, is of particular importance to Francis, who lived with him for five years. His grandfather is a prominent figure in former Polish aristocratic circles as “he came from a very well-known family in Poland.” (l.133) For Francis, artifacts in his grandfather’s house in Kenya, such as “genealogies [...] of all the princes [...] all over the walls” (l.134ff), reinforce the former high status of his family. These possessions come from unspecified members of his aristocratic family (“they”), who got everything they could out of Poland before “it got destroyed by the Communists and Nazis.” (l.136) Not only does the aristocratic status of Francis’ family represent an identity-conveying momentum, making him value his Polish origin in a way that is linked to an upper class social status and most likely, his socialization, it also implies inherent mobility experiences in his familial history that have already been in place for a few generations. Mobility is induced and maintained through the aristocratic network. Therefore, it has relevance in Francis’ family history and in his own life-path as we shall see in the following examination. Francis grew up and continued to live a highly mobile life with frequent geographical relocations of his life center.

Transnationality under the Condition of Mobility

Montreal is a central place for Francis. Not only was he born there and lived there as an infant with his two elder brothers (l.8f), it is also the place where he repeatedly experiences significant biographical events. He grew up in a multicul-

tural neighborhood, in which his childhood years proceeded rather uneventfully and normally. He started primary school in Montreal and encountered—as is the case for all of my Canadian-based interviewees—many fellow students from different ethnic backgrounds. He himself became good friends with a Russian-Canadian, with whom he spent much of his leisure time (11.82-95). Remembering his childhood, he talks about playing hockey with his father and sports:

“My childhood as a Canadian was defined by hockey, I mean as a kid all I did was play hockey [laughter] [...] I grew up in a very sporty, active family so I mean I was always running around playing sports and I still do.” (11.96-102)

Playing hockey was central to Francis at this point in his childhood “as a Canadian.” This is not only a position on his self-understanding, but it is also a clear reference to what would happen next in the further course of his life. Early in Francis’ life course, the family life in Montreal was shaken when a tragic and unexpected event occurred inducing his first mobility experience. To use his own words: “at the age of seven my father passed away, [...] and I moved to Kenya with my mother.” (1.9) From this moment on, Francis’ life changed to a great extent: he not only lost a parent, but he also relocated his center of life to another continent. Francis sees this as direct consequence of his father’s sudden death. In the course of the narration, he indicates that his grandparents’ poor health also played a role in this relocation to Kenya: “So my mother wanted to return to Kenya to look after her parents and she took me with her.” (1.130f) Family responsibilities are presented here as the major cause for moving. However, not all family members moved to Kenya after Francis’s father passed away:

“My two elder brothers are ten and twelve years older than me, so [...] that’s why I was the only one who went to Kenya. My brothers were seventeen and nineteen and were starting university, so they stayed in Montreal.” (11.44ff)

Moving from Canada to Kenya can be seen as a coping strategy of Francis’s mother for dealing with her husband’s unexpected death. Francis, a seven-year-old child, experienced these events and their consequences as heteronomous. They marked a decisive turning point in his life:

“Initially when I was there as a child, I remember hating it. Because I remember it being very difficult for me as a Canadian, coming from a society like Canada with structure and being able to go and play on the street and go to your friend’s house next door and then going to Africa where you can’t do that, it’s completely different [...]. So, that was really

difficult for me at the time and I remember I didn't like it at all. But by the time I was leaving, I absolutely loved it and I still cherish it dearly today." (ll.148-153)

Once relocated from Montreal to Nairobi, Francis faced difficulties in adapting to the new location and, related to that, to the new life situation. As we saw, at first, he hated it and suffered, while he retrospectively underlines that his negative feelings changed over time. This mobility experience was not self-initiated and happened out of an unpredictable biographical event in the family.

All in all, Francis spent several years living in Kenya: "So I lived in Kenya for five years, so my childhood was in Africa, [...] most of it, the childhood I remember. [...] I was in Kenya for all of my primary schooling." (ll.9f) Kenya is a biographically relevant place in Francis's early trajectory as he mostly remembers Kenya when he thinks back to his childhood. Francis indicates that all his primary schooling took place there. In fact, he attended boarding school:

"My mother put me into boarding school, because she just couldn't/ living in Kenya as a child on this big property, I was going crazy and so was my mother, so she just sent me off to boarding school [laughter]." (ll.139ff)

Francis and his mother lived on the family's property, together with his mother's parents and her two sisters. That is the aristocratic side of Francis's relatives. When referring to his "being put into boarding school" Francis immediately justifies his mother's decision since he was "going crazy." We do not know what this remark specifically means, but we can assume that he did not behave in the way that he was expected to, thus overwhelming the family in Kenya:

"[...] 'cause I hated my aunt with a passion when I was a child, 'cause she was strict, I mean [...] she didn't have any children, she's never had children, so she had a very short temper with me and my mother would get into huge arguments with her." (ll.246-249)

His mother got into arguments with her relatives about how to bring Francis up. Francis tells me that his grandfather and particularly his mother's elderly sister, Francis's aunt, were very strict about his table manners: as an eight-year-old kid he had to sit rigidly with a straight back, with "no elbows on the table ever" and he needed to learn to drink a soup by tilting the soup "towards you, not away from you." (ll.241-245) Disputes over this traditional aristocratic upbringing probably triggered the decision to send Francis to a strict boarding school:

“It was a British boarding school, so very strict rules and they really give you a proper upbringing and there was lots of sports, so I played all kinds of sports and that’s where I started playing rugby [...]” (l.153ff)

Francis claims that he got a “proper upbringing” there. Asking him what that means in the context of the boarding school, Francis refers to rules that had to do with manners: the students would have to do chores, polish their shoes, and clean up their bedrooms (ll.258-262). Yet, what was crucial for Francis were the sports on offer as one part of the curricular activities. It was there that he started to play rugby: “I picked up rugby [there], I fell in love with the sport.” (l.162) Francis found his passion in playing rugby. Arguably, it gave him a new perspective on life in Kenya. It facilitated the process of localization, allowing him to enjoy spending his time there. He started to build first friendships with other students while attending this boarding school, too:

“The thing is, I built friendships there that are still very close, like, I still have very close friends that I went to school with in Kenya, [...] that I [...] don’t see often, but we keep in touch [...] none of them really lives in Kenya, they all live in England or some live in South Africa.” (ll.172-176)

While Francis was in boarding school, he had close relationships with classmates, yet these relationships changed as they all began to move in different directions (ll.172). Francis is still in touch with them through modern technology, but personal face-to-face interactions are rare. His mobility experiences as well as the mobility experiences of this group of friends influenced the quality of the relationships. By the same token, he was not able to build long-lasting friendships at a young age, i.e., early in his life trajectory:

“From my group of friends in [elementary] school [in Montreal], [...] I don’t have any [...] because I left at such a young age, at seven. [...] I only have one [...] friend that I’ve known since I was one-year old, besides [...] all my close friends were from high school [in Montreal]. So [...] I didn’t build any relationships at that young age.” (ll.77-80)

He explains the lack of friends from his early childhood years with the fact that he left Montreal at the age of seven. He evaluates *post-hoc* that his ability to build friendships results from his mobility experiences as, in fact, he developed closer and more long-lasting relationships only later in his childhood in Kenya and as a teenager in high school in Montreal. Being away from his grandfather’s property, he would see his mother every three or four months (ll.145).

Francis and his mother would also keep in touch with the family in Canada through the practice of geographical mobility in the form of transnational mobility. As Francis started being mobile at a very young age, he was immediately involved in various transnational connections. His transnationality manifests itself in *two different ways*, which are intertwined with divergent social practices related to different geographical locations. The *first* form of transnationality is expressed through multicultural practices such as maintaining several elements of his heritage culture like eating Polish food, speaking the Polish language and listening to stories about the (aristocratic) family in earlier times. This kind of transnationality is culturally directed to Poland, but geographically linked with Kenya:

“I would say the biggest part of my life that was dominated by Polish culture and heritage was, when I was in Kenya, because [...] I mean Polish was being spoken at the dinner table and [...] it was my grandfather’s, I mean my aunts and my grandfather, they speak countless languages, five, six each, but Polish is the language of within the home.” (II.176-180)

Francis followed Polish cultural customs and traditions predominantly while living in Kenya, because there he was more in touch with his Polish roots on an everyday basis through the family members he was living with. The family, obviously, had a multicultural stance on their heritage culture. At the same time, the *second* form of transnationality is directed towards Canada while he was in Kenya:

“[...] and then every summer [...] I’d return back to Canada, so I’d spend summers in Canada, well two months in Canada and then back to school. [...] We’d come back to our house, so my brothers and my mother [...]” (II.166-169)

This form of transnationality is directed towards Canada (and not Poland) and is realized by geographical mobility (and not by maintaining cultural elements). Francis travelled with his mother in order to see his older brothers, who after the death of their father had not moved to Kenya. The transnational connections are implemented between, on the one side, Poland and Kenya, and on the other side, between Kenya and Canada. His transnationality is directed towards multiple destinations. In contrast to Kenya, Francis conceives of Canada as “home.” He constructs Canada as a place of belonging:

“I loved coming home to Canada in the summers, it was, like, what I looked forward to the most [...] ’cause Canada was always home to me. So, leaving Kenya, I mean it was great, but I looked forward ’cause I came back to Canada.” (ll.274-276)

The question of where “home” is, is often answered by referring to experiences of being away from “home.” Francis’s perception is unambiguous in this regard. He remains emotionally attached to Canada, and particularly Montreal, throughout his life trajectory, as we will see in the further course of the analysis.

“Polishness” and the Construction of Social Class

As already indicated, Francis most actively experienced his Polish heritage while he was living in Kenya. He associates food with being Polish (l.186), yet “being of Polish origin” also conveys a different meaning:

“For me as a child I came from a society where you don’t have maids and servants and drivers and gardeners, right? And then you go to Kenya and you have a maid that cleans the house, you have a cook that does all the cooking, you have a driver that drives you everywhere, you have gardeners, you-when you sit at the dinner table, you’re served by someone the food [...] you have four forks and three knives and a dessert spoon and it’s a four-course meal every night.” (ll.187-189)

Francis equates this experience of dining with staff his grandparents employed in their house. For him, eating Polish food is a crucial condition for maintaining his Polish roots within the circle of his family in Kenya. In fact, Francis’s grandparents and his aunts would have taught the family cook how to cook Polish food (ll.85f). We see here that his belonging to the Polish heritage culture is interrelated with a upper class status. When talking about what is Polish, he refers to his family’s wealth and thus to his family’s high social class. For him, it constitutes one of the biggest differences between his life in Canada and Kenya:

“I mean you don’t see that at all in Canada, unless you’re extremely wealthy. But even then, I don’t really know if they would do it. But in Kenya it’s [...] I mean you just have staff that’ll do it.” (ll.196ff)

Wealth is obviously one factor than enables the family to live and dine like that. Then again, Francis concedes that it is not only wealth, but rather class-consciousness of aristocracy which his maternal family in Kenya maintains, not to mention the family’s status as white people in Kenya. Were this aristocratic

consciousness absent, Francis is not sure whether other wealthy families, for instance, in Canada “would do it.” The latter, arguably, refers to the way his family dines and how it keeps up its aristocratic way of life, for instance, by employing household staff. When Francis states that he and his family are of “Polish origin,” he is not simply referring to his cultural roots, but also his class status. For Francis, “being Polish” also means “being of upper class.” We see that the meaning of “Polishness” is completely dislocated from the geographical place of Poland, yet for him it has a strong symbolic power. While the geographical place of Poland does not convey strong meaning, “Polishness” does *a fortiori*.

A Sporty Souvenir from Kenya

Francis’s second relocation of his center of life and thus another mobility experience occurred when he was twelve years old: he moved from Nairobi back to Montreal with his mother. He remembers that, as a child, he had expected this move back to Canada and that their stay in Kenya was only temporary:

“But I knew it was only temporary, which was ’cause I knew I would go back to Canada [...] I wasn’t gonna stay in Kenya. My mum didn’t want to stay in Kenya. She wanted to go back and she wanted me to go back.” (ll.283-292)

This relocation is, again, Francis’s mother’s decision: “once primary school had ended my mother wanted me to come back to Canada and [...] get proper secondary education.” (l.15ff) The reason presented here is education: both Francis and his mother suggest that “proper” education would not have been possible in Kenya and thus they needed to move back to Canada. Francis presents this occurrence and the explanation for it as inevitable. About a year after mother and son were back in Montreal, Francis’s grandfather and, not long after him, his grandmother passed away (ll.293, 131f). Back in Montreal, Francis started high school. Right after the return, he experienced a challenging situation:

“Then when I moved back to Canada, I had a British accent and [the kids at school] all made fun of me like: ‘This kid’s weird. Why does he have a British accent?’ [laughter], so that I quickly picked up a Canadian accent again.” (ll.234ff)

Unlike Oscar, Francis was able to attend an English-speaking high school in Montreal (l.301). This may be due to his father who, having immigrated to Toronto, most likely followed his educational path there in English before moving to Montreal. This, in turn, would allow his children to attend English-speaking

schools in Montreal. Upon his return, Francis did not want to be made fun of for his British accent and responded to the situation quickly, adopting the local pronunciation. Other than that, Francis does not tell me about further difficulties in adapting to his new life situation. In fact, it was at that high school in Montreal that he made what he considers to be his “best group of friends.” (l.307) Most of these friends are Anglophone Canadians/Anglo-Québécois (l.311) because Francis—even though he is probably embedded in the same aristocratic Polish network in Montreal as Oscar—would not “restrict [him]self to simply relating or being friends with just [people] within the Polish community.” (ll.116ff) Francis has not exclusively lived in a “Polish bubble.” Curious about Polish school, I asked Francis whether he attended as Oscar did. His answer is instructive:

“My mother, [...] she was born in Kenya whereas [Oscar’s] parents [...] they were born in Poland, grew up in Poland and then moved to Canada. So, they’re very Polish and they put all their kids into Polish schools, whereas my mother didn’t have that affinity with Poland, because she grew up in Kenya. So, there was no pressure. Me and my two brothers, none of us went to Polish school. And my father, his Polish was fairly broken, ’cause he left Poland when he was two and moved with his parents here [...]. So, that’s why, I mean, I never went to Polish school just because my parents didn’t put that pressure on me.” (ll.527-581)

Francis implies that the complex mobility history of his parents, who have been living out of Poland for generations or at least for a long time, diminished their affinity with Poland and, particularly, their knowledge and regular use of the Polish language. Many Polish (immigrant) families in Canada send their children to Polish school—first and foremost—so that they might learn the language. Learning Polish while being back in Canada was not an issue in Francis’s core family. In fact, Francis stopped speaking Polish after he left Kenya. He is “completely bilingual” (l.713), yet his bilingualism does not include Polish. He speaks French and English. He does not speak Polish anymore, but understands it (ll.567f). His lack of the Polish language is symptomatic for his Polish belonging: Francis has no distinctive belonging to the Polish culture. As indicated above, he relates, rather, his “Polishness” with social class. He did, however, observe cultural traditions like going to church and celebrating Christmas and Easter differently during his youth (ll.585-590), but Francis does not emphasize it as strongly as other interviewees. It is not biographically relevant to him. We can see that “Polish culture” lost significance once he was back in Canada.

What is important to Francis, is rugby. He continued playing it in Montreal. Since he started playing early, he was better than other kids. This was an im-

portant factor, obviously reconciling him with this second relocation of his life center:

“I was much better than everyone at it in high school, because I had been playing since I was eight and these other kids that I was in high school with hadn’t played it yet [...]” (ll.327ff)

At the age of fifteen, Francis became a part of the junior national team, where he “was playing provincially across Canada.” (ll.330f) Once Francis finished high school, he decided to pursue his studies in Victoria, British Columbia. This mobility experience accounts for the third relocation of his center of life. In contrast to previous moves, it was he who initiated this relocation. He chose British Columbia as he could play rugby for the National Academy there:

“That’s why I went to British Columbia ’cause I moved out there for the national academy and got to play a couple of matches for Canada with the senior men’s [...] which took me around the world, I traveled to Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Wales, Ireland, England, France just to play rugby.” (ll.156-160)

In his narrative, he underlines that it was important to him to play rugby and to pursue his university education at the same time. Francis thus incorporates the external motivation for his second move from Kenya to Canada—education—into his personal life plan:

“The focus wasn’t rugby, the focus was just being able to play rugby and to do school at the same time [...] I felt strongly that I needed to focus on school and my academics rather than just drop everything and focus on rugby.” (ll.398ff)

His aim was not to focus on rugby exclusively but to combine rugby with higher education. Francis decided against playing rugby professionally in the course of his studies. He gives two main reasons for this decision:

“Because [...] I knew in my heart that I didn’t want to drop everything for rugby, just as I knew where I stood with it. I’m good at rugby but once you get to [...] the top level, you know where you stand, so I knew where I stood in the sense that I was good at it, but I wasn’t like world class.” (ll.402-404)

Francis was aware of his rugby skills. He knew that he was good at it, yet not good enough to choose it as a career path. On the other hand, experiences of others, who played rugby in Europe, also influenced his decision:

“I fully thought I could go, like, train and then just get there and just go, like, pro [...] I’ve met enough people who have gone through it to see how it’s really cut-throat in the sense that you can be on top one day and be at the bottom the next day [...] the real reason was [...] there were guys that were coming back from Europe. They played rugby there five, six years and they were coming back and truth was, they dropped everything when they were nineteen, twenty to go to Europe and play with no education and now they were coming back to Canada at twenty-seven, twenty-eight and they were doing their undergrad-degree, you know, the first degree and I just, I didn’t want to do [that].” (II.423-435)

His evaluation of having insufficient skills for an exceptional professional career as well as his fear of being left with nothing resulted into the decision to not pursue a professional career in sports. Instead, he focused on finishing his degree in economics and finance (I.394). He assesses this decision as the right one: “No, I don’t regret it at all. I still love rugby. I still play it a lot; in the summers, I play.” (II.420f)

New Possibilities in a New Place

Obtaining a university degree and putting aside the idea of playing rugby professionally induced yet another mobility experience. After finishing his university education, Francis came back to Montreal where he started work as a mutual fund analyst (I.452). After one year (Francis was about twenty-three years old), his company went bankrupt. This, in turn, triggered the fifth relocation of his life center, this time to Toronto: “At which point I landed a job in Toronto, so I moved to Toronto, [...] and that’s where I am now.” (I.22f) At first, Francis presents the reasons for this mobility as professional. Later, it becomes apparent that he chose Toronto as a place to apply for a new position:

“And then [...] [my former girlfriend] finished her master’s and was moving back to Toronto ‘cause she’s from here and [...] my company had gone bankrupt and [...] I wanted to move to Toronto, so it just worked out, just worked out well.” (II.506ff)

Not only his former girlfriend left Montreal for Toronto, but also a group of friends, originally from Montreal, had moved to Toronto, so this time the relocation of his center of life did not imply a loss of personal contacts. While moving

from Kenya to Montreal was triggered by the expectation that Francis would get a better education in Canada, his move from Montreal to Toronto was motivated by the expectation of having better career chances there:

“[...] of my close friends, there are eight of us in Toronto, [...] they left Montreal. A large reason for that: there is way more opportunity here.” (Il.667ff)

Several factors influenced this last relocation to Toronto. Not only did his girlfriend at the time move there, but also some of his friends. The more long-term groups of friends are the ones who also moved from Montreal to Toronto. Thus, the friends that Francis is (still) close with live in the same city. Then again, his family relationships are all long-distance relationships as his mother and his brothers are geographically dispersed: “I have one brother in Dubai and I have one brother in Ottawa and my mother [...] is back and forth from Kenya.” (1.514) All of his closest family members live in different places, which make personal face-to-face meetings less frequent. Nevertheless, Francis keeps in touch with them every two days by using new technologies (i.e., Facetime, Skype, SMS) (Il.521f). This high frequency of virtual interactions is focused on his core family, suggesting that the social practice of virtual interaction is linked with the social practice of mobility and the strong ties of his family unit.

