

Home: Mobilities, Belongings and Identities

Introduction

In the 1939 film *The Wizard of Oz*, Dorothy runs away from home and is later swept away to the land of Oz. In that fantastical place, she encounters many perils, but also makes new friends. Together, each of the friends overcomes their fears, learns to recognise they already had the skills they desired, and understands that they have the power to shape their own futures. While the film is often described as a coming-of-age story, it is also a story in which migration and attachments to home play central roles. For all of Dorothy's experiences in Oz, as wonderful and frightening as they might have been, she is reminded, "There's no place like home."

Dorothy, like other migrants, has a complicated relationship with home. She needs to escape it, in part to save her dog, but also to develop into an adult. Yet she is loathe to break ties completely for fear of losing her sense of self and for fear of losing touch with the people closest to her. But looming over the entire film is also the question of whether Dorothy ever left home. Dorothy's Aunt Em, for instance, tries to convince Dorothy it was all a dream, that she had been hit on the head by a storm window, and that she had been in Kansas the entire time.

Contemporary migrants may be much like Dorothy in the way that home is dreamt, conceptualised and experienced. Scholars have often relied on transnationalism as a major analytic tool for understanding migrants' entangled connections and the networks and social formations that link homes in their place of origin and in the places to which they move. While many of these researchers have highlighted the shifting and mobile meanings that migrants give to home, there has been a tendency to underplay the resilience of its stable, bounded and fixed interpretations. The challenge for geographers and other social scientists is to conceptualize the simultaneity of home as sedentary and as mobile. We use a review of recent literature on transnational migration to advance the claim that home must be conceptualised as both both dynamic and as moored in order to reflect the complexity and ambivalence that makes it such a tricky and slippery concept. In particular, such an approach will help to enrich research that explores the ways in which home is

experienced both as a location and as a set of relationships that shape identities and feelings of belonging. While we use the transnationalism and international migration literatures, with their emphases on crossing and reimagining international borders, we argue that even people who do not cross such borders live in homes that experienced in many of the same ways – as locations, as relationships, as simultaneously fixed and fluid. In this way, the migrant serves as a figure through which we can understand home, its definition, meanings and implications for the ways we live our lives.

As the above statement suggests, home is a multidimensional concept, and this makes it difficult to define, conceptualise and operationalise in research (Mallet 2004).

Home contains variegated and overlapping aspects that are intimately related, yet at the same time distinct. Blunt and Varley (2004), for example, analyse home from the perspective of its dominant dimensions: namely, home and its relationships with place, identity, and belonging. Yet each of these dimensions, we argue, must also be understood as embedding the tension between home as mobile and home as stable. While this adds a level of complexity to the understanding of home, it also better describes the ways in which home is conceptualised by migrants and the ways that it is experienced and given meaning.

In the first section of the paper, we review existing literature that examines the dimension of place in relation to migrants' homes. Following this, we examine further strands of migration scholarship that examines the relationships between migrants' homes as an expression of identity and with the closely allied notion of belonging. We conclude by suggesting a conceptualisation of home as being accordion-like, in that it stretches to expand migrants outwards to distant and remote places, while also squeezing to embed them in their proximate and immediate locales. In this way, home seems to extend outward and to be mobile, but also to be grounded and sedentary. Such a conceptualisation, we argue, better reflects the ways in which migrants and perhaps other people, as well, understand and experience home. In the final section of the paper, we draw together the ideas to outline a way of approaching home that combines its sedentary and mobile aspects for migrants, and indeed, for all of us.

Geographies of home and migration: A question of place

One recurrent and dominant strand of research on home relates it to a fixed, bounded and discreet place. Inspired by philosophical writings on the power of place-attachments (Bachelard 1958; Casey 1993, 1998; Heidegger 1971), this approach examines the ways a sense of home plays an important role in grounding people to a particular place, a place like no other. Yet in recent years, scholars have begun to problematize the “sedentarist analytic bias” (Chu 2006, 397) that sees home as a fixed, bounded and enclosed site, as the analytical focus shifts to the threshold-crossing capacity of home to extend and connect people and places across time and space (Brettell 2006; Datta 2010; Nowicka 2006). This is especially the case in research on migrants’ homes, because the very act of moving throws into question the ability to locate people in specific places, specific homes (Staeheli and Nagel, 2006). The increasing speed, intensity, frequency and volume of human mobility and migration around the globe is sometimes claimed to saturate all facets of contemporary life (Urry 2000). In particular, migrant transnationalism, and the rise of a transnational paradigm in migration studies, often provides a theoretical framework for analyzing the location-spanning social, economic and political ties that migrants sustain across borders and emphasises the ‘bifocality’ (Rouse 1991), the ‘dual frame of reference’ (Guarnizo 1997) or ‘binationality’ (Kyle 2000) that migrants create and maintain. Both place of origin and destination influence migrants’ routine practices and everyday lives, leading to their effective refusal to simply be located in just one place (Al-Ali and Khoser 2002; Baldassar 1997; Basch et al. 1994).

