

The symbolic meaning of mobility in transnational families

Karolina Barglowski
University Bielefeld

Working Paper Series
“Gender, Diversity and Migration“
No. 7 (2015)

Bio Note

Karolina Barglowski is a member of the SFB 882 research project C3 “Transnationality and the unequal distribution of informal social protection“, and PhD candidate at the Bielefeld Graduate School in History and Sociology. Her research and teaching focus on social inequalities, gender, migration and qualitative research methods. Selected publications are the co-authored article "Semiprofessionen und der Wandel wohlfahrtsstaatlicher Organisationen: Subjektbezogene Erfahrungen zur institutionellen Transformation von Wohlfahrtsstaatlichkeit" in *Journal für Psychologie* (with Stella Müller) and a co-edited Special Issue “Safety Nets of Migrants Across Borders: An Inquiry into Social Mechanisms of Inequality” in *Population, Space and Place* (with Thomas Faist, Basak Bilecen and Joanna J. Sienkiewicz). Contact: karolina.barglowski@uni-bielefeld.de

Abstract

In the ‘age of transnationalization’, spatial mobility is highly valued as a resource and accordingly ‘sedentariness’ is often symbolically devalued. Migration between Poland and Germany (mainly from Poland to Germany) has a century-long tradition. Not only has it yielded the emergence of a dense transnational social space, but is also considered as a re-enactor of cultural traits and symbolic meanings. Spatial mobility is tied to notions of social mobility and to projects of life-making. Since legal restrictions for Polish migrants seeking to work and settle in Germany have vanished, the quest for ‘normalcy’ has enhanced and pressures towards even more migration have increased. I argue that symbolic meanings of mobility are decisive for hierarchies in transnational social spaces. I have put main emphasize on families’ practices of caring for and caring about each other: the first being more a physical or material activity, while the latter is a more symbolic and emotional one. The interviews reveal that people draw multiple differentiations between migrant populations in terms of their migration reasons as well as between the mobile and the immobile. Those differentiations are embedded in the distinct feature of the transnational social space between Poland and Germany with assumed differences in terms of ‘modernity’. At the end the symbolic meanings of mobility also help explain the puzzle of why the emigration rates from Poland are constantly high, although Poland is a comparatively wealthy country.

Introduction

“Men and women are forced, under pain of material disadvantage, to build up a life of their own by way of the labour market, training and mobility, and if need be to pursue this life at the cost of their commitments to family, relations and friends” (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 1995: 6).

International migration as a prime form of mobility often involves an expectation about a betterment of life-chances. Yet ‘betterment’ is contingent and is often related to different areas of life, such as economic, legal, political, educational, and personal. Poland and Germany are connected by a long migration history, which started in the 19th century and was characterized by intense flows between countries and heterogeneous populations in Germany with a migration history in Poland. Until nowadays Poland is experiencing high rates of emigration, although it is on a global scale a comparatively wealthy country. For most of their collective history, both countries were characterized by disparities in socio-economic, political and institutional conditions. More recently, these disparities have been converging. The internal hierarchization of the transnational social space between Poland and Germany is aptly described by researchers dealing with often precarious labor migration from Poland to Germany in devalued and low paid (domestic) sectors (cf. Lutz 2008).

Disparities are therefore reflected in narratives and reflections of asymmetrical life chances in both countries. When Poland was under socialist regime, the only or main encounter for most people with the ‘West’ was Western Germany, and it represented freedom as well as economic and social safety. While many people migrated from Poland to Germany with various motives and accompanying different legal circumstances, their expectations tended to be that their lives in Germany will be ‘easier’¹. In 2004, Poland entered the European Union and new legal conditions allowed people from Poland to legally enter labor markets in some European Union countries. Emigration from Poland became part of a narrative and socially accepted way of earning income or making a living. This exemplifies how “mobility evokes and re-enacts deep cultural traits and symbolic meanings” (Garapich 2011: 6). After 2004, when emigration, settlement, and working was no longer legally restricted in many western EU countries, together with the cultural narratives of migration to the West, people in Poland faced a ‘climate’ of emigration:

¹ For a similar discourse in the Ukrainian-German social space, see Amelina 2011.