Beginning a new job in Toronto, Francis first worked in the finance sector, just as he did in Montreal. After a little while, however, he changed his mind in terms of his professional pathway:

“When I first got here, I had a job lined up [...] at a dynamic [...] financial equities firm downtown, which I worked at for three months and then I quit [laughter]. [...] I quit because I had a change of mind in terms of what I wanted to do and I landed a job as a commercial real estate broker and that’s what I do now. So, I lease and trade real estate, commercial real estate, not residential, so office buildings, I don’t do any residential, I just do office.” (Il.463-467)

The relocation from Montreal to Toronto was a life-changing event not only in matters of mobility, but also in matters of his professional future. In this sense, it was biographically relevant for Francis as he re-oriented his professional aspirations. In fact, he was unhappy with his former job as he “hated what [he] was doing” (1.470) when working in finance, while “going into commercial real estate [he] had more of an opportunity to [...] work for [him]self and see [his] direct work, see the results of [his] direct input.” (Il.470ff) Relocating to Toronto and changing his professional path are self-determined decisions, giving Francis new

possibilities of orientation in his future life trajectory. For the time being, Francis wants to remain in Toronto (ll.630). In his life trajectory, we have seen that sooner or later, Francis always returns to Montreal. After Francis spent five years of his childhood in Kenya, he returned to Montreal. The same happened when he graduated from university in Victoria: he came back to Montreal and started his first job there, until he moved to Toronto. Being mobile and keeping up ties in the form of various transnational connections became a continuous social practice in Francis's life trajectory. The same holds true for the life of his family members: "Yeah, yeah, we don't stay in one place." (l.617)

Contextual Self-Understanding and Travelling Origins

The ongoing mobility experience in Francis's life, but also in his family history engenders a specific self-understanding in which he appreciates his Polish roots, but he understands himself as Canadian:

"I'm Canadian, yes. But no, I'm Polish though. It's like it's hard to/ see this is the disconnect between my generation and my mother's generation. My mother's generation, [...] they're Polish [...] It is my cousins and myself that were brought up Polish, we were brought up with Polish culture, Polish food, Polish in the house, we heard stories about Poland, but to me as great as that is and as proud as I am of my Polish heritage, I'm Canadian. I grew up playing hockey, I mean [...] the thing you notice here in Canada, is because we are all immigrants of some sort or another at some point in time we came from somewhere else, we are all Canadian, but we're all incredibly proud of our heritage. I'm like incredibly proud of being Polish." (ll.552-561)

Francis struggles with an ambiguous cultural affiliation. He cannot adhere to only one country or one culture. The reason why he does not see himself as only Polish is based on the fact that he sees a disconnect between the generations. But then again, he is living in a country where multiculturalism and the appreciation of the inhabitants' various heritages make it possible for him to maintain more than one cultural affiliation, self-understanding, and sense of belonging. Francis understands himself in terms of his residence by putting forward his affiliation with Canada while appreciating his Polish cultural heritage at the same time. In situations abroad, however, Francis has noticed that he gives different answers to the same question, namely the question of where he comes from:

"[...] It's amazing though, 'cause [...] if I go to Australia and they say like: 'Oh, so where are you from?' I say: 'I'm Canadian.' But if I'm here and people ask me: 'Where are you from?' I say: 'I'm Polish.'" (ll.544-546)

Francis actively responds to the question of his self-perception. Francis is aware that this situation is extraordinary. As already indicated in Oscar's and Malinka's case, we see here a *contextual self-understanding*, in which he, based on the geographical context he is in, decides what kind of self-understanding he puts forward. In addition, Francis experienced several situations where he indicates how others perceived him: "[...] it was [at boarding school in Kenya] that [...] I was known as the Canadian kid, right." (ll.223-228) He reflects about possible reasons for that and assumes his choice of clothes to play a role:

"I mean I wore caps with Canada on it and I was Canadian, I was so Canadian and I was so proud of being Canadian [...] it wasn't about being Polish, I was Canadian. I mean I had a Canadian accent, everyone there has a British accent." (ll.230-236)

Apart from the clothes he was wearing, his Canadian accent was also something distinct noticed by others. Francis presents himself as a very proud Canadian. In this particular situation abroad, his Polish heritage, however, did not play a role in the process of locating his cultural belonging, neither for him nor for the others. Once he practiced mobility to destinations other than Poland, his Polish sense of belonging faded into the background and his Canadian sense of belonging came to the fore. Then again, Francis would refer to himself as being Polish, but in other situations:

If I were to go to Poland [...], I'd proudly say I'm Polish, but to them I'd likely be Canadian, I mean as my Polish is very poor." (ll.564-568)

Francis perceives language as the momentum establishing cultural belonging or the perception of others about it. He points to the fact that he is perceived by Polish people in Poland as Canadian. Canada was in fact the "country of arrival" for Francis' parents. It is, however, problematic to say the same for Francis, as I also have argued in other cases. Since Francis was born in Montreal and since neither he nor his family have lived in Poland for generations, the classical categorizations of "country of arrival" and "country of origin" commonly used in migration studies is simply inadequate. Canada is not Francis's "country of arri-

val,”³⁰ neither biographically nor legally. However, both Poland and Canada account for Francis’s *countries* of origin, considering their roles in Francis’s life story. In order to categorize this dual, or multiple, narrative of origin, I would like to introduce the concept of *travelling origins*. Highly mobile individuals often have several origins that structure and construct their life stories in a cumulative way. Francis’s life story illustrates this “accumulation of origins” as he clearly sees his cultural roots in Poland, while his home is in Canada. This dual identity can also be felt by individuals with a migration background whose life stories involve fewer mobility experiences. Yet, I argue that the concept best describes the paradoxical situation in which cumulative origins travel as individuals travel. This becomes especially clear when Francis narrates that he is the Canadian in Poland, Polish in Canada, and the Canadian in any other destination that goes beyond one of his countries of origin, which is, arguably, determined by the perceptions of others as well as his own. Thus, the concept of travelling origins allows us to better grasp social practices that are specific to mobile life trajectories. *Travelling origins* are situationally constructed depending on the individual’s geographical location, which determines the *contextual self-understanding* he or she puts forth. As Francis’s life story demonstrates, when we—as scholars—assume that individuals have more than one origin, we are able to assign forms of transnationality directed towards multiple destinations. What is more, *travelling origins* enables us to understand in which context what kind of self-understanding the individual displays and accordingly, it emphasizes that “origin” is—in fact—*situationally constructed*.

5.3 COSMOBILITY: OPEN MOBILITY AND THE “HOMING-EFFECT”

The life stories of Francis and Malinka demonstrate how extensive mobility is constructed as a continuous social practice informed by certain biographical circumstances. We have seen that those respondents who practice cosmopolitan mobility attach different meanings to the locations relevant to them as well as to the experience of being mobile. The second part of Malinka’s life story further strengthens the assumption that she uses mobility as a coping strategy to get away from unpleasant life situations she faces in Berlin. Using mobility as a coping strategy prevents her from making “serious decisions” such as finding an apartment in Berlin or deciding what to do academically or professionally. To

30 In the sense of a (second generation) “migrant.”

construct her mobility experiences as meaningful, Malinka often acquires “soft-skills” such as learning a new language and doing internships during these temporally-restricted relocations of her life center. She constantly deliberates whether and when to go abroad. Here we see that knowing a (foreign) language is not only a precondition for mobility experiences, but also that the desire to acquire a new language triggers mobility as well. Mobility has become a habit, an integral part of her lifestyle, something Malinka describes as a craving, an addiction. In fact, her life-course involves twelve temporally-restricted relocations of her center of life. While she is clearly “hypermobile,” she also consciously favours phases of immobility or dwelling during certain periods of time, for instance when she stopped commuting from Greifswald to Berlin or when she decided to stay in Berlin in order start a family and to live a “settled life”—though only through her mobility experiences has she come to realize where she wants to settle, namely in Berlin.

Francis’s life-course also contains various spatial movements that he regards as meaningful. Right from the beginning, he relocates to places that are not related to Poland, the country of his cultural roots, unlike Malinka, whose mobility can, at least at first, be described as bi-local transnational between Poland and Germany. Francis’s mobility, however, is directed to destinations other than Poland, such as Kenya and other Canadian provinces. The fact that Francis does not practice mobility to Poland is related to how he constructs his belonging towards his Polish heritage culture. For Francis, the geographical space of Poland does not matter as such. What matters, however, is the construction of belonging to his Polish heritage through the aristocratic diaspora. The status of former aristocrats enables Francis to give meaning to his “Polishness.” For him, his Polish origin fulfills a symbolic function. Francis does not engage in an ethnic community life, he does not have many Polish friends and—unlike many other Canadian-based interviewees—he did not attend Polish school, which leaves him with a lack of spoken knowledge of the Polish language. We can see here that language skills play an important role. In fact, Francis, who never has been mobile to Poland, does not speak any Polish and places little value on observing certain Polish traditions.

As for Malinka, we have seen that her perception of Poland changes in the course of her life: while Poland was a desirable place to live at the beginning (ch. 4.3), it changed into an undesirable place. The fact of putting aside Poland as a possible mobility destination has to do—I assume—with her disagreeing with certain cultural values that are commonly upheld there. Malinka thus creates a cultural distance from Poland. What is more, in Germany, Poland is not valued as a destination in the same way as the United States and Canada. In the

course of her life, Malinka begins to look beyond Poland as an “eligible” place to relocate to. This is certainly one characteristic of the cosmopolitan pattern of mobility, emphasizing the fact that the individuals’ mobility is directed towards destinations other than Poland—as is not seen in the pattern of transmobility (ch. 4). Worthy of mention is that in both life stories mobility exists in the individuals’ family histories. In Malinka’s case, it was her mother who was transnationally mobile before Malinka was born. The story of Francis’s mother is a reminder that the path between Poland and Canada is not necessarily direct. His maternal family moved to other places (like Kenya) before his mother moved to Canada. Such complex mobility experiences complicate—as we have seen—the matter of categorizing according to “migrant generations.” Complex mobilities clearly go beyond a one-time change of one’s center of life. They are, rather, variations of transnationality or diaspora.

Malinka’s and Francis’s mobility experiences go beyond the geographical destination of Poland, demonstrating that cosmobility involves more open flows of spatial movements. This cosmopolitan mobility pattern differs from transmobility as its directionality does not include the country of origin, Poland. Malinka’s case is especially instructive as it shows an evolution from the pattern of “transmobility” to the pattern of “cosmobility”: her mobility experience changes from bi-local transnational mobility flows to multi-local transnational flows in the course of her life, leaving Poland aside as a country of destination. Direction and durability are dependent upon the biographical circumstances under which the mobility experiences occur. They are not predictable as they may arise in an ad hoc manner. This form of mobility can be seen as “cosmopolitan” because the respondents are open to various geographical places. They embody the cosmopolitan notion of a “global citizen.” (ch. 1.2) Generally, cosmopolitan mobility emphasizes that mobility experiences emerge out of the opportunity structures an individual encounters in certain life phases, which often come out of personal or professional connections, opportunities, or responsibilities. Yet, some mobility destinations are more likely than others. For instance, Francis’s moving to Toronto is “a pattern within a pattern”: it is not unusual that young adults trained in business and finance move to Canada’s financial center, Toronto. Another interesting insight—which is hardly found in the literatures so far—is that biographical constellations and personal motivations for mobility do not necessarily need to be professional (i.e., better work possibilities). In fact, Malinka’s mobility was—up until now—never professionally motivated because it was not linked to a professional position abroad, one that would offer her a better income.

Certainly, it also means that respondents whose mobility practices can be described as cosmopolitan possess a high motility. Motility refers to how an individual takes advantage of those opportunities that require him or her to be mobile (Flamm/Kaufmann 2006). It includes the aspects of language(s) (the lack, the acquiring, and using languages), social networks/family structures, as well as belonging/boundary-making with regard to the “root culture” and the encountered culture in the “country of arrival,” place of residency, or another country of origin. These factors not only determine the cosmopolitan pattern of mobility, they, in fact, determine the emergence of each pattern in the course of an individual’s trajectory. As also indicated in the two previous empirical chapters, these factors are based upon different constellations in each pattern. For the pattern of cosmobility, however, the acquisition of multiple (foreign) languages plays a significant role. In addition to Polish and German, Malinka speaks English and Spanish. She intentionally uses mobility as a strategy to learn new foreign languages, leaving her with a rather broad field of possible mobility destinations. Francis speaks English and French, enabling him to communicate in several different countries, too. What is less important, however, is the acquisition of Polish. In Francis’s case we have seen that the lack of knowledge of (spoken) Polish, which is certainly related to a weak sense of belonging to his Polish heritage culture, hinders him from being mobile to Poland. In fact, he does not think of Poland as a country where he wants to live. As for family structures and social networks, we have seen how they biographically determine mobility experiences. Francis, for instance, may never have lived in Kenya had his maternal family not already been living there. Crucial is also the aspect of belonging and boundary-making. As mentioned earlier, both Francis and Malinka have a weaker sense of belonging to the Polish culture, and a stronger cultural belonging to either Canada or Berlin. That is why their mobility experiences show a unique characteristic, a kind of “homing-effect” towards a specific location, which constitutes the “home base;” that is, the specific location they return to after perennial or month-long life experiences in different places. While Malinka repeatedly comes back to Berlin, Francis returns to Montreal. Under conditions of such extensive mobility, not only do the individuals move, so do their “origins.” I have pointed to this phenomenon by introducing the concept of “travelling origins.” The experiences that I have conceptualized under the pattern of cosmobility are very specific and rarer than the other types. In fact, only the minority of my interviewees qualify for this pattern. The lack of literature in both migration and mobility studies also suggests that the empirical insights from these life stories may not be a completely new phenomenon, but a phenomenon that is newly recognized as such.

Part III:
Making Sense of Movements:
Towards a “Mobilities Perspective”
in Migration Studies

6 Revisiting Migration through the Patterns of (Im)Mobility

In the preceding chapters, we have seen whether, and if yes, how often, when, for how long, why, and in which direction my respondents adjust their mobility practices. After initial migration, both Sandra and Anja are sedentary in their countries of arrival. They have developed an aversion toward mobility, which manifests itself in different ways. Other respondents, however, are more mobile. While Janusz constantly targets Poland as his favourite destination, Oscar additionally moved between Scotland and Poland by way of Montreal and plans to go to the United States soon, but both started to be mobile relatively late. And Malinka? She had already moved for the first time by the age of three. She has lived in Germany (Berlin), Poland and the United States, and has had shorter stays in Cuba, Argentina, and Spain. Compared to Malinka, Francis's "age of entry" into mobility at seven years is relatively late. During his life course, he has lived in different cities and provinces in Canada (Montreal, Victoria, Toronto) and in Kenya.

What the main characters of this book have experienced in their lives portrays the study's main contribution: the patterns of (im)mobility. As the title part III of the book suggests, the patterns show one possible way for us to make sense of movements. Movements embrace both migration and mobility, and how we make sense of them determines our understanding of these issues. I understand the patterns in a double sense: as empirical results and as a tool to revisit migration. In this chapter, I will first summarize and systematically evaluate each of the patterns of (im)mobility and demonstrate how I can utilize them to revisit migration by proposing a new reading of the theories in the field (ch. 6.1). I then discuss the empirical results more broadly in terms of their temporal, spatial, and social dimensions (ch. 6.2). Finally, I discuss the study's theoretical contribution and, ultimately, I highlight the fruitfulness of the "mobilities perspective" on migration (ch. 6.3).

As tools to revisit migration, the patterns of (im)mobility can also be used in different ways. Because they are constructed upon specific methodological and epistemological premises (biographical research, combination of migration and mobility studies) and, certainly, on a unique sample, they are not exhaustive. That is why I understand them as an invitation, for instance, to identify other, new, or differentiated patterns. For starters, one could examine a different sample representing a different form of migration, in different places of the world.

6.1 READING MIGRATION BETWEEN EXPERIENCES AND THEORIES

This section provides a systematic summary and evaluation of the patterns of (im)mobility, explicating how we can use them as tools to revisit migration. More specifically, I will point out what role the established theories in migrations studies, i.e., the “classical” and “new” approaches I presented in chapter one, play in the patterns themselves, and how these can guide our thoughts and reflections on migration beyond said approaches. The established theories all gain relevance in the patterns of (im)mobility. That is, in the biographical experiences of my respondents. Accordingly, I will propose a new reading of migration, one that connects the theories and the experiences in the field with one another, showing a possible way to use the patterns as tools.

Mobility as an Element of the Past: Sedentary Social Advancement and Assimilation

The pattern of immobility is the first type presented in part II of the book. It is the social phenomenon of *sedentariness after initial migration*, showing similarities to the concept of *assimilation*. The pattern corresponds with individuals and their families who have entered the country of arrival with a “one-way ticket” with the purpose of settling permanently (“immigration”)—i.e., mobility as practiced in the past, either by the individual being interviewed, or by his or her antecedents. After immigration, they are generally lacking in mobility experiences, as in (temporally-restricted) internal or international relocations of their life center. While internal mobility is still more likely to occur—for instance, individuals enroll in a university located in another city than their hometown or change their place of employment from one city to another—international mobility is practiced to a lesser extent to the point of being almost absent. The immobility experience for the individual means having a clear geographical center of life,

located in the country of arrival. It often implies an aversion toward mobility, characterized by a lack of intention to move someplace else—either for good, or for a limited period of time; either to the individual's country of origin, or to any other country. Unambiguously, the intention is to remain in the country of arrival: it is the only geographical reference point to maintain everyday activities and to integrate into the “host society.”