It is in this context that many commentators challenge the way home is often imagined as bounded, and instead offer a conceptualisation of home as messy, mobile, blurred and confused (Ahmed et al. 2003; Nowicka 2006, 2007). From this perspective, it is important to examine the ways in which migrants continue to ‘ground’ their lives astride locations and to consider how home is already inflected with mobility – and conversely, with the ways mobility is inflected with gestures of attachment (Easthope 2009; Flynn 2007; Lamb 2002; Walsh 2006b). In response to this, a number of geographers investigate mobile geographies of home, looking at the ways in which migrants dwell through travel, and vice versa (Ahmed et al. 2003; Blunt 2007; Blunt and Dowling 2006; Blunt and Varley 2004; Fortier 1999, 2001). These studies suggest that mobility *and* stasis, displacement *and* placement, as well as roots *and* routes go into the making of home (Ahmed et al. 2003; Clifford 1997;

Gustafson 2001). In other words, in order to grasp the empirical reality of contemporary meanings of home and home-making practices for migrants, it is necessary, as David Morley (2000, 41) argues, to reconceptualize “the conventional contrast between traditional, place-based notions of home . . . and the contemporary experience of globalization in such a way that we might see this not as a contrast between presence and absence of an experience of homeliness but rather as two different modalities of this experience.”

One particularly detailed examination of this reworking of the relationship between place and mobility is Magdalena Nowicka’s (2006, 2007) research on the experience of home for United Nations staff members. Given that their roles periodically place them in new countries, Nowicka examines specifically *how* homes are localised and territorially pinned down for her respondents. Refusing to assume that home is a stable physical place where domestic life is realised, Nowicka examines home as the emplacement of practices at varied geographical stretch and as an entity that is attached yet mobile. Here home is understood as a dynamic process of localising particular sets of relationships that do not necessarily depend on the essential qualities of a place. Home, in other words, is a process, an achievement involving both the people we share home with but also the material objects therein.

The importance of material objects in creating a sense of home and of sustaining relationships that help to constitute home can hardly be overstated. Possessions, Tolia-Kelly (2004, 317) argues, “are connective markers to geographical nodes of identification. Through their prismatic nature, ‘other’ lives, lands, and homes are made part of this one.” She continues that such material objects serve to both buffer individuals from the pressures of outside cultures, but also to help forge a feeling of identity and belonging somewhere, if not necessarily in the particular place they may occupy at a given moment. In this way, people and material objects can form the basis of home, establishing sets of relationships before these sediment to become what we have traditionally called ‘place’. For Nowicka (2006, 82), then, home is “a space in-becoming First, home arises out of sets of elements and relationships. Then home becomes localised and this localising has further effects.” In this context, the construction of home is not necessarily tied to a fixed location, but emerges out of the regular reiteration of social processes and sets of relationships to both humans and

non-humans (Hitchings 2004; Jacobs and Smith 2008; Miller 1998, 2001). Breaking down the binary of 'nomadic and 'sedentarist' paradigms of home reveals that it is the exclusive preserve of neither, but is implicated in both processes.

Yet forming and sustaining these relationships is not easy, and there is frequent dissonance between the lived and the ideal aspects of home. In other words, while home for migrants is very much about the real experience of establishing and maintaining connections and links between various locations, this does not detract from the continued salience of home's more idealized features. Re-memories of home (Tolia-Kelly 2004) through objects, for instance, can lead to a romanticised, nostalgic view that is often in tension with the day-to-day experience of home (Moore 2000). Previous research pays inordinate interest to the role that current circumstances – lived conditions – play in migrants' efforts to make sense of home, without paying sufficient attention to the important place of imagination, aspiration, and desire in shaping where they locate it. The yearned-for may be as significant as the 'real' in influencing where migrants place home.

As we have argued, research examining how migrants materially and symbolically 'ground' their lives across international borders is especially useful in enriching our appreciation of home. Yet as with all other aspects of social life, home and its relationships are intersectional, shaped by class, gender, 'race', sexuality, and other power-laden relationships. While home may be (some) men's castle, it is a castle riven with inequality, power, as well as love and care. Class, gender and various others power relations remain important determinants in shaping the experience of home for migrants. The challenge for geographers, therefore, is not only to examine migrants' articulations of mobile/grounded homes, but at the same time to interrogate the ways in which various power geometries influence such complex registers of home. In other words, it is crucial to investigate why home does not affect all migrants in the same way. For example, while they may share some common characteristics in terms of how they understand home, a refugee's experience of home qualitatively is likely to differ from that of elite business traveller's, the political exile's from the non-domiciled tax exile's, the asylum seeker's from the tourist's, and so on. In heeding the intensely political significance of home, feminist contributions to geographical thinking on home highlight that much of the domestic and emotional

work involved in the making of that place we call home is performed by unpaid, unrecognized female migrant labour (Espiritu 2003; Pratt and Yeoh 2003). Migration scholars influenced by post-colonial and post-structural perspectives further unpack some of the power structures governing migrants' attempts to fashion home in their new environments (Dwyer 2003). Importantly, the ability to expand home is part....of power.

In this way, conceptualisations of home as simultaneously mobile and sedentarist can be related to broader debates about the relationship between place and space. Massey (199_), for instance, describes a mobile sense of place in which....