“My husband received a job offer from the States, but it didn’t work out, when the crisis in the States started. And then we thought, all Poles thought, I mean that a lot of our friends moved to England, Ireland, that was a boom, a social movement a lot of friends from my studies live in England, my sister lives in London” (Andżelika, aged 40, Germany).

Migrants and non-migrants share the experience of a massive emigration climate, enhanced by stories of success from those in Germany or “on the Islands” (Nowicka 2014: 176). By paying attention to the perspectives of those who migrated as well as those who did not, it appears that social expectations and a lifting of legal restrictions affected pressure on potential migrants. In other words, it is every (healthy) Polish citizen who could- and consequently should? - follow the quest to find self-realization and a better life in the ‘West’. Taking a joint perspective, which includes legal, material, and symbolic ramifications, allows me to approach the puzzle of why so many people emigrate from Poland.

With the promise of free mobility, social expectations for being able to ‘succeed’ in life through migration, non-mobility has become symbolically devaluated. Spatial mobility is considered to be a trait of contemporary life-scripts tied to ‘self-realization’ and ‘individualism’, constructed in binary contrast to ‘collectivism’ and ‘familiarity’, which were traits of ‘pre-modern’ times. Being mobile, or the ability to be mobile, is a relevant form of capital understood as “mobility capital” (Broderson 2014), and an allocation mechanism in the transnational stratification ‘ladder’. International mobility, therefore, does not only refer to a betterment of life-chances in the ‘West’, but also to being mobile in itself. In the sense of realizing individualized life-scripts through spatial mobility, it is the ‘ability’ of persons to be active constructors of their biographies. Hitzler (2001) asserts that people are “craftsmen” of biographies who “piece together their lives” from what is just around (ibid.: 182). Yet, “what is just around” is different to many people, but at the end “all must play” the game in piecing lives together (ibid.).

One trait of ‘postmodernity’, ‘post-traditional’ (Giddens 1990), or ‘liquid’ times (Baumann, 2000) is that the possibilities for this ‘piecing together’ have grown. This is a contestable observation, since proposed growth depends very much on people believing in their freedom, and their ability to choose freely. With the promise and symbolic reenactment of freedom of mobility for all, mobility has become a good and a

disposition in itself. Mobility, like all forms of capital, is related to social inequalities in social spaces. Actors' location within these social spaces and their dispositions and resources plays a decisive role in their (asymmetric) social positioning.

Based on the narratives of 20 Polish migrants in Germany and 10 with their significant others in Poland, as well as 5 interviews with people living in Poland who do not have own immediate migration experiences, I reconstruct the role of mobility capital for processes of hierarchization within the transnational social space between Poland and Germany. I have put emphasis on the asymmetric classifications within and between families caring for and caring about each other: the former a more physical or material activity, and the latter a more symbolic and emotional one. Here, the focus is on families *caring about* each other at a spatial distance within the distinct Polish-German transnational social space. Care is a special or basic form of social practice and ties families together who live in different geographic locations. It is distinct due to its emotional character, thus it cannot be easily de-personified or substituted (Lutz 2008).

Reflections on modernity and “civilization”

One trait of transmigrants is that they constantly compare contexts of emigration and immigration. Stories of Polish migrants reveal a strong orientation towards achieving ‘normalcy’; hence all spheres of life are examined in terms of their state of ‘normalcy’. Very often the symbolized ‘West’, Germany is believed to be more capable of providing a ‘normal’ life. However, the ascriptions are paradoxical. Germany’s seemingly individualistic nature, mainly referred to as its ‘strong’ welfare state, is by interviewees held to be more artificial and less familiar and social than in Poland; whereas Poland fails to provide ‘normal’ lives for the majority. The artificial character of the ‘West’ is closely interlinked with evaluations of the disparities and idiosyncrasies of differences between the ‘West’ and the ‘East’. This is evident in the case of Germany and Poland, and their (different) states of ‘modernity’ and ‘civilization’. From the German side, one part of the discourse about Poland is its “rural” and “under civilized” character (see Schmidtke 2004), which Polish migrants in Germany often adapt.