The respondents incorporate national (migration-specific) discourses while narrating their experience of settlement and integration. In other words, they appropriate theoretical approaches such as assimilation and multiculturalism, emphasizing the social pressure of integration they face. While all patterns underline that they do integrate into the “country of arrival” in one way or another, the pattern of immobility emphasizes an assimilationist way to do so.¹ For these respondents, being successfully integrated into the country of arrival means more than the minimum: fulfilling specific objective “integration criteria” like learning the language, finding a job, and participating in the society. Integration means achieving a good social position in the national system of social stratification. Their integration efforts must involve upward social mobility within their (regional) place of residency. This kind of integration demands or results in assimilationist behavioural patterns and social practices. Individual and structural conditions produce certain limitations and paradoxes that often find expression in the three social dimensions of the interviewee's life: language(s), networks, belonging/self-understanding. My study suggests the following constellations that promote the development of the pattern of immobility in one's life course: (1) flawless mastery of the official language(s), (2) few contacts with co-ethnics, and (3) affiliations with the country of arrival and a calculated distancing of one-

-
- 1 As in probably every study on migration, I am unable to avoid using the overloaded and politicized term of “integration.” I have pointed out that the meaning of the term remains vague as it can be used in both an assimilationist way and a cultural pluralist/multicultural way. Whenever I do not indicate in which of these two ways I use the term, I use it in a *non-normative way*: I do not suppose that those labelled as “migrants” must distance or even give up their heritage culture in order to integrate, neither do I assume that integration should be their (one-sided) effort. I rather understand it as the mutual endeavour of a heterogeneous and open society, whose goal it should be to integrate all *factual* members so as to counteract inequalities and gaps in the social strata, wherein the status of “migration” is one of several other “markers of difference.”

self from the “root culture.”² These constellations show, conversely, how a particular theoretical strand—in this case: assimilation—gains empirical importance.

1) The Focus on Perfection

When it comes to language(s); individuals, who lack post-migration mobility experiences in their life courses, solely focus on the acquirement and the perfection of the (official) language(s) they encounter in the country of arrival. As a result, merely acquiring the language(s) is not enough. What they seek rather is a flawless mastery, i.e., speaking the language(s) without an accent so that others might not detect their “non-native” status based on their proficiency.³

Comparing German and Canadian-based discourses on language, I have found that the German-based interviewees are much stricter in their approach, probably because social expectations for “migrants” to master the language are much higher in assimilationist Germany than in multicultural/intercultural Canada. There, social advancement may arguably be possible without the flawless mastery of the official language(s), while it would be an exception in Germany. However, flawless language skills for the sake of advancing one’s social position also involves avoiding or shedding (linguistic) “marginal high status signals” (Lamont/Lareau 1988) such as using colloquial or foreign vocabulary, in order to avoid being identified as belonging to a lower social milieu. An assimilationist stance becomes also apparent in the predominant use of the language(s) of the country of arrival, whether in public or in private spheres. The individuals do not use their heritage language voluntarily. When forced to do so, they do it *reluctantly*. The focus on perfection eventually leads to a neglect of the heritage language and other foreign languages, hindering mobility experiences to both the country of origin and other destinations.

Individuals who relocating their life center for a certain amount of time, often work or study as well as engage in daily social interactions and activities in

-
- 2 Theoretically, I can also imagine a contrasting constellation for the immobility pattern: (1) no knowledge of official language(s), (2) many/only contacts with co-ethnics, and (3) affiliations with “root culture” and a distancing from the culture and country of arrival. It would then describe the condition of “marginalization,” (ch. 1.1) however, I could not observe it within my sample. Further research would be desirable in this respect.
 - 3 For Polish-speaking persons, an accent is mostly marked by the pronunciation of a “rolling r,” and many respondents made or make huge efforts to avoid this “mispronunciation,” going so far as to attend phonetics classes.

this new location. Heritage or foreign language skills are, in many cases, a precondition for “going abroad,” but sometimes individuals use the lack of it as a “driver for mobility” to learn new languages. Not so for the pattern of immobility, primarily because it is a distraction from the project of assimilationist integration and upward social mobility in the country of arrival. In these cases, upward social mobility does not aim at establishing an “international career” or to become part of an “elite,” because that would imply foreign language skills and mobility, but rather to move from a low(er) (middle) class position to a (higher) middle class position. For the latter, language skills other than those of the official language(s) in the country of arrival are not necessarily required. Relocating ones’ life center without having the language skills of the new place will often lead to a lowering of the social status, requiring the individuals to make new efforts to adapt to and advance in the new society—an unattractive outlook for those who already make an effort to climb the social ladder in their (first) country of arrival. In sum, knowledge of the heritage or foreign language(s) simplifies mobility while the lack of it often functions as a hindrance. Yet again, mastery of the official language(s) spoken in the country of arrival promotes processes of social advancement there.

2) Relationships with Co-Ethnics?—Only When It’s Family!

The family structures found in the pattern of immobility most often contain a local embeddedness of the individuals’ core family, i.e., family members who immigrated with the interviewees (e.g., parents, siblings), live in the country of arrival as well and are sedentary there themselves. Such a precondition simplifies continuous and close family relations. Certainly, almost all of my respondents have relatives in their country of origin and they visit them (regularly), without implying a change of the individuals’ center of life. Mostly, they perceive holidaying in the country of origin as an obligation. It is not altogether surprising that the German-based interviewees travel to Poland more frequently than the Canadian-based ones. The geographical proximity between Germany, particularly Berlin, and Poland favours these visits; sometimes even in the form of commuting. Conversely, the geographical distance between Canada and Poland prevents such frequent visits: travelling from Canada to Poland is more expensive and more time consuming. My Canadian-based interviewees most often combine visits to Poland with holidays in other European countries. While German-based interviewees visit their relatives in Poland two or three times a year on average, Canadian-based ones travel to Poland every three or four years. On both sides of the Atlantic, I have observed that visits to Poland decrease in frequency the older

the respondents get—an issue that certainly has to do with the fact that their contacts there are restricted to family members only.

Conversely, individuals strongly engage in social relationships *on the spot* in the country of arrival with friends, partners or girl/boyfriends, and colleagues. They establish social networks and accumulate social capital, but usually not with other people of Polish heritage. Some respondents are simply not interested, while others state that “it just didn’t happen.” If my respondents did not refuse contact with co-ethnics outright, neither did they intentionally seek out such social relationships. Again, this is more striking for the German-based interviewees as they almost exclusively engage in social interactions with Germans. In Canada, the situation turns out to be different: interviewees establish contacts with co-ethnics much more often, particularly during their childhood as many of them are involved in activities organized by Polish associations. In schools, for instance, peer groups often form on grounds of nationality, making the Canadian-based interviewees “automatically” part of these groups. The older the respondents get, the more diversified their social relationships become and sometimes they do not maintain Polish contacts other than with their core families. This seems to be the result of contextual differences: while there is a lively Polish community in Canada, there are comparably low numbers of Polish organizations and get-togethers in Germany.

3) Affiliating with the Country of Arrival and Distancing Oneself from the “Root Culture”

The pattern of immobility is characterized by constellations of belonging constructed toward the country of arrival: the individuals clearly favour the culture and society of the country of arrival over their “root culture.” Some construct their residence-affiliated belonging so as to reject their heritage culture, or at least to distance themselves from it. Affiliations with the country of arrival may become conflictual for some, which finds expression in the construction of a divergent self-understanding. It is—yet again—more pronounced in the German context. Individuals whose Polish background might be obvious because, for instance, they have a Polish name, are faced with the socially determined impossibility of being defined as *real* Germans. These individuals therefore both reluctantly incorporate their Polish background into their self-understanding and they practice transnational activities, albeit favouring the country of arrival. In Canada, it is much more socially accepted to see oneself as a Canadian when having a different ethnic background. It is, in fact, part of Canada’s self-conception as a multicultural country.

Immobility: Geographical Mobility as a Barrier for Social Mobility

The pattern of (im)mobility, or the experience of post-migration sedentariness, combines integration processes with intentions of upward social mobility. In order to be socially perceived as “integrated,” individuals set their focus on processes of social advancement. Such a focus prevents the emergence of opportunity structures for (geographical) mobility, and that is why the pattern is characterized by a low motility. While some of my respondents might make use of their “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et al. 2004), they typically do not. For others, it leads to the condition in which their personal and professional projects are not transferable to another setting without lowering their social status. They prefer to live a sedentary life in their country of arrival than to live with a lower social status in either their country of origin or another destination. Experiences of immobility in the life courses are thus accompanied by sedentary social practices, attitudes, and discourses that solely focus on the social context of the country of arrival: *sedentariness appears as the best condition and assimilation as the best strategy to reach the goal of (uni-local) upward social mobility*. Mobility only plays a role in the past and living an immobile life in the country of arrival is what happens when the individuals’ assimilation project gains momentum. Using assimilation as a strategy, they want to complete their parents’ initial “migration project” *successfully* so as to reassure them of their having made the right (life-changing) decision and to show their loyalty toward the family.

From the perspective of assimilation theory, these results typically correspond to the normative ideal. From a cultural pluralist point of view, however, they seem counter-intuitive. Certainly, scholars promoting the assimilation concept would be pleased about the pattern of immobility because it illustrates that ideas of assimilation are well founded. We should, however, be careful not to assume that assimilation is the “only,” the “self-evident,” or “natural” way of integrating into new contexts, and challenge the normativity of respective theoretical formulations, e.g., as do those of Gordon and Esser (ch. 1.1). In my work, I first used assimilation as a “category of practice” before using it as a “category of analysis.” Such an approach confirms Berry’s statement that individuals can choose how to integrate, which they—in fact—do, but not randomly. Those who practice assimilationist strategies perceive it as the most effective way to succeed in processes of social advancement in one particular social space, namely the “country of arrival.” Sometimes they perceive assimilation as a duty, directed at them by the society they encounter, particularly in the German context, and sometimes they combine assimilative practices with multicultural ones. We can witness more (willing) multicultural practices in the mobile patterns, especially when my respondents express and appreciate their cultural heritage. The Canadi-

an-based interviewees simultaneously understand themselves and are perceived by others as “Canadians.” This is not the case for German-based ones as they are reluctant to or *must not* use such a self-expression due to the German society’s broad consensus of an assimilationist stance on integration policy. However, practicing multicultural integration does not mean that individuals do not face challenges of integration or that they do not sometimes put forth assimilationist practices in their everyday lives. What is remarkable is that *the discourses inherent in the biographical narratives of my respondents are nationally tainted, emphasizing the ideological power of politicized theoretical concepts and actual agendas of policy-making like assimilation, (integration), and multiculturalism.*

When we think about these approaches once again, we notice that these theories are not only abstract ideas; but that they have either been designed for or they have evolved as the political basis of state action. As such, all these approaches conceptualize the migratory movement *only* as a unidirectional geographical move from A to B; commonly known as “immigration.” The migratory movement is perceived as a one-way street, reminding us of Simmel’s figure of the *stranger* “who comes today and stays tomorrow.” ([1908] 1950) While assuming a permanent settlement on the part of the migrants, the “classical” approaches reproduce a unitary vision of the modern (nation-)state (Favell 2014: 75, 84). They intensify—what I call—the “immobility-bias” in migration studies; the inherent assumption that migrants do not practice geographical movements other than only *one* border-crossing relocation of their center of life. Thus, I argue that the core structure of these approaches targets sedentariness in the country of arrival of “once immigrated migrants” without conceptualizing their (potential) “secondary movements.” (Moret 2015) Consequently, Schrooten et al. argue that these “traditional accounts of migration have been found inadequate for understanding contemporary mobility processes.” (2015: 4) I agree that these traditional accounts are not exhaustive and that their sedentary structure limits their explanatory value, yet all of these approaches—when contemplated in a differentiated manner—gain importance in the patterns of (im)mobility. The pattern of immobility, for instance, adheres to assimilation; and it also means that an (immobile) individual, who is based in a multicultural country, may put forward an assimilationist strategy to integrate while someone, who is based in a country with assimilationist policies and whose life course adheres to pattern of trans- or cosmobility, may very well develop and display a multicultural interpretation of integration. While the pattern of immobility suggests an assimilationist way of integrating, the other patterns clearly show multicultural integration as well as endeavours of multiple or *multi-local* integration into various geographical and societal spaces, as we are to see in the following sections.

Mobility as Bi-Locality: Mobile Paths of Integration and (Migrant) Transnationalism

The pattern of transmobility is the second type presented in part II of the book. Transmobility illustrates a form of migration other than “immigration.” It is organized in the form of transnational mobility, which involves *recurrent relocations of the individuals’ life center after initial migration mainly between the country of arrival and that of origin, and potentially also between other places of destination*. Mobility here is bi-local and it shares particularly strong links with the concept of (migrant) transnationalism as well as with the concept of *diaspora*. Contrary to the “classical” approaches in migration studies, the “new” ones conceptualize social reality beyond the borders of one nation-state, having thus a broadened spatial reach. However, they are not agendas of policy-making.

(Migrant) transnationalism deals with various kinds of border-crossing activities of migrants, while diasporas describe distinct communities, which were (forcedly) dispersed from their homelands, but whose members preserve their identities. Both concepts are related; a diaspora is often considered as one distinct form of a transnational community. Throughout all three patterns, my respondents engage in transnational activities: sometimes they practice them selectively (and reluctantly) while, at other times, they practice them comprehensively. Interestingly, their integration paths occur simultaneously to these activities (Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004) while both processes occur concurrently to mobility experiences, illustrating how crucial (migrant) transnationalism is for mobility, and vice versa.

Transnational mobility, as constructed in the pattern, brings about more than one geographical reference point in the lives of individuals. Combining the locations of the country of arrival and origin (and possibly others) with one another—by relocating between them—constitutes the individuals’ life-world in the form of a transnational social space (Pries 2008, Faist 2006, o.a.), in which geographical movements happen between specific places, and not between random ones (Pries 2001b: 53). The directionality of the individuals’ geographical movements is clear: the (classical) country of origin is the geographical destination, while—over time—the individuals may broaden their geographical scope to places other than their *countries* of origin. Transmobility therefore contains bi-local mobility flows and, as the circumstances require, multi-local ones. While the mobility experiences are restricted in duration, their length is not always determined *a priori*. Both the duration and the bi-or multi-directionality emerge out of an interplay between biographical circumstances and structural/contextual conditions, creating opportunity structures that consist of possibilities and re-

sponsibilities at specific points and places of time during the individuals' life course. The opportunity structures are linked to the individuals' educational and professional aspirations, and often combined with familial motives, and sometimes they constitute experiences of suffering, "cultural otherness," and attempts to integrate into multiple contexts. The following constellations of the social dimension are decisive for the development, maintenance, and shifting of the transmobile pattern: (1) fluency in (heritage and official) language(s), (2) transnationalization of relationships, and (3) identification with "root culture."

1) The Language—Mobility Nexus

The acquisition and mastery of (both) the official language(s) in the country of arrival and the heritage language is a precondition for gaining experiences of transnational mobility and bi-locality.⁴ The role of the heritage language is particularly crucial as it enables mobility directed to my respondents' country of origin. Acquiring or using the heritage language is far from being a matter of course in "migrant families": some families attach a higher value on speaking the language(s) of the "country of arrival" fluently while others prefer to focus on maintaining the heritage language. A combination of both, however, can lead to bilingualism.

There are interesting differences between the socialization process in Germany and Canada: if maintaining the heritage language is a relevant topic in my respondents' families (in both countries it is not always the case), language education is distinct. In Germany, respondents predominantly speak Polish at home with their parents or siblings and, certainly, when they visit their relatives in Poland. In Canada, parents additionally send their children to Polish schools, in which they get a more formalized education, including reading and writing skills in Polish. In fact, the institution of the Polish school and the use of it is an expression of Canada's multiculturalism. Both ways, however, promote (migrant) transnationalism and/or transnational mobility, yet being able to read and to write in Polish makes it easier to study, work, and live there.

But there is more to it than that: not only is knowledge of the heritage language a precondition for relocating one's life center to the (classical) country of origin for a specific period of time, but—conversely—mobility directed there is central for improving those language skills. For multi-local mobility, the logic is similar: multilingualism promotes multi-local mobility and multi-local mobility

4 For another sample, the official language(s) in the country of arrival and the heritage language may be the same one, e.g., for French migrants in Quebec or British migrants in the rest of Canada.

promotes the solidification of language skills. By the same token, lacking either the heritage language or (one of) the official language(s) and attempting to acquire it often leads to experiences of suffering.

2) Transnationalizing Social Relationships

In terms of family and other social relationships, the pattern of transmobility is characterized by a “transnationalization of social relationships.” Interestingly, transnational structures are often already established within the individuals’ family networks as their family members (e.g., parents) are sometimes mobile, too. While most of my respondents have relatives in the (classical) country of origin, the ones who practice transnational mobility mobilize their family networks as “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et. al. 2004), relying on their help for putting into practice their mobility projects as they can provide, for example, support with administrative tasks, finding accommodation, and establishing social contacts.

Once the individuals have gained a mobility experience in the (classical) country of origin, they usually have established further (non-familial) social relationships there, which they can later use for further mobility experiences. They generally engage in social relationships in at least two different geographical spaces. Their relationships are characterized by a bi-local embeddedness of social interactions, although permanent face-to-face interactions cannot be taken for granted anymore. When practicing multi-local mobility, the individuals not only fall back on their relatives in Poland, but either on other (mobile) relatives currently residing in different geographical locations, other (non-familial) social relationship or they organize their mobility experiences within institutional frameworks, e.g., school years or semesters abroad, internships, etc.

3) Sensing the “Roots”

Dealing with two sets of cultural repertoires of norms and values becomes an integral part of my respondents’ lives. In contrast with the other mobility patterns, the individuals’ affiliation with the “root culture” is comparatively strong, without approving all cultural norms and values. Rather, a strong belonging can be constructed through a strong family bond or a strong identification with a (high) social status, while the relationship to the culture of the “country of arrival” may be strong, too. Transmobility is thus characterized by the individuals’ feeling of belonging to both societies and cultures, leading to a dual, sometimes ambiguous, self-understanding. It indicates a localization of one’s belonging in the heritage as well as in the residence cultures. Under the condition of high mobility, a sense of belonging may change due to the individuals’ geographical and social context—a *contextual sense of belonging* in other words. It can go hand in hand

with boundary making, e.g., differentiating oneself from the others, and with experiences of “otherness” when being perceived as the “cultural other.”

Transmobility: Strategic Selection of “Mobility Capital” and Attempts of Multiple Integration

The pattern describes the phenomenon in which the (classical) country of origin becomes the individuals’ primary mobility destination. The above-mentioned constellations of the three social dimensions create opportunity structures, evolving into the transmobility pattern when, for instance, individuals use kinship and other social networks, their language skills, and cultural knowledge in order to put their mobility project into practice. Transmobility requires, or leads to, fairly high motility rates from individuals. They particularly mobilize those factors, capabilities, and constellations of social dimensions as “mobility capital” (Kaufmann et. al. 2004), which they can best transform in the society of their “root culture.” Selecting “mobility capital” and accumulating it also means reducing the risk of lowering one’s social status (too much) in the new geographical context because—as opposed to the pattern of immobility—it promotes the transferability of one’s personal and professional projects into other contexts, above all in the country of origin.