Geographies of home and identity

It is worth repeating that home's dominant dimensions seep into one another, and maintaining analytical distinctions between them is difficult. Nevertheless, while acknowledging the similarities between the dimensions of place and identity, the research reviewed in this section differs from that of the previous insofar as we focus on studies that examine migrants' sense of who they understand themselves to be in relation to home. So in keeping with Blunt and Varley's (2004) framework for analysing home, a further seam of migration research shows how migrant identity is not a zero-sum game based on fixed identifications with a singular home. This research looks at the ways in which a loosening of identity moorings and markers allows for a fluid model of identification with various places, various homes, whereby many migrants articulate a multilayered, 'hybrid' identity that affirms the duality of their experience of self and home (Brubaker and Cooper 2000; Easthope 2009; Walter 2004, 2006; Yau 2007).

Not all migrants maintain the same level or types of transnational connections, and their patterns of integration to the host society vary significantly. A number of studies show that maintaining contact with places of origin in some instances serves as an adaptive response to the hostile or unreceptive host context in which migrants often

find themselves. Limited migrant integration may encourage transnational identifications with homes elsewhere, helping migrants to cope with the hardships of their new settings. The home country therefore forms an important component of migrants' identities – with the implication that such transnational identities may, at times, hinder or even prevent their integration on the ground. A good example of the ways in which transnational identification may impede assimilation in the new environment is given in Cohen and Sirkeci's (2005) account of Turkish-Kurds living in Germany. According to the authors' evidence, one outcome of sustained transnational activity is that Turkish-Kurds have limited interaction in Germany with non-Turkish-Kurds. This results in the formation of Turkish-Kurd ethnic-enclaves or ghetto-like neighbourhoods in Germany, and instead of creating new opportunities or integration, their cross-border identifications serve to reproduce existing economic and social inequalities between migrant and host society members.

The decentring and destabilizing of identification away from the notion of a singular, authentic home is, arguably, more evident for migrants than for those who remain in their original place of residence (Paspastergiadis 2001). As migrants maintain contacts across international borders, their identity is not necessarily tied to a unique home (Bagnoli 2007; Lam and Yeoh 2004). One implication of migration is that contemporary migrants continuously negotiate identities between 'old' and 'new' worlds, forging novel configurations of identification with home in both places (Appadurai 1996). In this context, the burgeoning research area of transnationalism is a keyword when studying this process of identity formation. Transnationalism – albeit a heterogeneous term covering a vast array of practices, social morphologies, types of consciousness, and so on – is defined here as the social, cultural, economic, political and personal links forged by migrants themselves between diaspora and their homelands. While the notion of migrant transnationalism has numerous historical precedents and parallels, scholars argue that what is new about contemporary forms of transnationalism is the intensity and scale of today's migrants' exchanges and connections between their host and home societies. Rather than movement from one place to another uprooting or deterritorializing migrants' identities – as has been intimated – what scholars witness among contemporary migrants is a strengthening and deepening of ties to both sending and receiving contexts. While not all migrants display transnational identities, numerous recent studies suggest a general and durable

re-orientation of the migrant *habitus* whereby old- and new-world values are conceptualized together to transform identities, transform homes (Haller and Landolt 2005; Levitt 2001; Levitt and Waters 2002). One revealing example of this is Ruba Salih's (2003) research on Moroccan women living in Italy. Focussing on their cooking practices, Salih shows how these women fuse elements of both countries' cuisines to symbolize their double identities in homes 'here' and 'there'. When in Italy, the women mix traditional Italian recipes with imported Moroccan ingredients to enliven the dishes; and conversely, returning to Morocco for holidays, Italian goods are used in the preparation of local Moroccan meals. Rather than seeing the women's identities in relation to specific homes as mutually exclusive, Salih demonstrates how the meaning of home is defined through interactive transnational identifications with homes stretched across geographically remote places.

This research on migrants' transnational identities shows how home is simultaneously lived both 'here' and 'there'. However, a focus on migrants' border-spanning linkages that maintain multiple identities to more than one home runs the risk of overlooking the complex ways in which migrants negotiate settlement in their new places of residence. Steven Vertovec (2009) points out that much of twentieth-century migration scholarship concentrated on the ways in which migrants adapted to their new environments, a process variously labelled as assimilation, integration, incorporation, or insertion. Vertovec (2009) argues that early work on transnationalism often emerged as a response to the dominance of the assimilation paradigm, and therefore focused on the previously neglected cross-border aspects of migrants' everyday lives and selves. For Vertovec and others (Ehrkamp 2005; Morawska 2004; Nagel 2002; Nagel and Staeheli 2008; Portes et al. 1999; Staeheli and Nagel 2006; Yeoh and Huang 2000), this early transnational migration scholarship – while offering a productive way of engaging with migrants' powerful attachments to homes and selves elsewhere – resulted in a lack of attention to migrants' struggles in their host societies. In this light, more recent research aims to advance understandings of transnationalism by considering how migrants maintain transnational connections *while* at the same time assimilating to their host societies. As Kivisto (2003, 19) puts it, “transnational immigration and assimilation/incorporation . . . need to be seen as interrelated.”

