

## **Janusz Mucha**

AGH University in Krakow

### MIGRATION AND THE TRANSMISSION OF CULTURAL PATTERNS. INTRODUCTION

This volume presents readers with partial findings from a 2015 project sponsored by the Committee for Migration Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences ‘Migrations in the 21st Century – Choice, Necessity or Coercion.’ We concentrate here on the transmission of cultural patterns due to recent migration processes. Although our focus is on the emigration of Poles after the accession of Poland to the European Union (2004) and the opening up of labour markets in most of the Union’s member-states, we cannot overlook other types of post-migration cultural transmission. Therefore, internal migration of the Kurdish ethnic minority to Istanbul, as well as ‘new’ problems presented by the wars in the Middle East and the resulting large-scale migrations of refugees to the Union cannot escape attention of scholars. Equally interesting would be the analysis of short term and long term immigration to post-accession Poland by both highly skilled (e.g., experts, engineers, managers, artists, researchers) and low-skilled workers (regardless of the sense of this simplified bipolar distinction) and we are planning the publication of these research findings in the not-so-remote future. Foreign college students coming to Poland are a group we already are interested in for this volume (recent literature places mobile college students between the high- and low- skilled collectivities, classifying this group as ‘middling’ migrants; the class dimension of migration processes continues to be important; see, e.g., Luthra and Platt 2016). Polish social sciences do not neglect recent immigration processes and we can witness an increasing number of conferences and books devoted to this issue. New developments demand our constant attention – new research, debates and publications.

Migrations, understood here as intended (regardless of reasons), voluntary or otherwise, spatial mobility of individuals, families or larger collectivities, are as obvious and old as humanity. Even if over decades there has been no significant or rapid increase in this phenomenon (in terms of proportions) on a global scale, the volume of migrating populations is gradually increasing. Everywhere and always, migrations change the structural and cultural situation of the countries of origin and countries of destination, and intensify cultural

differentiation, both in sending and in receiving regions. In host societies, migrations disrupt established and normalized patterns of behaviour. With the return of migrants (and these kinds of processes of mobility also represent an extensive and significant topic of migration literature) or communication between them and their relatives and friends left behind, the cultural patterns (as well as their material manifestations) characterizing the target regions enter, physically or mentally, the sending countries. Out of necessity, we concentrate in this volume on so-called transmigration, understood here as dynamic networks involving both the mobile people (sometimes 'neo-nomads') and their immobile 'significant others,' whose life practices, information about outside worlds and their general worldviews are dependent (at least partly) on migration processes. The kinds of migration networks and processes shaping them are, actually, rarely finished and cannot be limited to one-directional mobility: from one sending country to one receiving country. In this volume, when we use the terminology of one-directionality, this is only for the sake of simplicity.

There are many types of migrations and, therefore, many typologies debated in social sciences. One such typology was coined by Anthony Richmond in 1994. We can roughly divide migrants (at least those of the last half a century) into 'reactive' and 'proactive.' The first type would consist mostly of people whose decisions are reactions to circumstances, to a large extent beyond their control, e.g., relocated workers, forced labourers, war victims, refugees, displaced persons. These people usually experience hardship and their destiny is in the hands of more powerful political and economic bodies. Their freedom to move is increasingly limited. The latter type would refer to the spatial mobility related to a relatively unconstrained choice. People engaged in this activity make decisions regarding whether to move at all or not to move, when to move, where to go, how long to stay, whether to travel alone or with relatives or friends, etc. This type of migrants, usually highly skilled people (educated in the sending countries and occupying very qualified positions in host societies), is characterized by a high level of agency and is usually welcome by the target societies. Reactive migrants rarely have the intention to introduce a cultural change in receiving societies, but still they do so, both within the system of their own cultural patterns practiced now in the new environment and in this new environment as such. Proactive migrants usually have the intention to introduce this change, but succeed only partially (at least initially). Both groups find themselves in situations of culture contact which brings profits both to them and to the host society, but simultaneously stimulates tensions and conflicts, of varying levels of intensity and permanence. The overwhelming majority of those migrants with whom we are dealing in this volume belong to the proactive type, even if they are not necessarily 'elite migrants' or highly skilled (in the target society) migrants. The intention of their mobility was to improve the standard of living of both themselves and their immediate families, and they wished to live comfortably in the host society: to adjust to some patterns they encountered due to migration and to retain those important for them, brought from the country of origin. In a sense, they transform the host societies – confront them with ways of life not yet experienced before immigration.