Since border-crossing activities of migrants are at the center of the concept of (migrant) transnationalism, we could assume—if we reflect about it once again—that the concept necessarily implies geographical mobility of individuals, but this is not entirely the case as there is no uniform opinion amongst transnational scholars. Levitt, for instance, states that “movement is not a prerequisite for transnational activism.” (2003: 179) Hers is a broad conception of transnationalism: transnational actors do not necessarily need to be migrants, who are neither necessary personally engaged in transnational activities, but who (at least) live within a transnational context (2003: 179, Levitt/Glick Schiller 2004, Levitt 2009). While such a broad idea includes a wide range of individuals and social phenomena, it also leads to analytical blur (Pries 2008: 227). If geographical mobility is not a defining feature of a perspective that is concerned with border-crossing activities of migrants, what then remains? I would say: sedentariness and the notion of “sedentary migrants.”⁵ When, for the sake of the argument, transnationalism is a sedentary notion, I wonder how it differs from other sedentary notions, say, multiculturalism. Many immigrants (and their descendants) follow multicultural practices (as opposed to assimilationist ones) like speaking their heritage languages and living in line with traditional values and

5 For a similar reading, see Dahinden 2010, and my review of her work in ch. 1.2.

norms in many ways. Indeed, they are often managing several cultural repertoires and sometimes they struggle, for instance, with their parents' expectations that they marry someone from their own religious community. If Levitt refers to such examples as transnational activities (2009), they qualify as multicultural ones as well, I argue.

However, others take geographical mobility into consideration when conceptualizing transnational phenomena. Within these literatures, mobility is based on different temporal and spatial frames. The geographical movements of "transnational migrants" can vary in their duration: some works include travel and holidaying as a characteristic of (migrant) transnationalism (Wessendorf 2013), others imply more enduring mobility of migrants relocating their center of life for a certain amount of time (Pries 2001b), and yet others include profession-bound extensive mobility of migrants which leads to multiple short-term stays abroad (Nowicka 2006b). Many of these (labour-inflected) mobility trajectories require and produce specific social conditions, which cannot be grasped by traditional concepts such as of em/immigration. In spatial terms, the approach implies bi-local, and sometimes multi-local, cross-border movements that migrants undertake after initial settlement. Scholars have particularly focused on processes of return, dual residence, and the circulation between two places (Moret 2015). Bi-local mobility is prevalent in transnational studies and the "country of origin" and the "country of arrival" play a significant role, but we need to keep in mind that these terms are themselves caught up in the dichotomous viewpoint of traditional migration theories that the transnational perspective criticizes (Palenga-Möllnbeck 2014).

Within the transmobility pattern, however, mobility between *only* the "country of arrival" and "the country of origin" is a phenomenon that is predominantly practiced in the German context. This, at least in part, is related to the geographical proximity between Germany and Poland. In the Canadian context, however, my respondents more often practice multi-local transmobility—that is, when individuals include further mobility destinations. Canadian-based interviewees usually have a good knowledge of English and/or French, two languages that would enable the interviewees to live and work in many places of the world, while the knowledge of German and Polish is restricted to only a few geographical spaces. That said, the proximity between Canada and the United States may also play a role as many multi-local transmobility experiences of my Canadian-based interviewees are directed toward the United States. Generally, transnational mobility and bi-locality are not always a voluntary action as they sometimes are the consequences of other peoples' choices. This becomes particularly appar-

ent in the early life courses of my respondents, for instance, when parents decide to relocate their children early in their life courses.

The pattern calls our attention to the fact that individuals are sometimes required to integrate into the “country of origin,” which they or their families emigrated from. At the same time, they make sure to become (or remain) integrated in the “country of arrival.” Integration, in this pattern, does not occur in the form of assimilation because efforts to integrate into two or more locations (*multi-local* integration) are only possible when individuals maintain and strategically combine different cultures as “multiculturalism” allows. In other words: assimilation is *theoretically* not possible as it requires “migrants” to give up one culture in favour of another, which conversely means that they cannot integrate into two or more societies with distinct cultures. Assimilation theory thus only allows for a culturally-restrictive form of *mono-local* integration. Reflecting on transmobility and integration triggers an intriguing thought: (migrant) transnationalism does not hinder “integration,” it might even promote it, if we do not take *mono-local* integration for granted. In other words, border-crossing activities of migrants promote *multi-local* integration and facilitate subsequent attempts.

Not only (migrant) transnationalism, but the diaspora approach gains meaning in the pattern of transmobility (and cosmobility). In the literatures, “diaspora” is often used interchangeably with “transnationalism,” even though both concepts reflect different genealogies. Diaspora is the older concept. It has often been used to describe religious or national communities living outside an (imagined) homeland. Transnationalism is rather new and used in both narrower and wider contexts. Diaspora is more politicized than “transnationalism” because the latter had not yet found entry into public debates to the same degree. The term “diaspora” is often used by national groups or governments to pursue agendas of nation-state-building or to control populations abroad, mobilizing group identities and political projects. Emigration countries currently use it to encourage financial investment and political loyalty of their expatriates (Faist 2010a: 10ff, see also Østergaard-Nielsen 2012: 109f, Goldring et al. 2003: 8). Scholars often consider a diaspora as one distinct form of a transnational community while not all transnational communities are automatically diasporas. What distinguishes the diasporic condition from transnational communities or other forms of international migration, is—according to King and Christou (2010)—the historical continuity across at least two generations. The concept refers to a multi-generational pattern: it is a social group formation of *longue durée* (Faist 2010a: 22, Cohen 2008). The time horizon is therefore significant not only when we want to understand whether, when, and how to use diaspora as opposed to transnationalism, but also with regard to mobility as “diaspora” stresses (various

kinds of) movements implied in the diasporic experience of generations, rather than post-migration mobilities. In this sense, the patterns of (im)mobility not only highlight the geographical dispersion of family members across different places of the world, but also the existence of mobility practices in the previous generations of my respondents. Such mobility practices may appear in the form of “circular migration” or “transnational motherhood.” (Hondagneu-Sotela/Avila 1997) The concept of diaspora includes mobility that encompasses generations, whose geographic reach can be more extensive as members of a diaspora are often dispersed to more than one destination: there are members of the same diaspora in different places and they may, certainly, practice mobility, e.g., homecoming visits and return mobility (King/Christou 2010).

In sum, diaspora embraces the time horizon of at least two generations, emphasizing the continuity of mobility in a multi-generational temporal framework, while (migrant) transnationalism rather stresses different geographical movements in the post-migratory lives of individuals. That is why both “new” approaches are based on modest to high geographical mobility of migrants before and after initial settlement in the “country of arrival,” even though the focus of both approaches was not to identify forms of mobility. As Schrooten et al. (2015) remind us, the “new” approaches therefore did not question the narrative of stasis and sedentarism.

Mobility as a Way of Life: Mobile Engagement with the World and Cosmopolitanism

The last type presented in part II of the book is the pattern of cosmobility. The pattern contains geographical movements to the most diverse destinations, showing striking similarities to the concept of *cosmopolitanism*. It is characterized by *recurrent relocations of the individuals’ life center to geographical destinations other than the (classical) country of origin*. The mobility experiences are diverse in terms of geographical direction, duration, and the social dimensions under which they emerge in peoples’ biographies. The open directionality is what distinguishes cosmobility from transmobility: my interviewees’ geographical movements go beyond the geographic space of the (classical) country of origin (figure 1). Both the directionality and the duration of my respondents’ mobility cannot be anticipated beforehand. Individuals tend to organize their cosmobility experiences within institutional frameworks, like school years or semesters abroad, and by changing their work places. It results from an interplay of one’s educational, professional, and personal circumstances as well as the opportunity structures one encounters in specific situations in certain phases of the life

course. The pattern features a “homing-effect” towards the specific location in the “country of arrival,” which constitutes the “home base.” The “homing-effect” describes the continuous return to a specific biographically-relevant geographical location (the “home base”) after mobility experiences in different places. Practicing this kind of mobility represents a way of life for my respondents.

The pattern comes close to the approach of cosmopolitanism, describing, on the one hand, the philosophical idea of a “world citizenship.” On the other hand, it is an analytical perspective used in relation to migrants’ practices and experiences, even though it did not derive from research on migration. The latter describes a specific mode of engaging with the world: aligning oneself with “the other,” and thus displaying an openness toward divergent cultural experiences. We find “actually existing cosmopolitanism” (Robins 1998, Nowicka/Rovisco 2009a) inherent in the pattern of cosmobility and in the social practices of highly mobile respondents. Their mobility practices and orientations include various destinations; individuals act in the sense of being “global citizens” (Beck 2005, Nowicka/Rovisco 2009a) while repeatedly coming back to a “home base.” They combine a distinct “home base” with various geographical reference points, (constantly) engaging in cultural multiplicity. Practicing cosmopolitan mobility during the life courses triggers a transformation process either towards more openness to divergent cultural experiences or an intensification of boundary-making processes, leading to painful experiences or/and to the development of plural identities and loyalties.

The continuous social practice of extensive mobility often functions as a strategy for escape, from unsatisfying biographical circumstances in the “home base” at a given point in time of the respondents’ life trajectory, or a strategy to improve or combine their personal and professional endeavours. It is its own way of life. For the specific logic of this pattern, the following constellations of relevant social dimensions can—sociologically speaking—contribute to its emergence and maintenance in individual life courses: (1) knowledge of several (foreign) languages, (2) social relationships in multiple locations, and (3) contextual affiliations. Changes in these constellations may likely lead to changes in the pattern, too.

1) Languages: The More, the Better

Mastering several (foreign) languages promotes mobility experiences to different destinations because it facilitates—to a great extent—everyday activities in different geographical spaces. Certainly, having a knowledge of languages that are widely spoken (such as English, French, and Spanish) constitutes a higher “mobility capital” than those spoken in comparatively less places of the world (such

as German and Polish). Knowing several languages is a precondition for the pattern of cosmobility, yet the desire to acquire a new foreign language triggers cosmoble experiences, too. Individuals are open to learning new languages, but it mostly depends on the stage of their life cycle: when (still) pursuing one's educational pathway, "going abroad" in order to study and learn another language is likely, while it is rather difficult to reconcile a stay abroad for the sake of learning another language once one is integrated into the labour market or has children. The heritage language, however, is not important: cosmobility can be practiced whether or not one speaks the heritage language; it is neither a help nor a hindrance.

2) Leaving Behind and Coming Back: Relationships of Mobile People

The family structures mirrored in the pattern of cosmobility most often have a unique feature: complex mobility across generations is already a given in the individuals' family history. Those individuals are usually brought up in families in which other family members have practiced, or continue to practice, mobility. Therefore, parts of the core family are not necessarily living in the same geographical space, and mobility thus becomes a precondition for engaging in face-to-face interactions with family members. Sometimes, mobility occurs as a reaction to a family rupture such as the parents' separation or death. Establishing and maintaining other relationships under the condition of mobility requires a lot of effort, too. The individual "on the move" not only needs to establish new social relationships in whatever location s/he relocates to, but s/he also leaves behind other relationships already established in the "home base," and usually wants to maintain these relationships. Besides practicing face-to-face interactions in different locations, virtual interactions through the use of new technologies become crucial to maintaining social relationships as "significant others" are not always in the same geographical location. Cosmobility is therefore characterized by a multi-local embeddedness of social interactions. On the one hand, geographical dispersion of social contacts comes about as a result of the individuals' mobility practices. On the other hand, diasporic or transnational family structures also produce mobilities and they contribute to maintaining them. Individuals likely mobilize their family networks, and once they have gained social networks in other places, they can mobilize them as further "mobility capital" for the mobility experiences to follow. Conversely, the geographical distance created by extensive mobility practices often leads to a loss of social contacts and/or the dissolution of romantic relationships.

3) Contextualities, Regional Affiliations, and the Citizens of the World

The respondents construct a stronger sense of cultural belonging to their “country of arrival” while they develop a weaker sense of belonging to the (classical) country of origin and their “root culture.” This latter is observably not an eligible destination and they place little importance on its specific cultural norms and values. The place in which the individuals (most) reside (i.e., the “country of arrival”) induces the “homing-effect.” In their narrations, they put forward a dual or ambiguous self-understanding, which most often develops into a *contextual self-understanding*. It is characterized by changing one’s cultural belonging according to the geographical context one is currently in. Some, however, prefer to sidestep the ambiguity that comes from several cultural affiliations by either putting forth regional affiliations (e.g., “I’m a Berliner,” or “I’m a Montrealer”) or a *cosmopolitan self-understanding*. The latter describes the process in which individuals localize their “self” independently of any specific geographical location. In so doing, they understand themselves as a “citizen of the world,” emphasizing their “place” to be everywhere, and at the same time, nowhere specific.

Cosmobility: Setting a Mobile Course in the Past and at Present

In sum, extensive mobility experiences to destinations other than that of the (classical) country of origin strongly depend upon the opportunity structures one encounters during certain stages of one’s life trajectory. They are caused by family, partnerships, and professional opportunities or responsibilities, and nurtured by the cross-generational mobility of an individual’s family members. The pattern is shaped by an individual’s high motility: most biographical constellations promote occasions in the form of opportunities for, or the responsibility of, being mobile. It requires my respondents to deliberate whether and when to go abroad as it needs to match current conditions and constraints. Cosmobility consists of both positive as well as negative experiences, which are often related to the difficulties of leaving behind friends, partners, and family as well as difficulties of (re-)localization, either in the destination or the “home base.” Respondents sometimes passively undergo relocations, as a result of the decisions made by others, and at other times, they actively undertake them. Cosmobile experiences can thus be self-initiated and externally initiated as well as admired or experienced as heteronomous.

What constitutes the main difference between the current research on cosmopolitanism in migration studies and the pattern of cosmobility, however, is that the mobility practices of my respondents are *not* embedded in globally-acting organizations such as the UN and NGOs or several economic enterprises.

In her empirical research, Nowicka (2006b) states that the “mobile professionals” in her sample are disembedded from the contexts of nation-states through their embeddedness in an international organization. This is, however, not at all the case for the pattern of cosmobility as it is grounded upon mobility practices that emerge out of my respondents’ everyday experiences rather than their institutional embeddedness. Here, mobility is a way of life that does not simply focus on work and occupation. The context of the nation-state or the multi-national country is thus very present in my respondents’ narratives. Further, the mobility experiences are not only (and sometimes not at all) linked to professional activities. More often, they are linked to educational ones. They emerge out of coinciding and interlocking opportunities or responsibilities that include, but go beyond, professional reasons. My respondents are thus not to be understood as expatriates.

Above all, cosmobility is—by far—the rarest pattern. It does not fit into the categories commonly used in migration studies, least of all in the “classical” approaches that tend to focus on processes of migrants’ incorporation into the “country of arrival,” implying sedentariness as their core structure. Therefore, “classical” approaches are not analytically fruitful for examining experiences such as cosmobility. Only when we shift away from the *conventional thinking about integration* (my footnote on p. 215) we might conceive of the “homing-effect” inherent in the cosmobility pattern as, say, a strategy to remain integrated in the “country of arrival,” or, for that matter, the other country of the “accumulated origins.” Cosmobility also goes beyond the (classical) transnational paradigm for the simple reason that it not only focusses on the “country of origin” as the mobility destination. The few highly contemporary works on migration and mobility, like the ideal types constructed by Moret (2015), do not grasp the logic of the pattern of cosmobility either. If Moret suggests “star-shaped” mobility, pendular movements, and secondary movements, which describe regular but short-term mobilities, the “mobile migrants” do not relocate their center of life and thus they do not shift their everyday activities to another place for a certain period of time. Cosmobility is also different from what Jeffery and Murison have called “onward migration” (2011) because cosmobility implies the “homing-effect” which guarantees the continuous return to the “home base.” Therefore, the individuals do not continuously move on from one destination to another, but they entangle return with departure; immobility with mobility.

However, openness toward divergent cultural experiences—as a feature of the approach of cosmopolitanism—is assumed to be largely acquired through experience, most importantly through travel. Thus, cosmopolitanism when used in empirical works (on migration) much more clearly implies active, ongoing,

often highly mobile trajectories of individuals as opposed to works that use transnationalism or diaspora as their analytical lens. Such intensive mobility practices have been mostly situated within the context of expats or other mobile professionals. In these studies, the distinction between “migrants” and “mobiles” gets blurry. The individuals practice hypermobility after initial settlement into one “country of arrival,” yet most of the time they are “abroad” for either longer or shorter stays. With that in mind, I argue that the core structure of the approach of cosmopolitanism most commonly targets experiences of hypermobility.

Table 4: Characteristics of the Pattern of (Im)Mobility

Main Characteristics	IMMOBILITY	TRANSMOBILITY	COSMOBILITY
	<i>"Mobility as the Past"</i>	<i>"Mobility as Bi-Locality"</i>	<i>"Mobility as a Way of Life"</i>
Spatial and Temporal Dimensions			
geographical movements	sedentariness in the country of arrival	recurrent relocations of the individuals' life center between the country of arrival and the country of origin (and other countries, too)	recurrent relocations of the individuals' life center to destinations other than the country of origin
geographical orientations	aversion toward mobility	bi-locality to multi-locality	open mobility
direction & duration	—	temporally-restricted duration mainly to country of origin	temporally-restricted duration to diverse destinations
life-center	country of arrival	more than one geographical reference point	"home base" and various geographical reference points: ("homing-effect")
Motility	low	high, especially towards the country of origin	very high
Social Dimensions			
language(s)	perfection of the official language(s) of the country of arrival, no sufficient knowledge of heritage language and foreign languages	mastery of the official language(s) of the country of arrival and the heritage language	proper knowledge of several foreign languages, including official language(s) of the country of arrival, knowledge of heritage language not required
family structures/social networks	predominantly local embeddedness of social networks, less contacts with co-ethnics	transnationalization of social relationships, bi-local embeddedness of social networks	multi-local embeddedness of social networks
belonging & self-understandings	distancing from "root culture," affiliating with country of arrival	ambiguous & contextual self-understanding, strong belongings to heritage culture and country of arrival	strong belonging to country of arrival, weak belonging to "root culture," contextual, regional, & cosmopolitan self-understanding

Source: Own elaboration


6.2 THE SPATIAL, TEMPORAL, AND SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF (IM)MOBILITY

The patterns of (im)mobility emphasize the duration and diversity of physical-geographical movements, their social implications, and how they become meaningful experiences within individual lives in a globalized world that seems to be increasingly “on the move.” From a sociological perspective, these experiences—as we have seen—are not completely random but they follow their own logic and they both mirror and go beyond the established theories in migration studies. Analytically, the patterns are characterized by the spatial, temporal, and social dimensions. They are not only constitutive in the human experience of being in the world, but they also reflect and capture dynamics of mobility and, more importantly, they shed light on their construction and meanings in individual life courses. They are inherent in both (im)mobility dynamics and in peoples’ lives, and by extension their biographies (ch. 2). That is also why they have been inherent all along in the preceding discussions and interpretative chapters of this book. The aim of this section, to that end, is to finally bring them to the fore and to emphasize their constituent role in the patterns of (im)mobility. With the help of figures and tables, I guide the reader through the empirical resume of the study.