“Well, now as the borders within Europe are open, people are not faced anymore with such categorical choices. It does not mean so much anymore. A lot of people from Poland, I think 2 million are in Western Europe, in Ireland, England, and they get along there very well. They see a bit another civilization, especially true for those from small

towns. I think it will help Poland in a sense opening to the world, getting to know. People then are not so closed in their xenophobia and belief that they are someone special, those are some kind of patriotic outcast (*wyżutki*) of poor societies, (*żeby coś tam wmówić*) to reason into them that they are chosen, because otherwise it would be hard to survive and I recognize that we, and one gets unused (*człowiek się odzwyczajają*) after 30 years, what is quite understandable. I studied Polish studies and when I read something in Polish, then always with a kind of patriotic bonus. It was close to me and somehow until the end of my life I will be jumping of joy when the Poles play soccer and score a goal” (Piotr, aged 55, Germany).

Contemporary migration appears to be easier - it is no longer connected to “*categorical choices*”. This is in comparison to the period of a socialist regime in Poland, when migration was legally prone to be permanent and visits to Germany were faced with legal and organization challenges, such as long visa procedures. Today migration from Poland appears to be much easier, as people can choose how often they visit and can return to Poland at any time (see also Morokvasic 2004). Thus, migration “*does not mean so much anymore*”, making it a viable option for many - especially for those in the peripheries (Warczuk and Zarycki 2014), who are often considered as those who did not benefit or even suffered from the post-socialist transformation.

Poland is often differentiated into its urban regions that appear to have adapted to the post-socialist condition and its predominantly rural regions, which face hardships in adapting, for instance by lacks in social infrastructure or high rates of unemployment. In migrant’s narratives ‘Poland’ occurs to be mostly signified with its less urbanized regions, and is described as „*patriotic*” and not open to the world, “*closed in their xenophobia*”. Polish communities have often been understood as “*poor societies*” in need of patriotism to feel “*chosen*” to deal with their deprived situation. Through international mobility, especially to the ‘West’, people can overcome their “*patriotic closeness*” by “*seeing a bit a different civilization*”. Nonetheless, those who migrate for economic reasons and those who should migrate but do not appear to be trapped in their sedentariness and closeness. According to Warczuk and Zarycki (2014) the division between ‘modernity’ and ‘unmodernity’ is typical for most (semi-) peripheral countries, which are “characterized by tension and even conflict between ‘globally’ orientated (cosmopolitan) and ‘locally’ orientated actors, a cleavage which, (...) redefines the key relations of power here.” (ibid.: 336).

Discourses on openness and parochialism are interrelated with spatial mobility and are used to classify the mobile and the immobile as well as the ‘Polish’ and ‘not-so-Polish’. After migrating, people are judged in terms of their German or ‘western’ attitude, their

being open to the world and letting collectivity and prescribed social roles behind, and their fulfillment of (western) social expectation of 'individualism' and 'self-realization'. Paradoxically people are simultaneously afraid of a 'Germanization', especially when it comes to their offspring. This interpretation, however, has to be dealt with in ambivalent terms, as the majority of respondents experience a lack of collectivity and ties or commitments within families. Reflections of the tensions between 'individualism' and 'collectivity' indicate the hardships migrants experience by being in between ways of live and habits.

Morokvasic (2004) describes pendular migrants as those who often "settle in mobility", meaning that they often experience their division of country of residence and of working as rewarding. Yet, narratives of my interviewees reveal that many of them evaluate pendular migration as a hardship as well as a danger to family life. Many (former) circular migrants perceive a 'normal' life as one that involves settling with a nuclear family, not living bivalent, and saving money for the future return and their (family) life in Poland.