The concept of 'patterns of culture' was introduced on a large scale to social sciences by scholars belonging to the broadly understood 'culture and personality' school in American cultural anthropology. Ralph Linton, in his 'The Cultural Background of Personality' (1945),

refers to culture as a configuration of learned behaviour or configuration of patterns of culture. One of Ruth Benedict's famous books, that of 1934, was entitled 'The Patterns of Culture.' In its first chapter, cultural anthropology is defined as a science of customs. Importantly, customs do not appear, according to the author, at random but rather in configurations. And these configurations are patterns of cultures of various tribes and other cultural groups. In our volume, the contributors do not refer directly to the 'culture and personality approach' in American cultural anthropology or to the above mentioned books. However, they do often refer to the concepts of acculturation and adaptation (to a lesser degree – assimilation). All these concepts refer to a more or less radical and permanent transmission of cultural patterns due, primarily, to migration.

In 1935, the (American) Social Science Research Council established a Committee consisting of great American anthropologists, Robert Redfield, Ralph Linton and Melville J. Herskovits, who were to prepare a memorandum defining acculturation and presenting the basic empirical and theoretical research agenda. In 1936, in the 'Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation,' the Committee came up with the following result: 'Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups' (Redford, Linton and Herskovits 1936: 149). This definition became incorporated in the UNESCO dictionary as the official standpoint of the organization and has been referred to ever since.

Despite strong criticism of acculturation, adaptation and assimilation theoretical models which soon followed, these concepts returned, transformed under the influence of new empirical developments, after decades and were picked up by our contributors. They refer mostly to the 1989 and 1997 works of Canadian cultural psychologist John W. Berry (his first important works in this field come from the mid-1970s; he is still actively developing his model; I will refer here to only one of his works) and his associates and followers as well as to the 2005 article of Spanish social scientist Marisol Navas and her collaborators. There is no need to devote much attention to these ideas in the introduction (they are elaborated further in the volume), but nevertheless I would like to focus on some important thoughts. Berry (with his colleagues) developed a model of psychological acculturation processes which inspired research focused on three basic issues: a) acculturation attitudes (ways in and the extent to which migrants intended to maintain their cultural identity when interacting with members of other groups constituting the host society), b) migrants' changes in their behaviour or ways of life in the receiving country, depending on various characteristics, c) stress originating due to the necessity to confront the migrating situation. In Berry's opinion, when analyzing acculturation (assimilation, adaptation), one has to separately consider: a) migrants' intention to maintain their (at least some) original cultural patterns, and b) their intention to adapt to some patterns dominant in the receiving society. If, obviously simplifying, we attribute only two values (yes or no) to each of the two dimensions, we come up with a four-field model of attitudes adopted by migrants: a) integration (yes/yes), b) assimilation (no/yes), c) separation (yes/no) and d) marginalization (no/no). Subsequent studies have shown that most migrants prefer integration and are against marginalization. However, various migrant groups prefer different acculturation options, and these migrant groups are rarely homogenous in their

disposition to acculturation. Follow-up theoretical and empirical research has proved that it is necessary to analyze not only the migrants' perspective, but that of the host society as well. New models stressed the idea that the receiving country's population usually has different approaches to migrants' acculturation, depending on their characteristics, and that both immigrants and host society group strategies can change from generation to generation. Despite strong critical debates, published for instance in 1989 and in 1998 (see also Berry's reaction to criticism; 2009), the above distinction is still used in intercultural psychology and cultural anthropology.