Modalities of the Three Dimensions

The first result to be presented deals with the *spatial and temporal dimensions* of the patterns of (im)mobility (figure 1). While the temporal dimension emphasizes the time limitation and the frequency of (im)mobility experiences, the spatial dimension specifies the form of the physical-geographical movement, which implies the relocation of an individual’s life center. To that end, the patterns describe the existence or absence of *temporally-restricted frequent relocations of an individual’s life center*, occurring after initial migration from the “country of origin” (A) to the “country of arrival” (B). The temporal dimension thus suggests that mobility occurs frequently; it is restricted in time rather than resulting in a final or long-term settlement (“im/migration”). The spatial dimension, additionally, urges us to think of mobility when individuals practice their daily activities for a certain amount of time in a different geographical place, effectively excluding other mobilities such as commuting, short-term visits or holidays, though domestic commutes are sometimes a “side effect” in my respondents’ life stories.

Figure 1: Result 1: Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility



Source: Own elaboration

In spatial terms, figure 1 shows the diversity of geographical movements inherent in the patterns of (im)mobility. The spatial dimension is tripartite: geographical mobility flows after initial migration may be absent in a person’s life course altogether (immobility) or mobility flows occur between B and A, and potentially between another destination C (transmobility), or more complex flows evolve between B, C, D, E, and F (cosmobility). The latter is subject to the “homing-effect,” describing recurring return movements to the “home base” in the “country of arrival” (B) from mobility experiences in other places. At the same time, cosmobility stresses that even if mobility flows between the “country of origin” and the “country of arrival” are absent, it does not mean that post-migration mobilities are absent altogether.

I also paid special attention to the *social dimension* in the study to uncover the broad range of biographical constellations that constitute heterogeneous social realities and produce these different experiences of (im)mobility within mi-

gratory and transnational contexts. Through the social dimension, I can grasp why a specific pattern emerges in someone’s life, and not in another one, and under which circumstances it may change. As indicated in former sections, their main biographical constellations come to the fore, promoting or hindering the development of (im)mobility experiences to a great extent: (1) the acquirement, use, and lack of *language(s)*, (2) *social networks* and *family structures*, (3) *belonging / boundary-making* and *self-understanding* (figure 2):

Figure 2: Result 2: Social Dimensions of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility




Figure 2 illustrates both the patterns and their social dimensions. In reality, the patterns of (im)mobility overlap in the life courses of my respondents because we can only analytically distinguish them. Additionally, the social dimensions (language(s), networks, belonging/self-understanding) are not fixed for they can change over time in the course of one’s life—and when they do, the mobility experience of an individual likely shifts from one pattern to another, too. The social dimension generally contributes to the discussion in mobility studies on the notion of “motility,” targeting factors that define the potential to be mobile. In fact, the *biographical constellation of language(s)* in an individual’s life is a crucial condition, determining whether, and if so when, someone might become mobile, and where to s/he directs his/her mobility. The *constellations of family structures* and *social networks* also play an important role, determining which pattern of (im)mobility gets through (phases of) one’s trajectory. The notions of “mobility


capital” (Kaufmann et. al. 2004) and “network capital” (Urry 2007) acknowledge the importance of social networks for mobility; yet, they say little about constellations of social networks hindering the emergence of mobility, and thus promoting immobility. Last but not least, the *constellations of belonging or boundary-making* are influenced by the social surroundings, contextual conditions, as well as personal experiences. Individuals cannot actively influence them as easily as they can, for instance, acquire another language or maintain ties to family members abroad because they are not determined by capabilities or effort. In sum, the social dimension sheds light on the following question: why does a specific pattern of (im)mobility prevail in (certain phases of) a trajectory or why does it shift in favour of another one?

The answer I can give, according to the results of my study, is that it depends on the specific biographical constellations of the aforementioned three social dimensions. In table 4 we can, for instance, see which specific constellations favour which patterns. The table is the output of my discussion on the systematic evaluation of the patterns (ch. 6.1). It presents their characteristics: on the one hand, it highlights features of the geographical movements, orientations, directions, and durations of the (im)mobility experiences, and on the other hand, it emphasizes the pattern-specific biographical constellations of language(s), family structures and social networks, as well as belonging and self-understanding (table 4).

The Analytical Circle of Sociological Dimensions

The sociological dimensions of (im)mobility embrace the temporal, spatial, and social level. From an analytical perspective, they allow us to understand and explain the patterns of (im)mobility. So far, we have come to see that the temporal dimension stresses the duration and frequency of mobility experiences, the spatial dimension focusses on their directionality, and the social dimension emphasizes crucial biographical constellations. Their modalities are typologically differentiated in the three patterns. Figure 3 shows how we are yet able to analytically close the circle of the patterns of (im)mobility according to the sociological dimensions.

Figure 3: Result 3: The Analytical Circle of the Patterns of (Im)Mobility



Source: Own elaboration

The illustration of the circle highlights, once again, that the social phenomenon of mobility is processual. The arrows, respectively, draw our attention to the fact that the patterns of (im)mobility can change in the course of one's life—so as we have seen in the narrations of Janusz, whose mobility experiences changed from immobility to cosmobility, and Malinka, whose experiences changed from transmobility to cosmobility. Crucial for determining the patterns are the socio-logical dimensions, which—as we can see in figure 3—are inherent in each of the patterns.

These dimensions are, however, not the only important categories to keep in mind: we can also sharpen the types according to their contents. I have proposed an understanding of the pattern of immobility as “mobility as the past” because when a mobility experience occurs in a person's life, it is a matter of “immigration” only. Sometimes it is the previous generation and not the individual in question who experienced the move. Mobility is neither part of their present, nor of their future; it is only part of the past. Transmobility, however, can be understood as “mobility as bi-locality,” not least because the individuals' mobility flows occur mainly between two very specific locations, the “country of arrival” and the “country of origin.” Lastly, I understand cosmobility as “mobility as a form of life.” Mobility here is employed a strategy for dealing with the challenges of human life. If we develop the thought further and if we understand immo-

bility as “mobility of the past,” transmobility as “mobility as bi-locality, and cosmobility as “mobility as a form of life,” then the constitutive core of the immobility structure would be temporal, it would be spatial for transmobility, and social for the structure of cosmobility. To be clear, it is not just one of the three dimensions that differentiates one pattern from another, rather it is one dimension that can typologically sharpen the type. For this reason, I included all three sociological dimensions in each of the patterns in Figure 3, showing that immobility corresponds to the temporal, transmobility to the spatial, and cosmobility to the social dimension while being composed of all the other dimensions, too. In other words: the analytical circle of the patterns of (im)mobility closes as the three dimensions correspond to the tripartite of the patterns themselves. Figure 3 thus demonstrates the equivalent relations between the dimensions and the patterns, and simultaneously, it shows the coherence of the analytical distinction. Such results help us to understand and explain (in the Weberian sense) the patterns of (im)mobility, which, in turn, illustrate how (im)mobility is constructed in post-migrant, transnational lives.

6.3 THE CONTINUITY OF (IM)MOBILITY

Having presented the empirical resume, I now discuss the main insights generated by the patterns of (im)mobility in view of their theoretical contribution. I have proposed a new reading of the established approaches in migration studies and I have presented how we can use the patterns of (im)mobility as tools to revisit migration and to take our reflections beyond these very approaches (ch. 6.1). The aim of this section is to draw a theoretical resume from the patterns of (im)mobility, more concretely to present what I understand as the main theoretical contribution of the study and to discuss what the “mobilities perspective” can bring us when doing research on migration.

Reassessing Migration Theories

The migration literatures I have dealt with in this study include “classical” approaches, like assimilation, integration, multiculturalism, and “new” ones, like (migrant) transnationalism, diaspora, and cosmopolitanism. As tools, the patterns of (im)mobility help us to revisit these approaches from a “mobilities perspective”, leading me to point out, for instance, that while the “classical” approaches are based on sedentariness, the “new” ones are based on various mobilities (ch. 6.1). From the latter, we can infer that migrants produce patterns of geographical

movements other than what is known as “immigration,” or to put it differently, *the first relocation of their center of life*, because these approaches go beyond a uni-directional understanding of migratory movement. The “new” approaches have less of an “immobility bias”: the inherent assumption in migration theories that migrants do not practice geographical movements other than only *one* border-crossing relocation of their center of life, or a “sedentary bias”: the unquestioned assumption that migration is a bad thing (Castles 2010: 1568). To that end, the “new” approaches can be seen to convey migrant trajectories of modest, high, and hyper mobility “after migration,” while the “classical” ones convey sedentariness.

In sum, I argue that the “new” and “classical” approaches in migration studies imply certain notions of (im)mobility, which are revealed through the patterns and which can be summarized in the following way:

(1) “CLASSICAL” APPROACHES IN MIGRATION RESEARCH:

- a. assimilation;
- b. integration, and
- c. multiculturalism

None of these approaches is conceptualized upon any kind of post-migration mobility. Their core structure implies migrants’ *sedentariness*.⁶

(2) “NEW” APPROACHES IN MIGRATION RESEARCH:

- a. (migrant) transnationalism: implies various forms of post-migration mobility: mostly bi-local (and multi-local) transnational flows of movements.
- b. diaspora: continuity of mobility in a multi-generational temporal framework.

The “new” approaches of (migrant) transnationalism and diaspora are therefore based on migrants’ *modest to high mobility*.

- (3) c. cosmopolitanism: implies ongoing post-migration mobilities that can lead to extensive mobility.


Its core structure most commonly targets experiences of *hypermobility*.

6 This may be the result of the interrelatedness of these theories with concepts of the “nation-state” or the “national society.”

As indicated before, these notions of (im)mobility emerge out of the relationship between the patterns and the theoretical approaches in migration studies. When we look at these established literatures from the “mobilities perspective,” not only can we identify the notions of (im)mobility, but we also see that the approaches do not speak to one another, even though they are coherent within their own frames. Each of these approaches deals with relevant aspects of migration phenomena and we can find plausible explanations for all these aspects in the different patterns of (im)mobility.

When we consider, however, what mobility studies teach us, we notice that migration literatures follow a different logic. Mobility studies promote a relational and constructivist understanding of mobilities, and, additionally, I have argued that mobilities are processual: they are always in the making, re-making and unmaking (ch. 1.3). The condition of (im)mobility continuously changes and that is why I think of it as a continuum (figure 4).

Figure 4: Reassessing Migration Theories According to the Continuum of (Im)Mobility



Source: Own elaboration

Figure 4 illustrates how the literatures in migration studies are positioned towards mobilities. At the bottom of the figure, we can see the continuum of (im)mobility, ranging from “no mobility” to “hypermobility,” which I depict as gradual and qualitative. Looking at the theories from a “mobilities perspective” and adding their implicit notions of sedentariness (as in assimilation, integration, multiculturalism) or modest to high mobility (as in transnationalism and diaspora) or hypermobility (as in cosmopolitanism), we are yet to see, at the bottom of the figure, that they interrupt the continuum’s logic. We are able to identify gaps between the theories and it becomes clear that they have a shortened perspective: through their inherent notions of (im)mobility, they are to be situated at specific

places that do not acknowledge the processual character of the phenomenon; that is, the fact that mobilities of individuals change, as do their accompanying assimilationist, multicultural, or transnational and cosmopolitan social practices. In sum, *approaches in migration studies, with their inherent notions of (im)-mobility, interrupt the processual logic of the continuum of (im)mobility*. This theoretical insight provides us with a better understanding of the theoretical core of migration studies and the opportunity to reassess the literatures in migration studies by putting mobilities at its center.

The Contribution of the Study to Current Scholarly Debates

The patterns of (im)mobility are the core of this book and the main contribution of my study. They grew out of combining two separate but similar research traditions with one another and with a specific methodological approach to investigate phenomena of migration. The result is the “mobilities perspective.” We may ask ourselves, why is the “mobilities perspective” on migration necessary? I see the contribution to current scholarly debates as twofold. First, it broadens the analytical perspectives offered by migration and mobility studies by exploring migration through a “mobilities perspective,” thus bridging these established research agendas with one another. Shifting toward such a perspective is not to be understood as a shift away from migration research towards mobilities research, but it is rather an attempt to bring both scholarly traditions together because mobility and immobility are entangled in migration, and vice versa. Second, the “mobilities perspective” benefits from the epistemological and methodological fruitfulness of biographical research. Taking into account the life course of the individuals when examining (im)mobility experiences within migratory contexts enables us to capture “guises of migration”—even such patterns that do not fit into the categories commonly used in migration studies and which would have gone unnoticed without taking into consideration the individuals’ life-path. The “mobilities perspective” is thus an epistemological tool that widens our outlook, revealing social dynamics and phenomena that would simply fall out of the analytical framework were we to adhere only to migration categories.

The patterns of (im)mobility are the best example. Only by applying the “mobilities perspective” to migration, they became sociologically visible and accessible. As ideal types, the patterns are results and tools. *As results*, they respond to the question I raised at the outset of the book: *How (geographically) mobile or immobile are “migrants” after initial migration and what social implications does this (im)mobility raise?* Based on biographical narratives, the *patterns of (im)mobility* suggest three sets of experiences of (im)mobility after

initial migration (*immobility, transmobility, and cosmobility*), each showing different spatial, temporal, and social configurations. Biographical constellations such as *language(s), belonging/boundary-making, as well as family structures and personal networks* influence the *development, maintenance or shifting of each pattern in the life courses of individuals*.

As for results, the patterns are certainly only valid for the sample of this study; i.e., young adults of Polish heritage (currently) living in Germany and Canada. *As a tool*, the patterns of (im)mobility emphasize the relevance of the migration literatures reviewed in the experiences of my respondents because they can empirically confirm them, yet they criticize their incompatibility with the continuum of (im)mobility. Proposing a new reading of the established theories, the patterns construct an integrative perspective which is, I argue, indispensable for a fruitful study of migration phenomena that are sedentary, and at the same time, more mobile than ever. As demonstrated in the sections above, they are able to generate a comprehensive and differentiated understanding of the empiricism and theory of migration.

The patterns are a first step to reducing the methodological, conceptual, and empirical dualism between migration and mobility: they are advantageous because they emphasize shifts in patterns in the life courses of my respondents and changes in the individuals' social practices within the patterns themselves, i.e., they are constructed upon the logic of the life course, which mirrors the processual nature of human life itself. They further develop the state of the art and they make a step toward reducing the gap between both migration and mobility literatures: *Many studies in the field of migration operationalize one of the "classical" or "new" approaches as the only valid perspective or the only empirical truth, although one perspective—no matter which one—does not meet the complexity of empirical reality: the patterns of (im)mobility clearly illustrate that an "either-or" choice is too reductionist, instead they promote an "as-well-as" approach and thus they conciliate not only between the different (competing) approaches in migration literatures, but also between migration and mobility studies.*

Conclusion: How to *Rethink* Migration and Mobility

The study is an example of how two (formerly) separate scholarly traditions—migration studies and mobility studies—may complement each other when they are combined in empirical research. Every study that generates new sociological insights, all the more in the field of migration studies, has political implications and thus it potentially has a political impact, too. As scholars, we have to be cautious on that score, I believe, as to enter the field of migration studies is essentially to enter into a politicized terrain. We face an ongoing dilemma, one that blurs the boundaries between policy-relevant and policy-driven research. Each study is prone to political instrumentalization and our results can be used in ways that we might not agree with. Attempting to mitigate the risk, I have formulated a plea as to how we need to rethink migration and mobility based on my reflections about what taken-for-granted assumptions of migration research my study challenges. My propositions evoke political implications, which I will ultimately enunciate as I understand them.

Challenging Taken-For-Granted Assumptions

How can we make sense of movements? The study gives us the following answer: we can make sense of movements as *patterns of (im)mobility*, and they certainly affect how we understand migration. More precisely, the patterns—notably the mobile ones (*transmobility* and *cosmobility*)—question several assumptions that are widely taken for granted in migration studies. Concretely, I plead to

- 1) Rethink the inherent sedentarism of the category of “migrant generation” and acknowledge its failure to fully take into account those migratory experiences that include various mobilities

The patterns challenge the widely-used (scholarly) practice of categorizing “migrants” into generations, which is strongly linked to a sedentary understanding of migration. Yet neither do the individuals nor their extended families always settle permanently in one “country of arrival” after initial migration. Instead, complex mobility flows occur in the trajectories of both my respondents and their parental (or otherwise previous) generations. Such cross-generational mobility experiences complicate the categorization into “migrant generations,” because they clearly go beyond a one-time event of a uni-directional change of one’s center of life. They signal that emigration from one country does not necessarily mean permanent immigration to another, but that there may be complex mobilities “in between” generations.

To illustrate, I take the family relations of my respondent, Francis, as an example. After his grandparents fled Poland during World War II, Francis’s mother was born in Kenya, which means she would be categorized as a 2nd generation migrant (in Kenya). She grew up there but moved to Canada once she met her future husband, Francis’s father. Already at this point, the categorization to a “migrant generation” becomes blurry: while a “2nd generation migrant” in Kenya, how would she be categorized after having moved to Canada? Does she become a “1st generation migrant” upon her arrival in Canada, or does she remain a “2nd generation migrant”? Let us go a step further in Francis’s story. His parents are in Canada. They start a family and have him. How is Francis to be categorized into a “migrant generation”? Would he be a 2nd or 3rd generation migrant? At some point in Francis’s life, he moved back to Kenya, and a similar question arises. Does he become a “1st generation migrant” as he is new to Kenya? All this to say, the category loses its analytical use once complex mobilities occur.

- 2) Rethink the essentializing binary of “country of origin” and “country of arrival” in favour of the relational concept of *travelling origins*

The patterns of (im)mobility deconstruct this division because they have empirically exposed that “migrants” often cumulate two origins, constructing two countries as their “original” ones. The patterns thus point to the *accumulation of origins*. Once individuals, who accumulate more than one origin, practice recurrent mobilities, the paradoxical situation emerges in which their “origins” travel just as they themselves do. The individuals choose which context of their *contextual self-understanding* they put forth based on their geographical location. I have conceptualized this phenomenon as *travelling origins*, emphasizing that “origin” is constructed and expressed *contextually* and *situationally*.