I: How did you stay in touch to Poland, when you were in Italy?

Adam: Mainly by phone calls, we had the agreement that we call Saturday evenings. We did not have a telephone in our apartment, where we lived back then for reasons of saving money (laughing). Everybody wanted to save each penny. Well, we all went once a week to a telephone cell. Well, that's how it looked like. We were orientated towards earning money and return to Poland, well making our business. In contrast now we live on other conditions. We simply live here. We don't save money, but have an ordinary, normal life" (Adam, aged 45, Germany).

In this case, the 'normal' life means that people stay, live, and work in one place and do not save for a future return. As Adrian Favell states, "the issue is not that you are always free to leave, but rather that you are able to settle in ways that make sense to your own mode of living" (2008: 119).

Images of spatial mobility are ambivalent and sometimes paradoxical. Spatial mobility is inscribed into the transnational social space between Poland and Germany as an easy and even social expected forms of a 'normal' life plan have developed (for some). Simultaneously, through the act of commuting between countries, spatial mobility contradicts 'normal' family life, e.g. one characterized by co-residence or the nuclear family.

Mobility in itself is also tied to processes of self-realization and a pursuit of individualized life-scripts, and is enhanced by a social space marked with constructed differences in ‘modernity’. Those that are not mobile and are located in Poland are often devalued as “*stuck*” and “*not developing*” by their migrant relatives. This can illustrate how mobility in itself is an inner attitude as well as a physical movement through space. Furthermore, this shows how mobility influences hierarchies within families by distinguishing between the mobile and the immobile. This was expressed by Waldek, who lives and works in Germany and has reflected on his daughter living in Poland.

“Well, I have built a home [*in Poland*] and the mentality of people is that they long to it, because you build it with your own hands and it would be hard to sell it. However, I would even persuade my daughter to come here [*to Germany*] too, and the house either renting or or or, no selling not, but renting or something like that. And I think that she would adapt quite easily here. But, she had never been across the border and she doesn’t know how it is. I will try to find the right word...because I am lacking words for that...Everything is a bit stuck [*zapyziałe*], because when a person travels around the world, has contact to people and if the persons like travelling and sightseeing then the person develops [*rozwija sie*] and if a person only sits in one place, I don’t say the person doesn’t go on vacation or something alike, but I talk about the world, then they simply grow and [*może nóż widelec*] you can maybe change something. I think she could change something, but well I would have to persuade her. Well she is not completely happy, because of the work but there it is as it is, it is a kind of trapping [*zasiedzenie*]. Yes this is the right word” (Waldek, aged 55, Germany).

Complementary to the discourses on the ‘parochial’ Polish/Poland discussed previously, this example shows that homologous classifications are used for people living there, leaving the macro-level descriptions of an amorphous ‘state’, ‘nation’, or setting. The immobile often are regarded as not only immobile, but also in lacking the ability for being mobile. They would have to be “*persuaded*” by the mobile. However, there is often ambivalence mirrored in migrants’ narratives about the benefits of migration for their non-mobile relatives. It is often experienced as hazardous: migration might be good for them, but they also might be not assessed for mobile experiences. In Waldek’s elaboration about his daughter: “*she had never been across the border and she doesn’t know how it is*”. Migrants’ narratives about their non-mobile relatives mirror an attitude widely termed as ‘cosmopolitan’, “broadly defined [*as a; KB*] disposition of ‘openness’ toward others, people, things and experiences whose origin is non-local.” (Skrbis and Woodward 2007: 730).