A renewed focus on migrants' assimilative practices in their current homes shows how transnational practices may, in fact, facilitate and strengthen local integration. Numerous recent studies show that rather than sustained transnational connections mitigating or weakening assimilation to the host environment, it is often the case that migrants' dual orientations and identifications with both home and host countries enhance assimilation in local spaces (Cohen and Sirkeci 2005; Jayawerra and Choudhry 2008; Staeheli and Nagel 2006). Staeheli and Nagel's research on Arab-American activists in the United States illustrates this connection between the maintenance of transnational ties and the enabling of local assimilation. In an effort to combat the stigma associated with Muslim populations in the United States post-9/11, the Arab-American activists spoke of how their complex identities to multiple homes enriched their sense of Americanness. In fact, some activists suggested that their multiple identifications with plural homes serves as a way of making them better Americans.

International migrants may be adept at negotiating selves simultaneously in homes 'here' and 'there'. Regardless, this does not obviate the desire of some migrants to pin-down the slippery and elusive nature of identifying with a discreetly-defined home. Much research stresses how migrants' retention of a desire to return home – the much-discussed 'myth of return' – is a symptom of their ongoing search for a stable sense of self in a world often characterised as in flux (Conway 2005). Numerous studies examining migrants' motives for wanting to return to their ancestral land, suggesting that the continuing instability of identity in diaspora drives the quest for an authentic sense of self allied to the act of 'coming home' (Christou 2002, 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Wessendorf 2007; Ralph 2009).

A further strand of the migration literature looks at the implications for identity once homecoming is realized for migrants. These studies highlight an emergent dissonance between the expectations and the realities of return, leading many returnees to underscore the ambivalence identities at home in the post-return context (Constable 1999, 2004; Conway and Potter 2009; Lomsky-Feder and Rapoport 2003; Ní Laoire 2007, 2008a, 2008b). As a number of studies demonstrate, returnees often consider the possibilities of re-emigration once the complex reality of returning is recognised, suggesting a revision of the idealized model of homecoming as restoration

of a fixed identification with home (Abdelhady 2008; Ley and Kobayashi 2005; Lidgard and Gilson 2002; Tsuda 2001, 2003). The gap that emerges between the dream and the reality of return results in disenchantment among many migrants who come home, leading some to revise their self-identities and articulate a liminal status as both insiders and outsiders. The literature on return migration, as returnees negotiate the old/new place of homecoming, is especially useful for interrogating the interplay between home's mobile and moored features, as well as for addressing the antagonism between the actual and the idealized meanings with which migrants imbue home.

The studies cited in this section show how migrants' identifications with homes play out in various and often unpredictable ways in relation to two important concepts in migration research: transnationalism and assimilation. What recent studies show, in effect, is that taken in isolation neither transnationalism nor assimilation tells the whole story of the migration process. Transnationalism, for its part, is not merely a case of forging links and identifications with the country left behind, while assimilation is not a linear trajectory of shedding connections with the place of origin and identifying totally with the host country. When conceived of as working in tandem and as co-existing processes, transnationalism *and* assimilation offer nuanced conceptual tools for researching migrants' identifications with home. Frequently absent from these accounts, however, is an explicit appreciation that migrants' multiple, hybrid and dynamic identifications with home may continue to idealize a stable identity with a fixed home (Pratt 1999; Tolia-Kelly 2006). In other words, missing from much research on migrants' fluid identifications with home is a sense of how the meaning of home incorporates both a lived and longed-for state. The articulation of a fragmented, partial and fluid identity does not preclude the yearning for an integrated, whole and stable identification with home (Varley 2008; Young 1997). Research on migrants' unfixed identities should reflect the continued salience of a singular and fixed model of identification with home as interwoven and implicated in their complex narratives of self.

Geographies of home and belonging

The dimension of belonging offers a useful entry point into interrogating migrants' attempts to make sense of home, as it trains the analytical lens explicitly on the social side of home. Belonging has two related aspects: the subjectively- and the socially-defined. The subjective side of belonging is in many respects synonymous with aspects of home's dimensions of place and identity. The ways in which migrants describe a sense of fitting in 'at home' shares several characteristics with their sense of place. Migrants' complex models of identification with home overlap in important ways with their articulations of multiple and ambivalent senses of belonging. However, the domain of belonging is distinguished from the others insofar as it facilitates a scrutinizing of the social definition of home.

Not only inclusion, but also the experience of exclusion (from national, domestic, institutional, socio-cultural formations, citizenship, and so on) in many instances first raises the question of belonging. Rather than belonging simply fostering warm feelings of fellowship to various peoples, places and cultures, for many the inability to participate in mainstream societal practices prompts awkward questions about affiliation and membership (Anthias 2001, 2002, 2008; Hedetoft and Hjort 2002). This experience of exclusion is often pointedly the case for migrants' encounters with members of their host societies (Bauman 2001; Bromley 2000; Kristeva 1991). Numerous studies show how migrants' bonds of belonging are influenced by the ways in which members of the host societies' dominant group impose categories of belonging upon them (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2006; Nash 2008; Salih 2003; Yuval-Davis 2006; Valentine et al. 2009). These studies foreground the issue that belonging is never entirely about migrants' subjective feelings of 'fitting in' or not, but also relates to how (powerful) others define who belongs to home according to specific spatial norms and expectations (Castles and Davidson 2000; Crowley 1999; Ilcan 2002). In these studies, while individual migrants may define themselves as feeling 'at home' in a particular place or places, self-definitions of belonging are partly dependent on being recognized by others for their legitimacy (Valentine et al. 2009). It is not sufficient to claim membership of a particular home; membership must be validated by the wider community or group to which one aspires to belong. In other words, the intimate question of belonging to home is intimately tied to the question of power and who wields it.