- 3) Rethink the methodological, conceptual, and empirical dualism of “migration” and “mobility” in favour of a more empirically-close symbiosis

Last but not least, the patterns of (im)mobility show a combination of domestic (national/internal) and international relocations of individuals’ center of life in the course of their lives. Different geographical movements have, without a doubt, varying impacts upon people’s lives, but it is often unproductive to split mobility up into internal versus international movements as is currently done in migration studies. Many of my respondents do perceive internal relocations, such as moving out of Quebec, as similar to international (border-crossing) movements. The routes of “migrants” often imply both: internal migration as well as commuting might occur before, during, and after international mobility takes place (Schrooten et al. 2015: 13). The trajectories under study reflect a variety of movements, and this diversity is notable between different respondents as well as within the routes of each respondent—so, between the patterns and within the patterns. Factors defining the mobility experience can emerge *ad hoc*, yet the original intention can always be changed on the way. This is crucial when we think about the connotations of the dualism between migration and mobility: while “migrants” are often perceived as unskilled, as a threat to the welfare state, as people who need to integrate; “mobiles” are often highly skilled or students, and they do not face the same pressure. Not least because “mobility” is assumed to be temporary, while “migration” is assumed to be permanent. My research shows, however, that we cannot always make a clear distinction between “migrants” and “mobiles,” because sometimes they are “mobile migrants.”

Political Implications: How to Accommodate Mobile Migrants?

Putting various mobilities to the fore in research on migration, I hope to contribute to the deconstruction of the social stereotyping and negative hierarchizing of those called “migrants.” Not least, challenging some of the migration-related categories is to ultimately take a step forward toward “de-migranticizing” research on migration and integration (Dahinden 2016). The most crucial step in this direction, however, is to tackle the issue politically. Essentially, the study’s political implications target the idea of how to accommodate “migrants” under the condition of mobility. This idea—as I see it—carries a different political meaning than the “classical” approaches, but more importantly the integration policies resulting from them would need careful reconsideration as the question arises: how can national societies integrate “migrants,” knowing that they do not necessarily stay? Some would agree that sedentary models (such as the “classi-

cal” approaches) are not sufficient to help us find a way; others may even wonder whether these “migrants” need to be integrated at all (Schrooten et al. 2015: 14). There are many open questions, but one thing is for sure: the patterns of (im)mobility have an effect on patterns of incorporation as the latter become diversified when individuals continuously practice post-migration mobilities. First empirical clues about how the patterns of incorporation may change are my respondents’ attempts to integrate into more than one geographical, political, and social space. “Mobile migrants” often pursue a project of “multiple” or “multi-local integration”—a result contradictory to Essers’ statement of “multiple integration” hardly being a realistic empirical case. On the contrary, the study shows that my respondents are not unsuccessful in their efforts, even if they are confronted with divergent expectations of integration coming from different (nation-)states. The pattern of transmobility especially stresses that the other country of “accumulated origins” requests integration requirements not only towards non-nationals but also towards “estranged nationals”—emigrants, who have not been fully or even not at all socialized in the (classical) country of origin as they have lived in the “country of arrival” for a certain amount of time. Some of us may think that “integrating into the country of origin” is a contradiction in terms, yet under the condition of mobility in migratory contexts, we must reckon with requirements of integration directed at such mobile individuals from different places. How can multi-local integration be conceptualized, organized, and politically supported then? These questions need to be put on the political agenda because they require political action: it is time to develop new ideas, new concepts, and new plans about how to facilitate “multi-local” integration without turning “mobile migrants” into—to use Caroline’s words—*second-time immigrants*, over and over again.

References

- Adey, Peter (2006): If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities, in: *Mobilities* 1:1, 75-94. Doi: 10.1080/17450100500489080
- Alba, Richard/Nee, Victor (1997): Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration, in: *International Migration Review* 31:4, 826-874. Doi: 10.2307/2547416
- Alscher, Stefan (2008): Focus Migration: Poland (Country Profile no.3), in: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung (bpb) (ed.): *Netzwerk Migration in Europa*, Weltwirtschaftsinstitut: Hamburg.
- Amelina, Anna (2008): Transnationalisierung zwischen Akkulturation und Assimilation. Ein Modell multipler Inklusion, in: *COMCAD Arbeitspapiere – Working Papers*, no.41, Bielefeld.
- with Faist, Thomas (2008): Turkish Migrant Associations in Germany: Between Integration Pressure and Transnational Linkages, in: *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 24:2, 91-120. Doi: 10.4000/remi.4542
- with Faist, Thomas (2012): De-naturalizing the national in research methodologies: key concepts of transnational studies in migration, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35:10, 1707-1724. Doi: 10.1080/01419870.2012.659273
- Anheier, Helmut K./Hurrelmann, Klaus (2014): *Die Hauptstädter: Berlin - 25 Jahre nach dem Mauerfall. Die Hertie Berlin-Studie 2014*, (= Hertie Berlin Studie), Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe.
- Apitzsch, Ursula/Siouti, Irini (2007): *Biographical Analysis as an Interdisciplinary Research Perspective in the Field of Migration Studies*, online publication. Online available at: http://www.york.ac.uk/res/researchintegration/Integrative_Research_Methods/Apitzsch%20Biographical%20Analysis%20April%202007.pdf

- Atkinson, Rowland/Flint, John (2001): Accessing Hidden and Hard-to-Reach Populations: Snowball Research Strategies, in: *Social research update* 33:1, 1-4.
- Avery, D.H./Fedorowicz, J.K. (1982): The Poles in Canada, in: *Canada's Ethnic Groups/ Canadian Historical Association*, booklet no. 4, Ottawa.
- Banton, Michael (2001): National integration in France and Britain, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27:1, 151-168. Doi: 10.1080/13691830124752
- Bar-On, Dan (2004): *Erzähl dein Leben!: Meine Wege zur Dialogarbeit und politischen Verständigung*, Hamburg: edition Körber-Stiftung.
- Barry, Brian (2002): Second-Thoughts and some First Thoughts Revived, in: P. Kelly (ed.): *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 204-238.
- Basch, Linda/Glick Schiller, Nina/Szanton Blanc, Cristina (1994): *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States*, London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203347003
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2000): *Liquid Modernity*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich (2000): The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity, in: *British Journal of Sociology* 51:1, 79-105. Doi:10.1080/000713100358444
- (2004): Cosmopolitical Realism: On the Distinction between Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Social Sciences, in: *Global Networks* 4:2, 131-156. Doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0374.2004.00084.x
- (2005): The Cosmopolitan State: Redefining Power in the Global Age, in: *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 18:3-4, 143-159. Doi: 10.1007/s10767-006-9001-1
- with Sznajder, Natan (2006): Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: a research agenda, in: *The British Journal of Sociology* 57:1, 1-23. Doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00091.x
- (2008): Mobility and the Cosmopolitan Perspective, in: W. Canzler/ V. Kaufmann/ S. Kesselring (eds.): *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective*, Farnham: Ashgate, 25-35. Doi: 10.4324/9781315550459
- Beige, Sigrun/Axhausen, Kay W. (2006): Long-term mobility decisions during the life-course: Experiences with a retrospective survey, (= conference paper session 2.3), paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Travel Behaviour Research, Kyoto. Online available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0386111214602065>

- Berger, Peter/Luckmann, Thomas ([1966] 1992): *Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Berry, John W. (1997): Immigration, Acculturation, and Adaptation, in: *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46:1, 5-68. Doi: 10.1080/026999497378467
- (2005): Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures, in: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29:6, 697-712. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.013
- (2009): A critique of critical acculturation, in: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 33:5, 361-371. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.06.003
- with Phinney, Jean S./Sam, David L./Vedder, Paul (2010): Immigrant youth. Acculturation, identity and adaptation, in: C. Allemann-Ghionda/P. Stanat/K. Göbel/C. Röhner (eds.): *Migration, Identität, Sprache und Bildungserfolg*, Weinheim: Beltz Juventa, 123-146.
- (2011): Integration and Multiculturalism: Ways towards Social Solidarity, in: *Papers on Social Representations* 20:2, 1-20.
- Bigo, Didier (2002): Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease, in: *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27:1, 63-92. Doi: 10.1177/03043754020270s105
- Blackburn, Christopher (2004): Marriage, Inheritance, and Family Discord: French Elite and the Transformation of the Polish Szlachta, in: *World History Review* 1:3, 2-19.
- Bommes, Michael (2003): Migration in der modernen Gesellschaft, in: *geographische revue* 5:2, 41-58.
- (2012a): Migration in modern society, in: C. Boswell/G. D'Amato (eds.): *Immigration and Social Systems: Collected Essays of Michael Bommes*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 19-36. Doi: 10.26530/OAPEN_426532
- (2012b): National welfare state, biography and migration: labour migrants, ethnic Germans and the re-ascription of welfare state membership, in: C. Boswell/ G. D'Amato (eds.): *Immigration and Social Systems: Collected Essays of Michael Bommes*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 37-58. Doi: 10.26530/OAPEN_426532
- (2012c): Transnationalism or Assimilation?, in: C. Boswell/G. D'Amato (eds.): *Immigration and Social Systems: Collected Essays of Michael Bommes*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 107-124. Doi: 10.26530/OAPEN_426532

- Boswell, Christina/ D'Amato, Gianni (2012): Introduction, in: C. Boswell/G. D'Amato (eds.): *Immigration and Social Systems: Collected Essays of Michael Bommers*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 11-18. Doi: 10.26530/OAPEN_426532
- Bouchard, Gérard (2010): What is Interculturalism?, in: *McGill Law Journal* 56:2, 435-468. Doi: 10.7202/1002371ar
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1983): Ökonomisches Kapital, Kulturelles Kapital, Soziales Kapital, in: R. Kreckel (ed): *Soziale Ungleichheiten* (= Soziale Welt, Sonderband 2), 183-198.
- (1987): *Die feinen Unterschiede: Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilstkraft*, Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Brinks, Jan Herman (1999): Zwischen Antislawismus und Polonisierung. Der lange Weg der deutschen Minderheit in Polen, in: *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* 44:8, 975-83.
- Brubaker, Rogers (2003): The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States, in: C. Joppke/ E. Morawska (eds.): *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, Hampshire: McMillan, 39-58. Doi: 10.1057/9780230554795_2
- (2004): *Ethnicity Without Groups*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511489235
- (2005): The 'diaspora' diaspora, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28:1, 1-19. Doi: 10.1080/0141987042000289997
- Büscher, Monika/Urry, John (2009): Mobile Methods and the Empirical, in: *European Journal of Social Theory* 12:1, 99-116. Doi: 10.1177/1368431008099642
- Canzler, Weert/Kaufmann, Vincent/Kesselring, Sven (2008): Tracing Mobilities: An Introduction, in: W. Canzler/ V. Kaufmann/ S. Kesselring (eds.): *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective*, Farnham: Ashgate, 1-12. Doi: 10.4324/9781315550459
- Castles, Manuel (1996): *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell. Doi: 10.1002/9781444319514.oth1
- Castles, Stephen (2004): Why Migration Policies Fail, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27:2, 205-227. Doi: 10.1080/0141987042000177306
- (2008): Migration and Social Transformation, in: *Migration Studies: Unit Working Papers* 1, (= London School of Economics and Political Science). Online available at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/government/research/resgroups/MSU/documents/workingPapers/castles.pdf>

- (2010): Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36:10, (=Special Issue: Theories of Migration), 1565-1586. Doi: 10.4337/9781788112376.00007
- (2012): Understanding the relationship between methodology and methods., in: C. Vagas-Silva (ed.): *Handbook of Research Methods in Migration*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. Doi: 10.4324/9780203138762
- Cohen, Robin (2008): *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, London: Routledge.
- Corbin, Juliet M./Strauss, Anselm (1990): Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons, and Evaluative Criteria, in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 19:6, 418-427. Doi: 10.1515/zfsoz-1990-0602
- Coulter, Rory/Van Ham, Maarten/Findlay, Allan M. (2016): Re-thinking residential mobility: Linking lives through time and space, in: *Progress in Human Geography* 40:3, 352-374. Doi: 10.1177/0309132515575417
- Cresswell, James (2009): Towards a post-critical praxis: Intentional states and recommendations for change in acculturation psychology, in: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 33:2, 162-172. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.005
- Cresswell, Tim (2006): *On the Move. Mobility in the Modern Western World*, London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203446713
- Crowder, George (2013): *Theories of Multiculturalism: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Curle, Edda (2005): Migration nach Polen, in: *Migration in Europa. Vorträge der 6. Tagung des Arbeitskreises Migration – Integration – Minderheiten der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Demographie (DGD) in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Europäischen Forum für Migrationsstudien (efms)*, 65-78.
- Cyrus, Norbert (1994): Polnische Arbeitsmigranten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Skizze eines Systems ausdifferenzierter Pendelmigration, in: Z. Kurcz/W. Misiak (eds.): *Mniejszość niemiecka w Polsce i Polacy w Niemczech*, Wrocław, 181-196.
- (2000): Mobile Migrationsmuster: Zuwanderung aus Polen in die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in: *Berliner Debatte INITIAL* 11:5/6, 95-103.
- Dahinden, Janine (2009): Die Transnationale Perspektive, in: *Terra Cognita, Revue Suisse de l'integration et de la migration (Schweizer Zeitschrift zu Integration und Migration)* 15:2, 16-19.
- (2010): Cabaret dancers: "Settle down in order to Stay Mobile?" Bridging Theoretical Orientations within Transnational Migration Studies, in: *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, no.3, 323-348. Doi: 10.1093/sp/jxq009

- (2016): A plea for the “de-migranticization” of research on migration and integration, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, online publication, 1-19. Doi: 10.1080/01419870.2015.1124129
- D’Andrea, Anthony/Ciolfi, Luigina/Gray, Breda (2011): Methodological Challenges and Innovations in Mobilities Research, in: *Mobilities* 6:2, 149-160. Doi: 10.1080/17450101.2011.552769
- De Haas, Hein (2008): Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective, in: *Working Papers* no.9, International Migration Institute: Online available at: <http://tinyurl.com/ncscro>
- Durkheim, Emile ([1895] 1984): *Die Regeln der soziologischen Methode*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Elliott, Anthony/Urry, John (2010): *Mobile Lives*, London: Routledge.
- Erick, Jennifer/Schwartzman, Luisa Farrah (2015): From statistical category to social category: organized politics and official categorizations of ‘persons with a migration background’ in Germany, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38:9, 1539–1556. Doi: 10.1080/01419870.2014.996240
- Endreß, Martin (2005): Introduction: Alfred Schutz and Contemporary Social Theory and Social Research, in: G. Psathas/H. Nasu/M. Endreß (eds.): *Explorations of the Life-World*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 1-15. Doi: 10.1007/1-4020-3220-x_1
- (2012): *Soziologische Theorien kompakt*, München: Oldenbourg. Doi: 10.1524/9783486735086
- Esser, Hartmut (1980): *Aspekte der Wanderungssoziologie: Assimilation und Integration von Wanderern, ethnischen Gruppen und Minderheiten. Eine handlungstheoretische Analyse*, Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
- (2001a): Inklusion, Integration und ethnische Schichtung, in: *Journal für Konflikt-und Gewaltforschung* 1:1, 5-34.
- (2001b): *Integration und ethnische Schichtung*, in: Arbeitspapiere: Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung MZES, no.40, Mannheim.
- (2003): Ist das Konzept der Assimilation überholt?, in: *geographische revue* 5:2, 5-22.
- (2009): Pluralisierung oder Assimilation? Effekte der multiplen Inklusion auf die Integration von Migranten, in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 38:5, 358-378. Doi: 10.1515/zfsoz-2009-0502
- (2010): Integration, ethnische Vielfalt und moderne Gesellschaft, in: J. Wienand/C. Wienand (eds.): *Die kulturelle Integration Europas*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-92512-7_6

- Faist, Thomas (2000a): Grenzen überschreiten. Das Konzept Transstaatliche Räume und seine Anwendungen, in: T. Faist (ed.): *Transstaatliche Räume: Politik, Wirtschaft und Kultur in und zwischen Deutschland und der Türkei*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/9783839400548-001
- (2000b): *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198293910.001.0001
- (2006): The Transnational Social Spaces of Migration, in: (=Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development), *COMCAD Working Papers*, no.10, Bielefeld.
- (2010a): Diaspora and transnationalism: What kind of dance partners?, in: R. Bauböck/T. Faist (eds.): *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 9-34. Doi: 10.5117/9789089642387
- (2010b): Towards Transnational Studies: World Theories, Transnationalisation and Changing Institutions, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36:10, 1666-1687. Doi: 10.1080/1369183x.2010.489365
- (2011): Transnationalism: Migrant Incorporation beyond Methodological Nationalism, in: *Transnationalismus & Migration: Dossier*, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, 25-33.
- (2013): The mobility turn: a new paradigm for the social sciences?, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36:11, 11637-1646. Doi: 10.1080/01419870.2013.812229
- Favell, Adrian (2014): *Immigration, integration and mobility: new agendas in migration studies: essays 1998-2014*, (=ECPR Press essays), Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Findlay, Allan/McCollum, David/Coulter, Rory/Gayle, Vernon (2015): New Mobilities across the Lifecourse: A Framework for Analysing Demographically Linked Drivers of Migration, in: *Population, Space and Place*, 21:4, 390-402. Doi: 10.1002/psp.1956
- Fischer, Peter A./Malmberg, Gunnar (2001): Settled People Don't Move: On Life Course and (Im)Mobility in Sweden, in: *International Journal of Population Geography* 7:5, 357-371. Doi: 10.1002/ijpg.230
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1961): Some Social and Psychological Determinants of Intergroup Relations in Changing Neighborhoods an Introduction to the Bridgeview Study, in: *Social Forces* 40:1, 42-51. Doi: 10.2307/2573469
- FitzGerald, David (2014): The Sociology of International Migration, in: C. B. Bretell/ J. F. Hollifield (eds.): *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, London: Routledge, 115-147. Doi: 10.4324/9781315814933

- Flamm, Michael/Kaufmann, Vincent (2006): Operationalising the Concept of Motility: A Qualitative Study, in: *Mobilities* 1:2, 167-189. Doi: 10.1080/17450100600726563
- Fortier, Anne-Marie (2014): Migration Studies, in: P. Adey/D. Bissell/K. Hannam/P. Merriman/M. Sheller (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, London: Routledge, 64-73. Doi: 10.4324/9781315857572.ch5
- Frändberg, Lotta (2008): Paths in Transnational Time-Space: Representing Mobility Biographies of Young Swedes, in: *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 90:1, 17-28. Doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0467.2008.00273.x
- Fuchs, Werner (1984): *Biographische Forschung. Eine Einführung in Praxis und Methoden*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Fürstenau, Sara (2004): Transnationale (Aus-) Bildungs- und Zukunftsorientierungen, in: *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft* 7:1, 33-57. Doi: 10.1007/s11618-004-0004-2
- Gans, Herbert J. (1979): Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1, 1-20. Doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-24984-8_23
- Geißler, Rainer (2004): Einheit-in-Verschiedenheit, in: *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 14:3, 287-298. Doi: 10.1007/bf03204582
- Glaser, Barney G. (1978): *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*, California: The Sociology Press.
- Glick Schiller, Nina/Basch, Linda/Blanc-Szanton, Cristina (1992): Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration, in: *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645:1, 1-24. Doi: 10.1111/j.17496632.1992.tb33484.x
- (1995): From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration, in: *Anthropological Quarterly* 68:1, S. 48-63. Doi: 10.2307/3317464
- Glorius, Birgit (2013): Polnische Migranten in Leipzig. Eine transnationale Perspektive auf Migration und Integration: Empirischer Forschungsbericht, in: *Hallesche Diskussionsbeiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeographie*, no.10, 1-57.
- with Friedrich, Klaus (2006): Transnational social spaces of Polish migrants in Leipzig (Germany), in: *Migracijske i etničke teme* 22:1-2, 163-180.
- Goldberg, David (eds.) (1994): *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goldring, Luin (2002): The Mexican State and Transmigrant Organizations: Negotiating the Boundaries of Membership and Participation, in: *Latin American Research Review* 37:3, 55-99.