Debate within cultural psychology continues, including more and more factors into the models of acculturation. Marisol Navas' (and her colleagues) 'Relative Acculturation Extended Model' (RAEM), implemented by some of our contributors, builds upon the former theoretical developments of intercultural psychology: a) joint consideration of the acculturation strategies of both the immigrants and the host society, b) differentiation of the body of immigrant groups, c) significance of societal as well as psychological factors for the acculturation processes. The Spanish scholars add new factors: d) a distinction between, on the one hand, acculturation attitudes preferred by both generalized involved parties (immigrants and host society), or the 'ideal situation' and, on the other hand, the strategies actually adopted, or the 'real situation,' e) the consideration of various domains of socio-cultural reality in which different strategies can be proposed (social policies and politics, workplace, economy, family, social relations, religion, mentality). Based on former research, the Spanish scholars stress the idea according to which it is profitable to distinguish between the 'hard core' (private action, or symbolic) zone and the 'periphery' (public action, material) zones in the cultures of the groups in question. Attitudes (behaviour, customs, patterns) tend to be more strongly maintained and defended in the former than in the latter zone, which has consequences for potential societal conflicts and their ways of resolution. Acculturation, both of the migrant groups to the host society and the host society to the cultures of immigrants, will always be partial and selective.

Another interesting concept, useful for the analysis of the transmission of cultural patterns (and applied in our volume by one of the authors) was suggested by Antonina Kłosowska (2001). She stressed the significance of studying individual ways of the usage of elements of the 'cultural syntagma' (understood as a national cultural structure). Within this conceptualization, the dominant factor shaping this usage would be 'culturalization,' understood as a process reassembling socialization but emphasizing the development of cultural identity in the course the individual's life. Peer groups, as well as individual 'significant others' who act as gate-keepers of contacts with a given culture, play a fundamental role during this process. They stimulate the individual's contact with the cultural content (such as beliefs, ideologies, art) and, as a result, these encounters shape one's cultural identity. It seems that cultural transmission partly depends on practices which may have an individual character, but which are affected by certain collective social actors, e.g., political or cultural elites.

It should be at least mentioned that the very concept of assimilation, after years of criticism, seems to have become increasingly significant in the social sciences, even before the recent (2015–2016) refugee crisis started. As early as 2001, Rogers Brubaker believed the shift from an overwhelming focus on persisting cultural differences to a much broader focus

encompassing emerging commonalities had taken place. In his opinion, although the term 'assimilation' had returned to public (including scholarly) debates, the concept had been transformed. After discussing a number of elements of this transformation, he concludes that the concept of assimilation seems to be not only useful but also indispensable. This concept enables us, in his opinion, not only to ask questions about the domain and degrees of emergent similarities in multicultural societies, but also about persisting differences between multi-generational populations of migrants and host societies. We could add, from this volume, that the concept of assimilation gives us a chance to ask new questions concerning the range of possible transmission of cultural patterns.

Among many interesting and large theory-driven research projects on the 'new' immigration in Europe, I would like to mention that funded by the Norface Research Programme on Migration, i.e. the SCIP ('Socio-cultural Integration Processes among New Immigrants in Europe') project, initiated in 2009. More than 8,000 recently arrived immigrants to four European societies from a number of countries of origin (within the European Union, e.g. Poland, and from outside of it) were surveyed soon after their arrival. Many were re-interviewed after about 1.5 years. Unfortunately, the already published findings concentrate mostly on integration in the labour market and the educational system. Despite the project's original emphasis on migrants' cultural identities, we still have not learnt much about the processes of the transmission of cultural patterns in either direction, with the exception of language acquisition (see, e.g., the journal 'Ethnicity' and its Special Issue: New Migrants' Socio-Cultural Integration; 16, 2, 2016; Diehl et al. 2016).