Belonging to home emerges out of entwined social processes of incorporation and exclusion that are partly self-defined, partly other-defined. This internal-external dialectic defining home, moreover, is in many cases predicated on an interplay of 'sameness' and 'difference' around the boundaries of who belongs to home, and who does not (Benhabib 1999; Madsen and van Naerssen 2003; Yeoh and Huang 2000). This means that part of the reason a person may be incorporated into any particular group or community stems from the fact that s/he shares certain criteria of similarity or 'sameness' with other members of the collectivity. Conversely, part of the reason a person may be excluded from belonging to the group results from in-group members categorizing her/him as different (and often inferior) and thereby not the same as 'them' (Pred 2000). This process of recruiting and excluding based on the perceived sameness and difference of in- and out-group members respectively works both within and between groups (Jenkins 2008). In other words, similar processes of belonging occur in intra-group as well as inter-group incorporation and exclusion. These processes, however, are arguably more evident for migrants, as they negotiate belonging intersubjectively in their new environments.

Many studies examine the ways in which migrants are constructed as not belonging to particular spaces because of their perceived difference from the mainstream members of their host society (Ehrhamp 2006; Gilmartin 2008; Gilmartin and White 2008; Magat 1999; Neal and Walters 2006). Migrants, because they often fail to meet normative expectations of behaviour, language, appearance, dress, eating habits, and countless other context-dependent etiquettes, are therefore perceived and discursively constructed as different by dominant others (Favell 1998; Noble 2002, 2005; Read 2000). A migrant's difference or foreignness excludes her/him, while simultaneously evoking and reinforcing the shared similarities between members of the in-group (Koefoed and Simonsen 2007). A number of studies show how various techniques and tactics of categorizing and labelling migrants positions and marginalizes them as alien to and outside the boundaries of belonging to 'us', which at the same time brings the host society's shared commonalities or sameness into focus (Neal and Walters 2006; Baubock 1994; Benhabib 1999; Madsen and van Naerssen 2003; Yeoh and Huang 2000).

Other studies, however, examine the ways in which migrants are understood as the same as 'us' (Braakman and Schlenkhoff 2007; Devlin Trew 2007; Fortier 2001; Lucas and Purkayastha 2007). Rather than focusing on migrants' alleged difference from the host society, the emphasis falls on their degree of similarity to members of the dominant societal group. Numerous studies examine how migrants, based on a perception of sameness, are recruited to the in-group and are understood as assimilated and belonging within the boundaries of the host society (Germann-Molz and Gibson 2007; Nash 2002). In many such cases, the onus falls on migrants to blend with the host societies' normative expectations, and through the gradual adoption of host society characteristics (language, accent, dress, consumption and lifestyle patterns, intermarriage with the dominant group, and so on) various subgroups are understood to, more or less, become the same as 'us' (Alba and Nee 1997; Gordon 1964; Gray 2006; Kivisto 2003). This emphasis on 'sameness', emanating largely from US assimilation theory, examines the processes through which migrants come to resemble, conform and accommodate to the mainstream society's dominant norms (Nagel 2002). In this view, by shedding their old world mannerisms and practices, migrants are, by degrees, absorbed into the host society culture in a teleological fashion.

Taken together, then, these debates highlight how belonging encompasses notions of sameness and difference within groups, but especially between non-migrant and migrant groups. The construction of sameness and difference works together in order to position migrants as belonging or not to home. Yet, echoing Nagel and Staeheli's (2005) concerns over discussions about assimilation and citizenship, one problem with these debates is that they often imagine belonging as an either/or condition, an all-or-nothing state. As Nagel and Staeheli (2005, 489) claim, discussion of migrants' sameness to and difference from the host society often fails to examine how "immigrants and other marginalized groups often move between sameness and difference in ways that challenge those constructions." The ways in which dominant others label migrants as the same as or different from mainstream society may be internalized by individual migrants in whole or in part. At the same time, such external categorization of migrants' familiarity to or strangeness from dominant social groups may provoke resistance on migrants' behalf. Acts of non-conformity to norms of belonging are important because they foreground migrants' own practices of

belonging that may emerge in the interplay of sameness and difference. Numerous studies examine how migrants' articulations of home unsettle the stability of belonging as something natural or possessed by certain groups (Ehrkamp 2005, 2006; Salih 2000; Yuval-Davis 2006). These studies highlight how migrants' yearnings to belong inject a movement of desire into belonging to "consider forms of belonging outside of the divisiveness of categorizing" (Probyn 1996, 10). Drawing on Probyn's (1996) theorizing of belonging, a number of studies examine how the term belonging consists of two interrelated states: that of 'be'-ing, and that of 'longing' (Bell 1999; Feldman 2008; Mee and Wright 2009; Savage et al. 2005). The focus of these studies is on the latter aspect, the longing that belonging implies. While the be-ing element of belonging focuses on the performance and reiteration of normalized codes of belonging, recent studies show how migrants' longings suggest an alternative mode of membership that goes beyond rigid categories of belonging and non-belonging (Braakman and Schlenkhoff 2007; Fortier 2003; Moreton-Robinson 2003; Walsh 2006a, 2006b; Yuval-Davis et al. 2005). In sum, our review suggests that many migrants articulate an idiom of inclusion that begins to resist demands to look, behave and speak in ways that conform to dominant cultural expectations of migrants as either the same as or different from the mainstream population, thus minting a novel grammar of belonging to home in the process.