- with Henders, Susan J./Vandergeest, Peter (2003): The Politics of Transnational Ties: Implications for Policy, Research, and Communities, in: *YCAR-CERLAC Workshop Report*, 1-19.
- (2004): Family and Collective Remittances to Mexico: A Multi-dimensional Typology, in: *Development and Change* 35: 4, 799-840. Doi: 10.1111/j.0012-155x.2004.00380.x
- with Landolt, Patricia (2014): Transnational Migration and the Reformulation of Analytical Categories: Unpacking Latin American Refugee Dynamics in Toronto, in: L. Rivera-Sánchez/F. Lozano-Ascencio (eds.): *The Practice of Research on Migration and Mobilities*, Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, 103-127. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-02693-0_5
- Golembiowska, Beata (2011): *W jednej walizce: Polska arystocracja na emigracji w Kanadzie*, Poligraf.
- (2014a): In One Suitcase, in: *Pangea Magazine*. Online available at: <http://www.pangeamagazine.com/one-suitcase-introduction>
- (2014b): In one suitcase – Count Tarnowski, in: *Pangea Magazine*. Online available at: <http://www.pangeamagazine.com/one-suitcase-tarnowski>
- Gordon, Milton (1964): *Assimilation in American Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen (2009): A Mobility Studies Manifesto, in: S. Greenblatt (ed.): *Cultural Mobility: A Manifesto*, 250-253. Doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511804663.008
- Hägerstrand, Torsten (1975): Survival and Arena: On the Life-History of Individuals in Relation to their Geographical Environment, in: *The Monadnock*, no.49, 9-29.
- Halbwachs, Maurice (1950): *The Collective Memory*, New York: Harper-Colophon.
- Halfacree, Keith H./Boyle, Paul J. (1993): The challenge facing migration research: the case for a biographical approach, in: *Progress in Human Geography* 17:3, 333-348. Doi: 10.1177/030913259301700303
- Hannam, Kevin/Sheller, Mimi/Urry, John (2006): Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings, in: *Mobilities* 1:1, 1-22. Doi: 10.1080/17450100500489189
- Harris, Marvin (1976): History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction, in: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, no.5, 329-350. Doi: 10.1146/annurev.an.05.100176.001553

- Helmich, Magdalena/Kujawiński, Jakub/Kutschke, Marget/Tomman, Juliane (2005): "Entdeutschung" und Polonisierung. Die Umwandlung Breslaus in eine Polnische Stadt, in: P. Ther/T. Krolík/L. Henke (eds.): *Das polnische Breslau als europäische Metropole*, Wrocław.
- Hess, Sabine/Kasperek, Bernd/Kron, Stefanie/Rodatz, Mathias/Schwertl, Maria/Sontowski, Simon (2016): *Der lange Sommer der Migration: Grenzregie III*, Berlin: Assoziation A.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette/Avila, Ernestine (1997): "I'm Here, but I'm There": The Meanings of Latina Transnational Motherhood, in: *Gender and Society* 11:5, 548-571. Doi: 10.1525/california/9780520225619.003.0015
- Howes, David/Classen, Constance (2016): The Management of Diversity. Part 1: A Clarification of Terms: Canadian Multiculturalism and Quebec Interculturalism, online publication: *The Country Which is Not One*. Online available at: <http://canadianicon.org>
- Iglicka, Krystyna (2001): Migration Movements from and into Poland in the Light of the East-West European Migration, in: *International Migration* 39:1, 3-32. Doi: 10.1111/1468-2435.00133
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2008): *Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy*, (=World Migration), Geneva: IOM.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod W. (1999): *Understanding Diversity: Ethnicity and Race in the Canadian Context*, Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Iyer, Pico (1997): The Nowhere Man: Confessions of a perpetual foreigner, in: *Prospect*, online publication. Online available at: <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/features/thenowhereman>
- Jeffery, Laura/Murison, Jude (2011): The Temporal, Social, Spatial, and Legal Dimensions of Return and Onward Migration, in: *Population, Space and Place* 17:2, 131-139. Doi: 10.1002/psp.606
- Joppke, Christian/Morawska, Ewa (eds.) (2003): *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, Hampshire: Macmillan. Doi: 10.1057/9780230554795
- Juhasz, Anne/ Mey, Eva (2003): *Die zweite Generation: Etablierte oder Außen-seiter? Biographien von Jugendlichen ausländischer Herkunft*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-322-80497-6
- Kaluza, Andrzej (2002): Zuwanderer aus Polen in Deutschland, in: *UTOPIE*, no.141/142, 699-709.
- with Mack, Manfred (2010): Emigration aus Polen – eine besondere Dynamik im letzten Jahrzehnt, in: *Landeszentrale für politische Bildung*, no.60, 72-79.

- Kant, Immanuel (1795): *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*, Königsberg: Friedrich Nicolovius.
- Karl, Lars/Skordos, Adamantios (2013): Panslawismus, in: *European History Online (EGO)*, Leibniz: Leibniz Institut für Europäische Geschichte (IEG). Online available at: <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/transnational-movements-and-organisations/pan-ideologies/lars-karl-adamantios-skordos-panslawismus>
- Kaufmann, Vincent/Bergman, Manfred M./Joye, Dominique (2004): Motility: Mobility as Capital, in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28:4, 745-756. Doi: 10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00549.x
- Kempf, Andreas O. (2012): *Biographien in Bewegung: Transnationale Migrationsverläufe aus dem ländlichen Raum von Ost-nach Westeuropa*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-19656-5
- Kennedy, Paul (2009): The Middle Class Cosmopolitan Journey: The Life Trajectories and Transnational Affiliations of Skilled EU Migrants in Manchester, In: M. Nowicka/M. Rovisco (eds.): *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*, London: Routledge, 19–36. Doi: 10.4324/9781315574424
- Kesselring, Sven (2006): Pioneering mobilities: new patterns of movement and motility in a mobile world, in: *Environment and Planning A* 38:2, 269-279. Doi: 10.1068/a37279
- King, Russell (2002): Towards a New Map of European Migration, in: *International Journal of Population Geography* 8:2, 89-106. Doi: 10.1002/ijpg.246
- with Ruiz-Gelices, Enric (2003): International student migration and the European ‘Year Abroad’: Effects on European Identity and Subsequent Migration Behaviour, in: *International Journal of Population Geography* 9:3, 229–252. Doi: 10.1002/ijpg.280
- with Christou, Anastasia (2010): Diaspora, Migration and Transnationalism: Insights from the Study of Second-Generation ‘Returnees’, in: R. Bauböck/ T. Faist (eds.): *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 167-183. Doi: 10.5117/9789089642387
- (2012): Theories and Typologies of Migration: An Overview and a Primer, in: *Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations* 3:12, Malmö.
- with Lulle, Aija/Moroşanu, Laura/Williams, Allan (2016): *International Youth Mobility and Life Transitions in Europe: Questions, Definitions, Typologies and Theoretical Approaches*, working paper no.86, Brighton: Sussex Centre for Migration Research.

- Kivisto, Peter (2001): Theorizing transnational immigration: a critical review of current efforts, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24:4, 549-577. Doi: 10.1080/01419870120049789
- Kogler, Rudolf K. (1968): Demographic Profile of the Polish Community in Canada, in: *Polish American Studies*, XXV:1. Online available at: http://polishroots.org/Research/History/poles_in_canada/tabid/239/Default.aspx
- Kohli, Martin (1985): Die Institutionalisierung des Lebenslaufs. Historische Befunde und theoretische Argumente, in: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 37:1, 1-29. Doi: 10.1007/s11577-017-0417-6
- with Bertaux, Daniel (1984): The Life Story Approach: A Continental View, in: *Annual Review of Sociology*, no.10, 215–237. Doi: 10.1146/annurev.so.10.080184.001243
- Koopmans, Ruud (2015): “Does Assimilation Work? Sociocultural Determinants of Labour Market Participation of European Muslims,” in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (2): 197-216. Doi: 10.1080/1369183x.2015.1082903
- Krüger, Heinz-Hermann/Marotzki, Winfried (2006): *Handbuch erziehungswissenschaftliche Biographieforschung*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-90010-0
- Kühn, Natalia (2012): *Die Wiederentdeckung der Diaspora. Gelebte Transnationalität russischsprachiger Migrantinnen in Deutschland und Kanada*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-94136-3
- Kukathas, Chandran (1992): Are There any Cultural Rights?, in: *Political Theory* 20:1, 105-139. Doi: 10.1177/0090591792020001006
- Kymlicka, Will (1989): *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1995): *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Doi: 10.1093/0198290918.001.0001
- (2002): Multiculturalism and minority rights: West and East, in: *JEMIE: Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, no.4, 1-24.
- (2010): The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies, in: *International Social Science Journal* 61:199, 97-112. Doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2451.2010.01750.x
- (2012): *Multiculturalism: Success, Failure, and the Future*, Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute (MPI).

- Lamont, Michèle/Lareau, Annette (1988): Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps, and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments, in: *Sociological Theory* 6:2, 153-168. Doi: 10.2307/202113
- Lanzendorf, Martin (2003): Mobility Biographies. A New Perspective for Understanding Travel Behaviour, in: *Moving through Nets: The Physical and Social Dimensions of Travel*, (=Conference Paper Session I, Utrecht University), Utrecht: Urban Research Center.
- Lehmkuhl, Ursula (2014): Reading Immigrant Letters and Bridging the Micro-Macro Divide, in: *Studia Migracyjne-Przegląd Polonijny* 40:1, 9-30.
- with McFalls, Laurence (2012): *Diversity: Mediating Difference in Transcultural Spaces (GRK 1864/0)*, Proposal for the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), unpublished.
- Levitt, Peggy (2001a): *The Transnational Villagers*, Berkeley: University of California Press. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954x.2004.t01-1-00469_4.x
- (2001b): Transnational migration: taking stock and future directions, in: *Global Networks* 1:3, S. 195-216. Doi: 10.1111/1471-0374.00013
- (2003): Keeping Feet in Both Worlds: Transnational Practices and Immigrant Incorporation in the United States, in: C. Joppke/E. Morawska (eds.): *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship. Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, Hampshire: Macmillan, 177-194. Doi: 10.1057/9780230554795_7
- with De La Dehesa, Rafael (2003): Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 26:4, 587-611. Doi: 10.1080/0141987032000087325
- with Glick Schiller, Nina (2004): Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society, in: *International Migration Review* 38:3, 1002-1039. Doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00227.x
- (2009): Roots and Routes: Understanding the Lives of the Second Generation Transnationally, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35:7, 1225-1242. Doi: 10.1080/13691830903006309
- with Lamba-Nieves, Deepak (2011): Social Remittances Revisited, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37:1, 1-22. Doi: 10.1080/1369183x.2011.521361
- Ley, David (2010): Multiculturalism: A Canadian Defence, in: S. Vertovec/ S. Wessendorf: *The Multiculturalism Backlash. European Discourses, Policies and Practices*, London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203867549
- Library and Archives Canada (2015): *Immigration History: Ethnic and Cultural Groups – Polish*. Online available at: <http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/immigration/history-ethnic-cultural/Pages/polish.aspx>

- Loew, Peter Oliver (2014): *Wir Unsichtbaren: Geschichte der Polen in Deutschland*, München: C.H. Beck. Doi: 10.17104/9783406667091-1
- Lüdke, Tilman (2012): Pan-Ideologies, in: *European History Online (EGO)*, Leibniz: Leibniz Institut für Europäische Geschichte (IEG). Online available at: <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/luedket-2012-en>
- Lutz, Helma (2000): Biographisches Kapital als Ressource der Bewältigung von Migrationsprozessen, in: I. Gogolin/B. Nauck (eds.): *Migration, gesellschaftliche Differenzierung und Bildung. Resultate des Forschungsprogramms FABER*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 179-210. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-663-10799-6_9
- (2004): Transnationale Biographien in globalisierten Gesellschaften, in: M. Ottersbach/ E. Yildiz (eds.): *Migration in der metropolitanen Gesellschaft. Zwischen Ethnisierung und globaler Neuorientierung*, Münster: LIT Verlag, 207-217.
- Makowski, William (1987): *The Polish People in Canada: A Visual History*, New York: Tundra Books.
- Marcus, George E. (1995): Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography, in: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, no.24, 95-117. Doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.24.1.95
- Massey, Douglas/ Arango, Joaquin/ Hugo, Graeme/ Kouaouci, Ali/ Pellegrino, Adela/ Edward, Taylor, J. (1993): Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal, in: *Population and Development Review* 19:3, 431-466. Doi: 10.2307/2938462
- Mau, Steffen (2010): *Social Transnationalism. Lifeworlds beyond the Nation-State*, New York: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203879061
- Meister, Hans-Peter (1992): Polen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in: Berliner Institut für Vergleichende Sozialforschung (ed.): *Ethnische Minderheiten in Deutschland: Arbeitsmigranten, Asylbewerber, Ausländern, regionale und religiöse Minderheiten, Vertriebene, Zwangsarbeiter*, Berlin: Edition Parabolis.
- Merton, Robert K. (1968): *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York: The Free Press.
- (1995): The Thomas Theorem and the Mathew Effect, in: *Social Forces* 74:2, 379-424. Doi: 10.1093/sf/74.2.379
- Miera, Frauke (1997): Migration aus Polen. Zwischen nationaler Migrationspolitik und transnationalen sozialen Lebensräumen, in: H. Häußermann/I. Oswald (eds.): *Zuwanderung und Stadtentwicklung*, Wiesbaden: Opladen, 232-254. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-322-95611-8_14

- (2001): Transnationalisierung sozialer Räume? Migration aus Polen nach Berlin in den 80er und 90er Jahren, in: C. Pallaske (ed.): *Die Migration von Polen nach Deutschland*, Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verlags-Gesellschaft.
- (2008): Transnational Strategies of Polish Migrant Entrepreneurs in Trade and Small Business in Berlin, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, (=Special Issue: The New Face of East-West Migration in Europe), 34:5, 753-770. Doi: 10.1080/13691830802106010
- Mikrozensus (2013): Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund: Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2012, in: Statistisches Bundesamt (ed.): *Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2*, Wiesbaden.
- (2015): Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund: Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2014, in: Statistisches Bundesamt (ed.): *Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2*, Wiesbaden.
- Mijić, Ana (2013): Grenzen des Verstehens?–Verstehen der Grenzen!, in: R. Bettmann/M. Roslon (eds.): *Going the Distance: Impulse für die interkulturelle Qualitative Sozialforschung*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 95-116. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-658-00871-0_5
- Morawska, Ewa (2003): Immigrant Transnationalism and Assimilation: A Variety of Combinations and the Analytic Strategy it Suggests, in: E. Morawska/C. Joppke (eds.): *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship. Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 133-176. Doi: 10.1057/9780230554795_6
- Moret, Joëlle (2015): Cross-border mobility, transnationality and ethnicity as resources: European Somalis' post-migration mobility practices, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, online publication, 1-18. Doi: 10.1080/1369183x.2015.1123089
- Morokvasic, Mirjana (1994): Pendeln statt auswandern. Das Beispiel der Polen, in: M. Morokvasic/R. Hedwig (eds.): *Wanderungsraum Europa. Menschen und Grenzen in Bewegung*, Berlin: Sigma, 166-187.
- (2003): Transnational mobility and gender: a view from post-wall Europe, in: M. Morokvasic/U. Erel/K. Shinozaki (eds.): *Crossing Borders and Shifting Boundaries*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 101-113. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-663-09529-3_6
- Nowicka, Magdalena (2006a): Mobility, Space and Social Structuration in the Second Modernity and Beyond, in: *Mobilities* 1:3, 411-435. Doi: 10.1080/1450100600902388
- (2006b): *Transnational Professionals and their Cosmopolitan Universes*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.

- (2007a): Mobile Locations: Construction of home in a group of mobile transnational professionals, in: *Global Networks* 7:1, 69-86. Doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0374.2006.00157.x
- (2007b): *Von Polen nach Deutschland und zurück: die Arbeitsmigration und ihre Herausforderungen für Europa*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/9783839406052
- (2008): “Do you really talk about emotions on the phone...?” Content of Distance Communication as a Structuring Moment of the Modern World Society, in: R. G. Anghel/E. Gerharz/G. Rescher/M. Salzbrunn (eds.): *The Making of World Society: Perspectives from Transnational Research*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 253-274. Doi: 10.14361/9783839408353-011
- with Rovisco, Maria (2009a): Introduction: Making Sense of Cosmopolitanism, in: M. Nowicka/ M. Rovisco (eds.): *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*, London: Routledge, 1-16. Doi: 10.4324/9781315574424
- with Kaweh, Ramin (2009b): Looking at the Practice of UN Professionals: Strategies for Managing Differences and the Emergence of a Cosmopolitan Identity, in: M. Nowicka/M. Rovisco (eds.): *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*, London: Routledge, 51-71. Doi: 10.4324/9781315574424
- (2013): Positioning Strategies of Polish Entrepreneurs in Germany: Transnationalizing Bourdieu’s Notion of Capital, in: *International Sociology* 28:1, 29-47. Doi: 10.1177/0268580912468919
- Noy, Chaim (2008): Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research, in: *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11:4, 327-344. Doi: 10.1080/13645570701401305
- Okin, Susan Moller (1999): *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2009): Mobilizing the Moroccans: Policies and Perceptions of Transnational Civic Engagement among Moroccan migrants in Catalonia, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35:10, 1623-1641. Doi: 10.1080/13691830903165840
- (2011): Codevelopment and Citizenship. The Nexus between Policies on Local Migrant Incorporation and Migrant Transnational Practices in Spain, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34:1, 20-39. Doi: 10.1080/01419871003777791
- (2012): Transnational Migration, in: M. Martiniello/J. Rath (eds.): *An Introduction to International Migration Studies: European Perspectives*, (=IMISCOE textbook), Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 107-130.