Evaluations often mirror asymmetric classifications of being “*stuck*”, when remaining in the ‘parochial’ environment versus being ‘mobile’ as “*growing*” and discovering the

world. Being “*stuck*” resembles discursive descriptions such as old-fashioned, isolated, ‘back of beyond’, backwards, unprogressive, and on the margins. This is a common discourse about Poland from a German perspective (see Schmidtke 2008). Similarly, small towns and rural regions in Poland are interpreted as backwards. The chance to overcome their backwardness is by travelling: in Piotr’s opinion, to “*the West*” and in Waldek’s opinion, “*through the world*”. Moving from Poland to Germany, more or less permanently, they could overcome this backwardness. From Germany, they were able to perceive the “*stuckness*” of their relatives back home by relating to notions of cosmopolitanism, which stress the reflexivity and openness to the ‘other’, while the ‘other’ non-cosmopolitan is excluded from the ability to be open and reflexive. From a distance, Waldek can see that his daughters work and that life “*is at it is*”. This is only possible from this distance, which supports his role as the one who overcame “*stuckness*” by migrating. Through mobility, he achieved a broader perspective, while excluding his daughter from relevant knowledge about her own life conditions.

International mobility can be roughly divided into what Waldek describes as only “*traveling and sightseeing*” as a tourist and “*really living there*” as a migrant. This distinction between tourist and migrant are common figures of a globalized world, “If the migrant sees the bordered world from below, the tourist views it from above” (Cavanaugh 2008: 345). It is also reflected in literature on transnationalism as the dialectical relationship between “transnationalism from below and from above” (Guarnizo and Smith 1998). As Cavanaugh traces the distinction of different types of people moving through space, such as pilgrim and monk, stating that “the motives for both tourist and pilgrim may be seen in the transformation of the self (...).” (ibid.: 349), he indicates that first moving is a historically relevant social phenomenon and second that it is tied to transformations of the subject.

Against the backdrop of the two different figures of mobility, tourism and migrant, Waldek is classifying his daughter as a tourist rather than a migrant. Yet his son, raised together with his daughter in the same ‘parochial’ environment, overcame the “*trapping*” through achieving the status of a migrant working with Waldek in Germany. His daughter on the other hand is described as passive and “*trapped*”, which appears ‘comprehensive’ to her closed surrounding and her lack of cross-border experience. That is why it might be hard, to “*tear*” her out of her common surrounding. ‘Openness’ ascribed to themselves does not include openness to those in the ‘parochial’ settings.

Making the ‘non-parochial’ way of life the most valued way of life, if not the only one desirable. Cosmopolitanism as an inner attitude and a social ethic thus can be challenged, as the ‘entrance’ to cosmopolitanism is not evenly distributed and because cosmopolitanism in itself is highly valued, which in turn devalues all that are non-cosmopolitan. Furthermore, because of the cosmopolitan subject’s blind spot, it displays a non-ability to approach its own lack of reflexivity.

Life-chances and mobility: migration projects and the quest for ‘normalcy’

Spatial mobility is tied to realizing various life-chances and often is interrelated with social mobility. Due to the distinct feature of the social space, migration is an option for most, including those who have not yet migrated:

“We would migrate, if my husband and I would find an appropriate job according to our education. We don’t want to migrate for pure financial reasons, but more to get to know another culture, living a bit abroad” (Dorota, aged 30, Poland).

Although migration is not perceived as a ‘necessity’, it may be a potential life-plan. There is also a clear distinction between those who “*migrate for pure financial reasons*” and those who want “*to get to know another culture, living a bit abroad*”. The wish to migrate, although largely evident, is decreasing when people seem to have found a “*job according to our education*”. This marks a class differentiation according to educational background and position in the labor market. The ranking of reasons for migration in terms of ‘financial’ versus ‘cultural’ pushes some towards a potentially exhausting migration project who cannot afford to not migrate, while excluding others from migration for ‘higher’ reasons, such as encountering the culturally distinct ‘other’.