Conclusions

The study of migrants' homes offers a fascinating perspective from which to unravel the clusters of opaque, overlapping and ambiguous meanings surrounding peoples' movement from one place and settlement in another. From our critical review of the migration literature, the principal ramification is that home cannot be viewed singly as either static or mobile. We contend that the fixed and fluid components of home must be viewed as enmeshed and working together, without marginalizing either of these qualities. Second, recognizing home as at once grounded and uprooted highlights the often-overlooked dissonance between the lived and the desired meanings that migrants imbue the notion with. Our assessment of various strands of the migration literature shows that previous research gives inordinate interest to the role that current circumstances play in migrants' efforts to make sense of home, without paying sufficient attention to the important place of imagination, aspiration, and desire in

shaping the meaning of home. Third, our appraisal of current research on the spatial forms of migrants' homes shows how home is a prime site for connecting people, places, things, and cultures across time and space. Home is an accordion-like concept: it both stretches to expand migrants outwards to distant and remote places, while also squeezing to embed them in their proximate and immediate locales and social relations. Fourth, our summary of the literature on migrants' identities speaks to research that suggests that flexible, fluctuating subjectivities are not mutually exclusive to the desire to anchor the self in a singular home. Fifth, our evaluation of current migration research on home softens the hard boundaries between the private and the public sides of home. It is not enough to approach the concept of home as the product of migrants' subjective, idiosyncratic sense-making efforts; at the same time, dominant social meanings inflect the ways in which home gets understood. We argued that debates over belonging to home are intrinsically debates over power and who controls it. Despite this, our discussion of extant migration studies suggests that migrants' capacity to fashion their own notions of home are not over-determined by public categorizations that aim to fix its meaning. Migrants' efforts to carve out a model of home on their own terms unsettle normative constructions of home, and draw attention to the fundamentally fragile and porous nature of reified social representations of home.

Geographers' voices have been crucial in enhancing engagement with complex debates on home and migration. Nevertheless, current geographical research offers only an incomplete picture of the ways in which migrants negotiate the concept of home. The heightened emphasis on the relationship between mobility and stasis at the centre of migrants' homes can obscure involvement with other approaches to studying migration. Distinctions between different types of migrants, with differing resources and stocks of social and financial capital, are currently undertheorized in many geographical considerations of migration. There is also a lack of dialogue between approaches that study migration from the perspective of migrants' own conceptualizations of home, and those investigating the role that states, institutions, ideologies, government policies and the media play in representing, politicizing, and shaping migrants' incorporation into their new homes. Future geographical research agendas could theorize together these two levels of analysis.

The complexity and heterogeneity surrounding migrants' efforts to understand home makes it a bracing concept through which to channel research on migration. Our survey of the field suggests that home speaks to multiple and overlapping facets of the migration process, and we urge future geographical contributions to migration scholarship to engage in a more comprehensive and systematic way with this compelling concept.

References

- Abdelhady, D. (2008). Representing the homeland: Lebanese diasporic notions of home and return in a global context. *Cultural Dynamics* 20, pp. 53-68.
- Ahmed, S., Castaneda C., Fortier, A. M., and Sheller M. (eds) (2003). *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford: Berg.
- Al-Ali, N., and Khoser, K. (eds) (2002). *New approaches to migration? Transnational communities and the transformation of home*. London: Routledge.
- Alba, R., and Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review* 31, pp. 826-875.
- Anthias, F. (2001). New hybridities, old concepts: The limits of 'culture'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4), pp. 619-641.
- . (2002). 'Where do I belong?' Narrating collective identity and translocational positionality. *Ethnicities* 2 (4), pp. 491-515.
- . (2008). Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: An intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations* 4 (1), pp. 5-20.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Auge, M. (1995). *Non-places*. London: Verso.

Baldassar, L. (1997). Home and away: Migration, return and 'transnational' identity. *Communal/Plural* 5, pp. 230-249.

Bachelard, G. (1958). *The Poetics of Space*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bauböck, R. (1994). *Transnational citizenship: Membership and rights in international migration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., and Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Bell, V. (1999). Performativity and belonging: An introduction. *Theory, Culture and Society* 16 (2), pp. 1-10.

Benhabib, S. (1999). Citizens, residents, and aliens in a changing world: Political membership in the global era. *Social Research* 66, pp. 709-744.

Berger, J. (1984). *And our faces, my heart, brief as photos*. London: Pantheon Books.

Blunt, A., and Dowling, R. (2006). *Home*. London: Routledge.

Blunt, A. and Varley, A. (2004). Introduction: Geographies of home. *Cultural Geographies* 11, pp. 3-6.

Blunt, A., Bonnerjee, J., Lipman, C., Long, J., and Paynter, F. (2007). My home: Text, space and performance. *Cultural Geographies* 14 (2), pp. 309-320.

Braakman, M., and Schlenkhoff, A. (2007). Between two worlds: Feelings of belonging while in exile and the question of return. *Asien* 104, pp. 9-22.