- Palenga-Möllnbeck, Ewa (2005): "Von Zuhause nach Zuhause"—Transnationale Sozialräume zwischen Oberschlesien und dem Ruhrgebiet, in: L. Pries (eds.): *Zwischen den Welten und amtlichen Zuschreibungen. Neue Formen und Herausforderungen der Arbeitsmigration im 21. Jahrhundert*, Essen: Klartext-Verlag, 227-250.
- (2014): *Pendelmigration aus Oberschlesien: Lebensgeschichten in einer transnationalen Region Europas*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/transcript.9783839421338
- Pallaske, Christoph (2001a): Einleitung: Die Migration von Polen nach Deutschland. Ein europäisches Migrationssystem, in: C. Pallaske (ed.): *Die Migration von Polen nach Deutschland: Zu Geschichte und Gegenwart eines Europäischen Migrationssystems*, Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verlags-Gesellschaft, 9-18.
- (2001b): Die Migration aus Polen in die Bundesrepublik Deutschland in den 1980er und 1990er Jahren, in: C. Pallaske (ed.): *Die Migration von Polen nach Deutschland: Zu Geschichte und Gegenwart eines Europäischen Migrationssystems*, Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verlags-Gesellschaft, 123-140.
- Panter, Sarah/Paulmann, Johannes/Szöllösi-Janze, Margit (2015): Mobility and Biography. Methodological Challenges and Perspectives, in: *Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte/ European History Yearbook*, no.16, 1-14. Doi: 10.1515/9783110415162-001
- Park, Robert E. (1930): Assimilation, Social., in: E.R.A. Seligmann/A. Johnson (eds.): *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (1950): The Race Relations Cycle in Hawaii, in: E. Hughes (ed.): *Race and Culture. A Collection of Park's Essays*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 189-195.
- with Burgess, Ernest W. (1969[1921]): *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pike, Kenneth L. (1967): *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*, The Hague: Mouton & Co. Doi: 10.1515/9783111657158
- Poitras, Dave (2016): Nationhood as a Context for Staging Personas: A Sociological Narrative of Montreal and Brussels, in: U. Lehmkuhl/H-J. Lüsebrink/L. McFalls (eds.): *Spaces of Difference: Conflicts and Cohabitation*, Münster: Waxmann, 181-199.
- Portes, Alejandro/Zhou, Min (1993): The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants, in: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, no.530, 74-96. Doi: 10.1177/0002716293530001006

- Portes, Alejandro/Guarinzo, Luis E./Landolt, Patricia (1999): The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:2, 217-237. Doi: 10.1080/014198799329468
- Pries, Ludger (1996): Transnationale Soziale Räume: Theoretisch-empirische Skizze am Beispiel der Arbeitswanderungen Mexico—USA, in: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 25:6, 456–472. Doi: 10.1515/zfsoz-1996-0603
- (1997): *Wege und Visionen von Erwerbsarbeit. Erwerbsverläufe und Arbeitsorientierungen abhängig und selbstständig Beschäftigter in Mexiko*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- (2001a): *Internationale Migration*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- (2001b): The Disruption of Social and Geographic Space: Mexican-US Migration and the Emergence of Transnational Social Spaces, in: *International Sociology* 16:1, 51-70. Doi: 10.1177/0268580901016001005
- (2002): Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt?, in: *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 12:2, 263–272. Doi: 10.1007/BF03204056
- (2003): Transnationalismus, Migration und Inkorporation. Herausforderungen an Raum- und Sozialwissenschaften, in: *geographische revue* 5:2, 23-40.
- (2004): Transnationalism and Migration: New Challenges for the Social Sciences and Education, in: S. Luchtenberg (ed.): *Migration, Education and Change*, London: Routledge, 15-39. Doi: 10.4324/9780203299760_chapter_2
- (2005): Configurations of geographic and societal spaces: a sociological proposal between ‘methodological nationalism’ and the ‘spaces of flows’, in: *Global Networks* 5:2, 167-190. Doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0374.2005.00113.x
- (2008): *Die Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt. Sozialräume jenseits von Nationalgesellschaften*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- (2010): *Transnationalisierung. Theorie und Empirie grenzüberschreitender Vergesellschaftung*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-92595-0
- (2015a): Teilhabe in der Migrationsgesellschaft: Zwischen Assimilation und Abschaffung des Integrationsbegriffs, in: *IMIS-Beiträge*, no.47, Osnabrück: Institut für Migrationsforschung und Interkulturelle Studien, 7-35.
- (2015b): Boundaries of Belonging, Migration and Types of Social Spaces, in: U. Lehmkuhl/H.-J. Lüsebrink/ L. McFalls (eds.): *Of ‘Contact Zones’ and ‘Liminal Spaces’: Mapping the Everyday Life of Cultural Translation*, Münster: Waxmann, 29-48.

- Prodolliet, Simone (2003): Ein fragwürdiger Rückgriff auf ein überholtes Konzept, in: G. D'Amato (ed.): *Forum*, (=Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies), Neuchâtel, 24-26.
- Przyborski, Aglaja/Wohlrab-Sahr, Monika (2009): *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Ein Arbeitsbuch*, München: Oldenbourg. Doi: 10.1524/9783486719550
- Robbins, Bruce (1998): Introduction Part I: Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism, in: P. Cheah/B. Robbins (eds.): *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1-19.
- Roberts, Brian (2002): *Biographical research*, (=Understanding Social Research), Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Römhild, Regina (2010): "Aus Der Perspektive Der Migration. Die Kosmopolitisierung Europas." *Das Argument* 285, 20-59. Doi: 10.14361/9783839408902-014
- Rogers, Ali (2007): A European Space for Transnationalism?, in: *Working Paper Series WPTC-2K-07* (= Transnational Communities: An ESRC Research Programme), University of Oxford.
- Rosenthal, Gabriele (2004): Biographical Research, in: C. Seale/G. Gobo/J.F. Gubrium/D. Silvermann (eds.): *Qualitative research practice*, London: Sage, 48-64. Doi: 10.4135/9781848608191.d7
- (2014): *Interpretative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung*, Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.
- Rosenwald, George C./Ochberg, Richard L. (1992): *Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-Understanding*, Yale: Yale University Press. Doi: 10.2307/2074553
- Ruchniewicz, Krzysztof (2001): Die polnische politische Migration nach Deutschland in den Jahren 1945 bis 1980, in: C. Pallaske (ed.): *Die Migration von Polen nach Deutschland: Zur Geschichte und Gegenwart eines Europäischen Migrationssystems*, Baden-Baden: Nomos-Verlags-Gesellschaft, 61-75.
- Rudmin, Floyd W. (2003): Critical History of the Acculturation Psychology of Assimilation, Separation, Integration, and Marginalization, in: *Review of General Psychology* 7:1, 3-37. Doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.7.3.250
- (2009): Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress, in: *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 33:2, 106-123. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.001
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. (2012): Generation 1.5, Educational Experiences Of, in: *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education*, Sage. Doi: 10.4135/9781452218533.n312

- (2015): Assimilation of Immigrants, in: *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, no.2, Oxford: Elsevier, 81-87. Doi: 10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/02188-4
- Ruokonen-Engler, Minna-Kristiina (2012): *Unsichtbare Migration? Transnationale Positionierungen finnischer Migrantinnen. Eine biographieanalytische Studie*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/transcript.9783839418765
- with Siouti, Irini (2013): 'Doing Biographical Reflexivity' as a Methodological Tool in Transnational Research Settings, in: *Transnational Social Review: A Social Work Journal* 3:2, 247-261. Doi: 10.1080/21931674.2013.10820767
- Safran, William (1991): Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return, in: *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 1:1, 83-99. Doi: 10.1353/dsp.1991.0004
- Salazar, Noel B. (2010): Towards an anthropology of cultural mobilities, in: *Crossings: Journal of Migration and Culture* 1:1, 53-68. Doi: 10.1386/cjmc.1.53_1
- with Smart, Alan (2011): Anthropological Takes on (Im)Mobility, in: *Identities* 18:6, i-ix. Doi: 10.1080/1070289x.2012.683674
- Sanford, George (2003): *Historical Dictionary of Poland*, (=European Historical Dictionaries), Lanham: Scarecrow Press.
- Sassen, Saskia (2005): The Global City: Introducing a Concept, in: *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 11:2, 27-43.
- Schmeiser, Martin (1994): *Akademischer Hasard: Das Berufsschicksal des Professors und das Schicksal der deutschen Universität 1870-1920: Eine verstehende soziologische Untersuchung*, Stuttgart: Klett.
- Schrooten, Mieke/Salazar, Noel B./Dias, Gustavo (2015): Living in mobility: trajectories of Brazilians in Belgium and the UK, in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-17. Doi: 10.1080/1369183x.2015.1089160
- Schütz, Alfred ([1932] 2013): *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt: Eine Einleitung in die verstehende Soziologie*, Vienna: Julius Springer. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-7091-3108-4
- Schütze, Fritz (1976): Zur soziologischen und linguistischen Analyse von Erzählungen, in: *Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge/Contributions to the Sociology of Religion*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 7-41. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-663-14483-0_1
- (1983): Biographieforschung und narratives Interview, in: *Neue Praxis* 13:3, 283-293.


- (1984): Kognitive Figuren des autobiographischen Stegreiferzählens, in: M. Kohli/G. Robert (eds.): *Biographie und soziale Wirklichkeit. Neue Beiträge und Forschungsperspektiven*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 78-117. Doi: 10.1007/978-3-476-03188-4_5
- Sheller, Mimi (2011): Mobility, in: *Sociopedia.isa*, 1-12. Online available at: <http://www.sagepub.net/isa/resources/pdf/mobility.pdf>
- (2014a): Sociology after the Mobilities Turn, in: P. Adey/D. Bissel/K. Hannam/P. Merriman/M. Sheller (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, London: Routledge: 45-54. Doi: 10.4324/9781315857572.ch3
- (2014b): The new mobilities paradigm for a live sociology, in: *Current Sociology* 62:6, 789-811. Doi: 10.1177/0011392114533211
- with Urry, John (2006): The new mobilities paradigm, in: *Environment and Planning A* 38:2, 207-226. Doi: 10.1068/a37268
- with Urry, John (2016): Mobilizing the new mobilities paradigm, in: *Applied Mobilities* 1:1, 1-16. Doi: 10.1080/23800127.2016.1151216
- Shih, Johanna (2012): Three mistakes and corrections: on reflective adaptation in qualitative data collection and analysis, in: C. Vargas-Silva (ed.): *Handbook of Research Methods in Migration*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 560-571. Doi: 10.4337/9781781005231
- Shinozaki, Kyoko (2008): “National heroes” or “transnational shames”? Exploring the development-migration nexus in migrant domestic workers and ICT workers, in: *COMCAD – Working Paper/ Arbeitspapiere* (= Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development), no.8, Bielefeld.
- Siouti, Irini (2013): *Transnationale Biographien: Eine biographieanalytische Studie über Transmigrationsprozesse bei der Nachfolgegeneration griechischer Arbeitsmigranten*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/transcript.9783839420065
- Simmel, Georg ([1908] 1950): The Stranger, in: K. Wolff (ed.): *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, New York: Free Press, 402-408.
- Smith, Robert (1997): Reflections on migration, the state and the construction, durability and newness of transnational life, in: *Soziale Welt*, no.12, 197-217.
- Statistics Canada (2013): *Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in Canada: National Household Survey 2011*, Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- (2017): *Ethnic and cultural origins of Canadians: Portrait of a rich heritage. Census of Population 2016*, Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Straub, Jürgen (1993): Zeit, Erzählung, Interpretation. Zur Konstruktion und Analyse von Erzähltexten in der narrativen Biographieforschung, in: H. Röckelein (ed.): *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der psychohistorischen Biographieforschung*, Tübingen: edition discord.

- Strauss, Anselm L. (1987): *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511557842
- with Corbin, Juliet (1990): *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, London: Sage. Doi: 10.4135/9781452230153
- with Corbin, Juliet ([1990] 1996): *Grounded Theory: Grundlagen Qualitativer Sozialforschung*, Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.
- with Corbin, Juliet (1998): *Basics of Qualitative Research: Procedures and Techniques for Developing Grounded Theory*, London: Sage. Doi: 10.4135/9781452230153
- Taylor, Charles (2012): Interculturalism or multiculturalism?, in: *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 38:4-5, 413-423. Doi: 10.1177/0191453711435656
- Thériault, Barbara (2013): *The Cop and the Sociologist: Investigating Diversity in German Police Forces*, Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. Doi: 10.14361/transcript.9783839423103
- Thomas, William I./ Thomas, Dorothy S. (1928): *The Child in America. Behaviour Problems and Programs*, New York: Knopf.
- Thompson, Paul (2000): *Voice of the Past: Oral history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thranhardt, Dietrich (2005): Entwicklung durch Migration. Ein neuer Forschungsansatz, in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte (APUZ)*, vol. 27, 3-11.
- Tissot, Florian (2016): Highly-Skilled Labour Migration in Switzerland: Household Strategies and Professional Careers, in: *Working Paper Series "Gender, Diversity and Migration"*, no.10, Frankfurt am Main: Goethe-Universität.
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafolis (2012): *Becoming Multicultural. Immigration and the Politics of Membership in Canada and Germany*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Tulder, Elisabeth (2014): What about the 'National' when Doing Transnational Research? – Reflections, Translations and the Impact of Power Relations, in: *Transnational Social Review: A Social Work Journal* 2:1, 31-46. Doi: 10.1080/21931674.2012.10820712
- UNDP (2009): *Human Development Report 2009. Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development* (=Human Development Report), Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Urry, John (2000): *Sociology beyond Societies. Mobilities for the 21st Century*, London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203021613
- (2003): *Global Complexity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2007): *Mobilities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

- ([2001] 2010): Mobile Sociology, in: *The British Journal of Sociology*, no.61, 347-366. Doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01249.x
- Vargas-Silva, Carlos (2012): Briefing: EU Migrants in other EU Countries: An Analysis of Bilateral Migrant Stocks, in: *Migration Observatory Briefing, COMPAS*, Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Vertovec, Steven (1997): Three meanings of ‘diaspora,’ exemplified among South Asian religions, in: *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 6:3, 277-299. Doi: 10.1353/dsp.1997.0010
- with Cohen, Robin (2002): Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism, in: S. Vertovec/R. Cohen (eds.): *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2004): Migrant Transnationalism and Modes of Transformation, in: *International Migration Review* 38:3, 970-1001. Doi: 10.1111/j.17477379.2004.tb00226.x
- (2007): Super-Diversity and Its Implications, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30:6, 1024-1054. Doi: 10.1080/01419870701599465.
- with Wessendorf, Susanne (2010): Introduction: Assessing the Backlash against Multiculturalism in Europe, in: S. Vertovec/S. Wessendorf (eds.): *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*, London: Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203867549
- Vickermann, Milton (2002): Second-Generation West Indian Transnationalism, in: P. Levitt/ M.C. Water (eds.): *The Changing Face of Home. The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*, New York: Russel Sage, 341-366.
- Vogt, W. Paul/Johnson, R. Burke (2015): *The Sage Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology: A Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences*, London: Sage.
- Waldram, James B. (2009): Is there a future for “culture” in acculturation research? An anthropologist’s perspective, in: *International Journal of Inter-cultural Relations* 33:2, 173-176. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2009.03.004
- Warner, Lloyd W./Srole, Leo (1945): *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Waters, Mary C. (1990): *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weber, Max ([1904/05] 2010): *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, München: C.H. Beck.
- ([1921] 1978): *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1949): *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

- Wessendorf, Susanne (2013): *Second-Generation Transnationalism and Roots Migration. Cross-Border Lives*, Farnham: Ashgate. Doi: 10.4324/9781315607962
- Więckowski, Marek (2008): New International Mobility of Poles, in: *Espace populations sociétés/ Space populations societies*, no.2, 261-270. Doi: 10.4000/eps.2509
- Wieczorek, Xymena (2016): Biography En Route: Investigating Mobility Experiences through Biographical Research, in: U. Lehmkuhl/H.-J. Lüsebrink/L. McFalls (eds.): *Spaces of Difference: Conflicts and Cohabitation*, Münster: Waxmann, 101-123.
- Willis, Katie (2010): Introduction: mobility, migration and development, in: *International Development Planning Review* 32:3-4, i-xviii. Doi: 10.3828/idpr.2010.15
- Wimmer, Andreas/Glick Schiller, Nina (2002): Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences, in: *Global Networks* 2:4, 301-334. Doi: 10.1111/1471-0374.00043
- Zhou, Min (1997): Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation, in: *International Migration Review* 31:4, (=Special Issue: Immigrant Adaptation and Native-Born Responses in the Making of Americans), 975-1008. Doi: 10.2307/2547421
- Zolyna Memorial (2005): The Polish Nobility. Online available at: <http://www.zolynia.org/about-new.html>
- Zmuda, Marius (2004): *Identität und Abgrenzung: Die polnische “Szlachta” auf der Suche nach ihrem Platz in Europa (1648-1668)*. Magisterarbeit, Digitale Osteuropa-Bibliothek: Geschichte 10, last update: 20.10.2004. Online available at: <https://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/557/1/zmuda-szlachta.pdf>
- Znaniecki, Florian/ Thomas, William I. ([1918-1923] 1958): *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, New York: Dover.
- Zurakowska, Anna (1991): *Proud Inheritance: Ontario's Kaszuby*, Ottawa: The Polish Heritage Institute Kaszuby.

Social Sciences



Alexander Schellinger, Philipp Steinberg (eds.)

The Future of the Eurozone

How to Keep Europe Together:

A Progressive Perspective from Germany


October 2017, 202 p., pb.

29,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-4081-6

E-Book

PDF: 26,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-4081-0

EPUB: 26,99€ (DE), ISBN 978-3-7328-4081-6



Franziska Meister


Racism and Resistance

How the Black Panthers Challenged White Supremacy

April 2017, 242 p., pb.

19,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-3857-8

E-Book: 17,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-3857-2



Maik Fielitz, Laura Lotte Laloire (eds.)

Trouble on the Far Right

Contemporary Right-Wing Strategies
and Practices in Europe

2016, 208 p., pb.

19,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-3720-5


E-Book

PDF: 17,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-3720-9

EPUB: 17,99€ (DE), ISBN 978-3-7328-3720-5

**All print, e-book and open access versions of the titles in our list
are available in our online shop www.transcript-verlag.de/en!**

Social Sciences



James Morrow

Where the Everyday Begins

A Study of Environment and Everyday Life

October 2017, 220 p., hardcover

99,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-4077-9

E-Book: 99,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-4077-3



Cameron Harrington, Clifford Shearing

Security in the Anthropocene

Reflections on Safety and Care

August 2017, 196 p., hardcover

79,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-3337-5

E-Book: 79,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-3337-9



Ilker Ataç, Gerda Heck, Sabine Hess, Zeynep Kasli, Philipp Ratfisch, Cavidan Soykan, Bediz Yilmaz (eds.)

movements. Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies

Vol. 3, Issue 2/2017: Turkey's Changing Migration Regime and its Global and Regional Dynamics

November 2017, 230 p., pb.

24,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-3719-9

**All print, e-book and open access versions of the titles in our list
are available in our online shop www.transcript-verlag.de/en!**