Another interesting, and potentially fruitful for the analysis of transmission of cultural patterns (as well as barriers to this transmission), field of research are studies on the social, symbolic and structural boundaries. Initiated in today's sense by the famous collection edited by Fredrik Barth on ethnic groups and boundaries (1969), further analyzes developed in the 21st century concentrate on relations between migrants and receiving countries as well as on the dynamic structures of multicultural societies. Boundaries are important in the context of our project, because they hinder transmission of cultural patterns, regardless of the characteristics of the parties building these boundaries. Sometimes they are themselves the long-lasting and relatively strict cultural and structural norms, sometimes they are intentionally constructed only recently, more or less tentatively. The strength and permanence of these boundaries are important for internal group cohesiveness, integration and solidarity, but at the same time hinder relations between the groups. However, in modern dynamic societies the boundaries are very often mutable, porous and permeable. Michele Lamont and Virag Molnar (2002), as well as Christopher A. Bail (2008), Andreas Wimmer (2008) and other scholars are of the opinion that there is a considerable variation in the kinds of boundaries groups construct in order to separate themselves from others. Lamont and Molnar, for instance, distinguish (assuming, however, the relative character of the distinction) between symbolic and social boundaries. The former are conceptual distinctions made by social actors which separate people into groups and generate feelings of similarity and group belonging. The latter are 'objectified forms' of social differences, manifested in unequal access to or unequal distribution of social resources and opportunities. Wimmer stresses the fact that boundaries are quite often the result of political struggle between neighbouring parties and are shifting.

I would like to summarize this discussion on acculturation, assimilation, and the transmission of cultural patterns. Why are the traditional concepts of acculturation or assimilation not sufficient? It seems to me that these concepts are biased, in the sense that they underestimate the complexity of the processes we are interested in. Modern cultures are rarely homogenous. They consist of patterns which are coordinated differently in different societies in different times. Within the same culture, different classes, generations, gender groups etc. can practice different patterns. These look different in the various fields composing modern cultures. Taken from migration processes, the patterns are transferred across cultural boundaries, some very tight, and some mutable, porous and permeable. The patterns travel across these boundaries, modifying all parties involved. Therefore, transmission is not a one-way process. The transmission of cultural patterns involves: a/ complex societies of origin, b/ migrants who maintain some contacts and feel responsible for those left behind, and c/ various groups in host societies. The migrants bring some patterns to the target countries: they practice these in their own ethnic enclaves but also affect the host society and its patterns. They adopt some patterns from the host societies to practice them in their own enclaves, but also 'send' them 'back home' – modifying the countries of origin.

Let us move to the content of this volume, to the more 'empirical' issues which I would like to stress. Due to migration, patterns of family structures and roles, gender roles in the societies of origin and host societies, ways of application of technologies, the ways of social (including political) organization etc. of migrating groups are transferred in the transnational field within a network of at least three kinds of individual and collective actors, but rarely in a similar way. The parties involved in these processes are not only immigrants and host societies, but also sending countries, in particular those collectivities within them who have direct contacts with migrants. Cultural patterns established and rooted in one kind of structural and cultural circumstances are moved to the others. For instance, the following may be reinterpreted and transferred: ideas of democracy, social security and safety, social dialogue, education on various levels, mass media and the accepted levels of their freedom, ways voluntary associations and other non-governmental organizations function including trade unions, leisure and sport activity, ways of childcare and eldercare, sending and accepting social remittances, etc. We address these issues in our volume.

It seems to be important to approach our topics in a critical way, following recent developments in migration as well as minority theories. This critical attitude concerns, first of all, the former concentration on one-way transfers, the stress on the positive functions of cultural transfers, and their potential to stimulate growth and development (which, in fact, look different depending on the group perspective). It seems that one should pay more attention to the circulation of cultural transfers, to both positive functions and dysfunctions, from the sending society, receiving society, migration groups as cultural entities (but also characterized by weaker or stronger normative differentiation) and migrating individuals with their intentions to organize anew their own life in new social environments, retaining some old cultural patterns and accepting some new ones.