Brettell, C. (2006). Introduction: Global spaces/local places: Transnationalism, diaspora, and the meaning of home. *Identities* 13 (3), pp. 327-334.

Bromley, R. (2000). *Narratives for a new belonging: Diasporic cultural fictions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brubaker, R., and Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond 'identity'. *Theory and Society* 29 (1), pp. 1-47.

Casey, E. S. (1993). *Getting back into place: Towards a renewed understanding of the place-world*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

———. (1998). *The fate of place: A philosophical history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Castles, S., and Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. London: Macmillan.

Christou, A. (2002). Greek American return migration: constructions of identity and reconstructions of place. *International Journal of Migration Studies* 145, pp. 201-229.

———. (2004). Reconceptualising networks through Greek-American return migration: Constructing identities, negotiating the ethnos and mapping diasporas: Theoretical challenges regarding empirical contributions. *Spaces of Identity* 4 (3), pp. 53-70.

———. (2006a). *Narratives of place, culture and identity: Second-generation Greek-Americans return 'home'*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

———. (2006b). Deciphering diaspora, translating transnationalism: Family dynamics, identity constructions and the legacy of 'home' in second-generation Greek-American return migration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (6), pp. 1040-1056.

Chu, J. Y. (2006). To be 'emplaced': Fuzhounese migration and the politics of destination. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 13, pp. 395-425.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cohen, J., and Ibrahim, S. (2005). A comparative study of Turkish and Mexican transnational migration outcomes. In: Henke, H. (ed) *Crossing over: Comparing recent migration in the United States and Europe*. Oxford: Lexington Books, pp. 147-163.

Constable, N. (1999). At home but not at home: Filipina narratives of ambivalent returns. *Cultural Anthropology* 14 (2), pp. 203-228.

———. (2004). Changing Filipino identities and ambivalent returns. In: Long, P., Lynellyn, D., and Oxfeld, E. (eds) *Coming home? Refugees, migrants, and those who stayed behind*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 104-127

Conway, D. (2005). Transnationalism and return: 'Home' as an enduring fixture and 'anchor'. In: Potter, R. B., Conway, D., and Phillips, J. (eds) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*. London: Ashgate. Pp. 263-283.

Conway, D., and Potter, R. B. (eds) (2009). *Return migration of the next generations: 21st century transnational mobility*. London: Ashgate.

Crowley, J. (1999). The politics of belonging: Some theoretical considerations. In: Geddes, A., and Favell, A. (eds) *The politics of belonging: Migrants and minorities in contemporary Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 15-41.

Datta, A. (2010). The translocal city: Home and belonging among East-European migrants in London. In: Brickell, K., and Datta, A. (eds) *Translocal geographies: Spaces, places, connections*, London: Ashgate, pp. 10-27.

Devlin Trew, J. (2007). Negotiating identity and belonging: Migration narratives of Protestants from Northern Ireland. *Immigrants and Minorities* 25 (1), pp. 22-48.

Dwyer, C. (2003). 'Where are you from?' Young British Muslim women and the making of 'home'. In: Blunt, A., and McEwan, C. (eds) *Postcolonial geographies*. London: Continuum., pp. 184-199.

Easthope, H. (2009). Fixed identities in a mobile world? The relationship between mobility, place, and identity. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 16, pp. 61-82.

Ehrkamp, P. (2005). Placing identities: Transnational practices and local attachments of Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (2), pp. 345-364.

———. (2006). 'We Turks are no Germans': Assimilation discourses and the dialectical construction of identities in Germany. *Environment and Planning A* 38, pp. 1673-1692.

Ehrkamp, P., and Leithner, H. (2006). Rethinking immigration and citizenship: New spaces of migrant transnationalism and belonging. *Environment and Planning A* 8 (9), pp. 1591-1597.

Espiritu, Y. L. (2003). *Home bound: Filipino American lives across cultures, communities, and countries*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Favell, A. (1998). *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain*. New York: Palgrave.

Feldman, A. (2008). Facing all the others: The legacy of old identities for new belongings in post-emigration Ireland. In O'Sullivan, M., and Farago, B. (eds) *Facing the other: Interdisciplinary studies on race, gender and social justice in Ireland*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar Press, pp. 259-275.

Fortier, A. M. (1999). Re-membering places and the performance of belonging(s). *Theory Culture Society* 16, pp. 41-59.

———. (2001). Coming home: Queer migrations and multiple evocations of home. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 4 (4), pp. 405-424.

———. (2003). Making Home: Queer migrations and motions of attachment. In: Ahmed, S., Castaneda C., Fortier, A. M., and Sheller M. (eds)

Uprootings/Regrounding: Questions of home and migration. Oxford: Berg, pp. 115-135.

Flynn, M. (2007). Reconstructing 'home/lands' in the Russian Federation: Migrant-centred perspectives of displacement and resettlement. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (3), pp. 461 – 481.

Germann-Molz, J. (2008). Global abode: Home and mobility in narratives of round-the-world travel. *Space and Culture* 11 (4), pp. 325-342.

Germann-Molz, J., and Gibson, S. (eds) (2007). *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. Hampshire: Ashgate.

Gilmartin, M. (2008). Migration, identity and belonging. *Geography Compass* 2 (6), pp. 1837-1852.