Behind the polarization between ‘financial’ and ‘cultural’ migration there is a hidden life-orientation, namely the ‘quest for normalcy’. ‘Normalcy’ is predominantly related to a way of life where income and life-style match the level of skills and the requirements of family life, embracing the mobile as well as the non-mobile. The ‘quest for normalcy’ is reflected in respondents’ narratives mainly as ‘achieving a normal’ life, which appears to be easier in the ‘West’ (respectively UK see Lopez Rodriguez, 2010; White, 2011). Migrants and their significant others evaluate migration projects according to their ability to achieve ‘normalcy’.

One family constellation perceived as a ‘migration success’ and a ‘normal’ life is comprised of a household that functions on one income. The gendered division of labor within households thereby does not only signify success on labor market, it also meets demands for good child care:

Aneta: And besides, that’s the way we chose, with three kids, I sit at home, I can afford to be sitting at home and taking care of the home and the kids. Because, you also in the afternoons have to take care of them. Take care of their homework, and how they get along at school, this and that, I don’t know if I could do that in Poland.

Janek: No rather not!

Aneta: I even don’t know if we would have three children. I just don’t know.

Janek: Right, this is unclear!

(...)

Janek: Take a look at my sister, only to survive not to have a super life- she is a teacher- she (break by wife), she needs to work in two schools and besides earn additional money in after school teaching. She is the whole day out of home.

The classic division of labor here is experienced as satisfying by both Janek and Aneta. The positive evaluation of the classic division of labor is yielded by transnational comparisons, which are usually undertaken in terms of similar class, age, gender and family composition, which is here Janek’s sister in Poland. She is at a similar age and has a family with children, yet in contrast to Aneta, “*cannot afford to sit at home*” and has to work on multiple shifts not to have a “*super life*” but “*only to survive*”. Although the household is often discussed as a realm of oppression for women, Aneta values her situation as an achievement of their migration and as a freedom of choice. Transnational comparisons, providing a foil within which life-plans and life conditions are valued, are also expressed by relatives of migrants, here Janeks mother, Jagoda in Poland:

„There [*her son and wife in Germany*] is only one person working. He is securing the livelihood of the family. And they do not have any problems; they take cars and travel on vacation, just like that. And here, you know how it is. If you have a job, you have to work. When I observe, when we are there [*visiting them in Germany*], then I think that you can live better there” (Jagoda, aged 60, Poland).

It is not only migration reasons which are differentiated, for example between purely economic and for self-realization, but also on a more general level, affects distinctions between ‘here’ in Poland and ‘there’ in Germany by drawing on differences in ways and standards of living. Achieving a good standard of life, which may mean gendered task division, is perceived as a migration success. This is furthermore displayed by the fact that although they are earning only one income, they can easily go for vacation “*just like that*”. Their life situation is perceived to allow for spontaneity, while work life in

Poland is characterized by long working hours and an insecure and strict working regime, “*if you have a job, you have to work*”. Life in Germany seems to allow for more free time and economic independency, while the dependency of the women from the husband in this male- breadwinner model remains uncontested by grandparents’ generation in Poland. It is interpreted by both as a freedom of choice for women, who in Germany do not have to be involved in two working fields- inside and outside the home.

Evaluations of an easier and economically secure life are also described by patterns of transnational communication between friends and within families. Migrants reflect expectations for a better economic situation from relatives and friends in Poland, which may place the responsibility for getting in touch and maintaining contact on those migrating:

“Those, who are in England, they call me. But in Poland they have the imagination, that I have more money and that I can afford doing international phone calls. (...) I call her every day that is my problem. I believe, that they have the imagination that for me it’s easier, financially, and that when you live in Poland it’s very expensive to call. This is how I explain to myself, that my friend, who I always visit when I am there that she never calls me” (Marta, 35 years old, Germany).

Many migrants share the experience that they are the ones having to visit and/or call in order to maintain familial contact. They rationalize this by assuming that for those in Germany, and from the German perspective, it is “*easier financially*”. This is tied to asymmetries within transnational relationships, and may be causing future exclusions from transnational networks for those who do not or cannot meet their obligation for maintaining contacts.

Conclusion: settled in mobility or stuck in non-mobility?