Our contributions address the issue of the transmission of cultural patterns as a result of recent migration processes. However, as mentioned above, in such a small collection it is not possible to cover the whole territory – neither the field of contemporary migrations nor the

themes presented above, important for many social scientists. Therefore, what we do is offer some examples. During the last decade, Polish emigration opened new important directions and target societies, e.g., Scandinavia and Ireland, without, however, neglecting Germany and the United Kingdom. Therefore, we concentrate on these examples. We focus on new, mostly relatively young middle-class migrants who are deeply rooted in Polish culture, but are at the same time open to new experiences, new patterns of culture, new ways of individual and institutional collective practices and also to the potential continuation of mobility. Most of them migrate with their immediate families, but leave some ‘significant others’ (relatives) ‘back home,’ and feel responsible for their wellbeing. As mentioned at the beginning of this Introduction, one must not overlook recent processes of migration, in particular when they have a strong ‘ethnic flavour,’ which occur outside of the regular field of interest of the Polish scholars. Kurds migrating to the multicultural capital city of Turkey, Istanbul, exemplify this case in our volume. Theoretically speaking, issues debated in this chapter are very similar to the issues involving migration processes of Poles.

The volume begins with a contribution from Łukasz Krzyżowski, who discusses the issue of the heterogeneity of recent Polish emigration (to European, traditional for Poles, target countries): their transnational social networks and particularly transfers of social remittances. The next three articles analyze the very new, newer than the United Kingdom and Germany, emigration direction: Scandinavia. Małgorzata Budyta-Budzyńska is interested in the transmission of organizational patterns between Poland and Iceland. Monika Nowicka discusses the transmission of leisure time patterns, holiday celebration patterns, also between Iceland and Poland. Radosław Kossakowski, Magdalena Herzberg and Magdalena Żadkowska are interested in transmission of sport-related attitudes and practices from Norwegian culture to Polish immigrants. Our next contribution, by Karolina Podgórska, deals with immigration to Poland. Her field research report is an analysis of the ways educational migrants to Poland use new information and computer technologies both to adapt to their target country and to make communication with the ‘back home’ easier and more efficient. The last article presents an interesting case, in which the discriminated against Kurdish minority in Turkey both adopts and transforms Turkish cultural patterns in Istanbul.

Both the editor and the contributors would like to express their appreciation for the work and effort of the reviewers and their interesting and very thoughtful comments on both the whole volume and individual articles.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bail, Christopher A. 2008. *The Configuration of Symbolic Boundaries against Immigrants in Europe*, “American Sociological Review” 73, February: 37–59.
- Barth, Fredrik (ed.). 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, London: George Allen and Unwin
- Benedict, Ruth. 1934. *Patterns of Culture*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Berry, John W. 2009. *A critique of critical acculturation*, “International Journal of Intercultural Relations” 33, 5: 361–371.

- Brubaker, Rogers. 2001. *The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany and the United States*, "Ethnic and Racial Studies" 24: 531–548.
- Diehl, Claudia, Marcel Lubbers, Peter Muehlau and Lucinda Platt. 2016. *Starting out: New migrants' socio-cultural integration trajectories in four European destinations*, "Ethnicities" 16, 2: 157–179.
- Kłoskowska, Antonina. 2001. *National Cultures at the Grass-Root Level*, Budapest and New York: Central European University Press.
- Lamont, Michele and Virag Molnar. 2002. *The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences*, "Annual Review of Sociology" 28: 167–195.
- Linton, Ralph. 1945. *The Cultural Background of Personality*, Oxford: Appleton-Century.
- Luthra, Renee and Lucinda Platt. 2016. *Elite or middling? International students and migrant diversification*, "Ethnicities" 16, 2: 316–344.
- Navas, Marisol, Maria C. Garcia, Juan Sanchez, Antonio J. Rojas, Pablo Pumares and Juan S. Fernandez. 2005. *Relative Acculturation Extended Model (RAEM): New Contributions with regard to the study of acculturation*, "International Journal of Intercultural Relations" 29: 21–37.
- Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton and Melville J. Herskovits. 1936. *Memorandum on the study of acculturation*, "American Anthropology" 38: 149–152.
- Richmond, Anthony. 1994. *Proactive and reactive migration*, in: Anthony H. Richmond (ed.), *Global Apartheid. Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order*, Toronto et al.: Oxford University Press, pp. 47–74.
- Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. *The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory*, "American Journal of Sociology" 113, 4: 970–1022.