Respondents are characterized by different forms and degrees of transnational attachments, meaning that their frames of reference and actions refer to both Poland and the ‘West’, mainly Germany. Migration often changes frames of reference and constructions of the ‘national’ for migrants, but also for their relatives. The differences people construct and experiences they have are tied to different types of ‘embodiment’ of crossing borders and reveal a symbolic dimension of spatial mobility that indicates hierarchies in transnational social spaces.

Studies on multiple attachments of subjects and transnational social spaces predominantly make use of a ‘transnational’ or ‘cosmopolitan’ perspective. These academic perspectives share a common occupation with theorizing the contemporary subject as ‘uprooted’ from a local/national embedding. While the transnational perspective takes socio-spatial categories and identities as empirical questions, the cosmopolitan perspective often rests on assumptions about subject’s “*reflexive* openness and awareness of others” (cf. Skrbiš and Woodward 2011).

Migration from Poland to the ‘West’ is a common livelihood strategy tied to notions of “bivalent lifestyles” and “incomplete migration” (cf. Jaźwińska and Okólski 2001), and “settlement in mobility” (Morokvasic, 2004). This argument indicates that people who commute between countries mainly for economic reasons stay mobile as long as they can in order to improve their livelihood. What occurs is a ‘settlement’ in mobility as an alternative form of socialization. However “bivalence” and “settlement in mobility” may be contradicting the strong orientations towards ‘normalcy’. In fact, bivalence may have negative implications for family life and life-scripts as many respondents perceive a bivalent life-style as a danger for their families. Since 2011, the Polish-German social space has been promising free mobility and settlement between countries. This includes a discourse that everybody can be mobile, and even the expectation that people should be mobile, especially for those with difficulties with difficulties in adapting to the post-socialist condition (Warczok and Zarycki 2014) and indicates a deep cultural enactment and symbolic value of international migration in the Polish case (see Garapich 2011).

Although Poland is a comparatively wealthy country, emigration from Poland is persistently high. Taking the symbolic perspective of valuations of spatial mobility as well as meanings of a ‘normal’ life, the puzzle of constantly high emigration rates appears less enigmatic. International migration to ‘West’, symbolized by freedom and individualized and more secure life-scripts, as well as the symbolic meanings of movement through space in themselves, offers an explanation for migration outflows from Poland. This case also indicates processes of hierarchization in a transnational social space between Poland and Germany.

Ascriptions of mobility as a disposition in itself, and mobility as a trait one can acquire by being physically mobile construct a certain paradox. Ascriptions of mobility influence ascriptions within families, mainly between those who are mobile and those

who are not. The mobiles are ascribed as ‘self-developing’ and individual pioneers, while those who are immobile are apprehended in immobility, collectivity and lower degrees of reflexivity. It appears that the immobiles cannot improve their situation due to their lack of previous migration experience. Not being able to migrate and change their lives for the better, they can be understood as ‘trapped in immobility’. Lacking encounters with the ‘other’, their ‘deprived’ situation is not reflexively accessible by themselves.

Here, we achieve an empirical indication that literature on “mobility capital” (Brodersen 2014) has discussed, namely that exclusions from international mobility is not only due to legal restrictions or ‘tangible’ commitments, such as work or family, but also that some seemingly have not entered or cannot enter the ‘learning process’ required for movement through space:

“However, it seems important to also insist on the more processual and cumulative (Bourdieu 1997) character of the capacity to be mobile – mobility capital: it is through a learning process whilst being ‘on the move’ that individuals acquire the competences for consecutive mobilities” (Brodersen 2014: 99).

The empirical account of ascriptions between and within families composed of mobiles and non-mobiles enriches a ‘cosmopolitan’ perspective, which through its focus on ‘openness’ to the others runs the risk of falling into the trap of devaluating the non-cosmopolitanism ‘other’. Anderson addresses the non-mobile parochial subject, unwilling and unable to leave and overcome its parochial surrounding:

“As a consequence, the elective cosmopolitanism is also selective; it does not represent a general openness to ‘Others’ in the world, but to those ‘Others’ who occupy the same social context” (Anderson, 2012: 159).

Bibliography

Amelina, A. (2011): *Intersectional Approach to Complexity of Social Support*. in: Chow, E., Texler Segal, M. and Tan L. (eds.) *Analyzing Gender, Intersectionality, and Multiple Inequalities: Global, Transnational and Local Contexts*, *Advances in Gender Research*, Special Issue 15(2): 211–234.

Anderson, M. (2012): *Cosmopolitan Practices in social Contexts: Swedish skilled Migrants in the Netherlands*. *Crossings: Journal of Migration & Culture* 4 (2): 155-173

Baumann, Z. (2000): *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Beck, U., Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995): *The Normal Chaos of Love*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Broderson, M. (2014): *Mobility: Ideological Discourse and Individual Narratives*. In: Gerhards, J., Hans, S., Carlson, S. (eds.): *Globalisierung, Bildung und grenzüberschreitende Mobilität*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag: 93-110
Cavanaugh, W.T. (2008): *Migrant, Tourist, Pilgrim, Monk: Mobility and Identity in a Global Age*. *Theological Studies*: 340-356.

Favell, A. (2008): *Eurostars and Eurocities: Free Movement and Mobility in an Integrating Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell

Garapich, M (2011): *Transnationalism revisited – a Decade of Migration between Poland and the United Kingdom*. Introduction to the Special Issue “*Studia Migracyjne-Przegląd Polonijny*” 1: 5-11

Giddens, A. (1990): *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press

Guarnizo, L.E., Smith, M.P. (1998): *Transnationalism from Below*. New Brunswick/New Jersey: Transaction Publishers

Hitzler, R. (2001): *Pioniere einer anderen Moderne? Existenzbasteln als Innovationsmanagement*. In: *Sozialwissenschaften und Berufspraxis (SUB)*, 24. (2): 177-191

Jaźwińska, E., Okólski, M., (2001): *Ludzie na huśtawce: Migracje między peryferjami Polski i Zachodu*. Warszawa: Scholar

Lopez Rodriguez, M. (2010): *Migration and a Quest for 'Normalcy'. Polish migrant Mothers and the Capitalization of meritocratic Opportunities in the UK*. *Social Identities* 16 (3): 339-358

Lutz, H. (2008) (ed.): *Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme*. Aldershot: Ashgate

Massey, D. (1990): *Social Structure, Household Strategies, and the Cumulative Causation of Migration*. *Population Index* 56 (1): 3-26.

Morokvasic, M. (2004): "Settled in Mobility": *Engendering post-wall migration in Europe*. *Feminist Review* 77: 7-25

Nowicka, M. (2014): *Migrating Skills, skilled Migrants and Migration Skills: The Influence of Contexts on the Validation of Migrants' Skills*. *Migration Letters* 11 (2): 171-186

Schmidtke, O. (2004): *Die „unsichtbare“ polnische Community in Deutschland: Die strategische Entdramatisierung von kollektiver Identität*. In: Eder, K., Rauer, V. and Schmidtke, O. (eds.): *Die Einhegung des Anderen. Türkische, polnische und russlanddeutsche Einwanderer in Deutschland*. Opladen: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften: 131-158

Skrbiš, Z., Woodward, I. (2007): *The Ambivalence of ordinary Cosmopolitanism: Investigating the Limits of Cosmopolitan Openness*. *The Sociological Review* 55 (4):730–747

Stark, O., Bloom, D. (1985): *The New Economics of Labour Migration*. *The American Economic Review* 75: 173-178

Warczok, T., Zarycki, T. (2014): *Bourdieu recontextualized: Redefinitions of Western critical Thought in the Periphery*. *Current Sociology* 26

White, A. (2011): *Polish Families and Migration since EU-accession*. Bristol: The Policy Press