Gilmartin, M., and White, A. (2008). Revisiting contemporary Irish migration: New geographies of mobility and belonging. *Irish Geography* 41 (2), pp. 143-149.

Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray, B. (2006). Curious hybridities: Transnational negotiations of migrancy through generation. *Irish Studies Review* 14 (2), pp. 207-223.

Guarnizo, L. (1997). The emergence of a transnational social formation and the mirage of return migration among Dominican transmigrants. *Identities* 4 (2), pp. 281-322.

Gustafson, P. (2001). Exploring the relationship between place attachment and mobility. *Environment and Behavior* 33 (5), pp. 667-686.

Haller, W., and Lanholt, P. (2005). The transnational dimensions of identity formation: Adult children of immigrants in Miami. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28, pp. 1182-1214.

- Hedetoft, U., and Hjort, M. (eds) (2002). *The postnational self: Belonging and identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). *Poetry, language, thought*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ican, S. (2002). *Longing in belonging: The cultural politics of settlement*. New York: Praeger.
- Jacobs, J. M., and Smith, S. (2008). Living room: Rematerialising home. *Environment and Planning A* 40 (3), pp. 515-519.
- Jayaweera, H., and Choudhury, T. (2008). *Immigration, faith and cohesion: Evidence from local areas with significant Muslim populations*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social identity*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Kivisto, P. (2003). Social spaces, transnational immigrant communities, and the politics of incorporation. *Ethnicities* 3, pp. 5-28.
- Koefoed, L., and Simonsen, K. (2007). The price of goodness: Everyday nationalist narratives in Denmark. *Antipode* 39 (2), pp. 310–330.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Kyle, D. (2000). *Transnational peasants: Migrations, networks, and ethnicity in Andean Ecuador*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Lam, T., and Yeoh, B. S. A. (2004). Negotiating ‘home’ and ‘national identity’: Chinese-Malaysian transmigrants in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 45 (2), pp. 141–164.
- Lamb, S. (2002). Intimacy in a transnational era: The remaking of ageing among Indian Americans. *Diaspora* 11, pp. 299-330.
- Ley, D., and Kobayashi, A. (2005). Back to Hong Kong: Return migration or transnational sojourn? *Global Networks* 5 (2), pp. 111–127.

Levitt, P. (2001). *The transnational villagers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Levitt, P., and Waters, M. C. (eds) (2002). *The changing face of home: The transnational lives of the second generation*. New York: Russell Sage.

Lidgard, J., and Gilson, C. (2002). Return migration of New Zealanders: Shuttle and circular migrants. *New Zealand Population Review* 28 (1), pp. 99-128.

Lomsky-Feder, E., and Rapoport, T. (2003). Seeking a place to rest: Representation of rounded movement among Russian-Jewish homecomers. *Ethos* 30 (3), pp. 227-248.

Lucas, S., and Purkayastha, B. (2007). 'Where is home?' Here and there: Transnational experiences of home among Canadian migrants in the United States. *GeoJournal* 68, pp. 243-251.

Madsen, K., and van Naerssen, T. (2003). Migration, identity and belonging. *Journal of Borderland Studies* 18 (2), pp. 66-85.

Magat, I. N. (1999). Israeli and Japanese immigrants to Canada: Home, belonging, and the territorialization of identity. *Ethos* 27 (2), pp. 119-144.

Mallett, S. (2004). Understanding home: A critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review* 52 (1), pp. 62-89.

Mee, K., and Wright, S. (2009). Geographies of belonging. *Environment and Planning A* 41, pp. 772-779.

Miller, D. (1998). Why some things matter. In: Miller, D. (ed) *Material cultures: Why some things matter*. London: University College London Press, pp. 3-21.

———. (2001). *Home possessions: Material culture beyond closed doors*. Oxford: Berg.

Moore, J. (2000). Placing home in context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20, pp. 207-217.

- Morawska, E. (2004). Exploring diversity in immigrant assimilation and transnationalism: Poles and Russian Jews in Philadelphia. *International Migration Review* 38, pp. 1372-1412.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2003). I still call Australia home: Indigenous belonging and place in a white postcolonizing society. In: Ahmed, S., Castaneda C., Fortier, A. M., and Sheller M. (eds) *Uprootings/Regrounding: Questions of home and migration*. Oxford: Berg, pp. 23-40.
- Morley, D. (2000). *Home territories: Media, mobility and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Nagel, C. (2002). Constructing difference and sameness: The politics of assimilation in London's Arab communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25 (2), pp. 258-287.
- Nagel, C., and Staeheli, L. A. (2005). 'We're just like the Irish': Narratives of assimilation, belonging and citizenship among Arab-American activists. *Citizenship Studies* 9, pp. 485-498.
- . (2008). Integration and the negotiation of 'here' and 'there': The case of British Arab activists. *Social and Cultural Geography* 9 (4), pp. 415-430.
- Nash, C. (2008). *Of Irish descent: Origin stories, genealogy, and the politics of belonging*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Neal, S., and Walters, S. (2006). Strangers asking strange questions? A methodological narrative of researching belonging and identity in English rural communities. *Journal of Rural Studies* 22 (1), pp. 177-189.
- Ní Laoire, C. (2007). The 'green green grass of home'? Return migration to rural Ireland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 23, pp. 332-344.
- . (2008a). Complicating host-newcomer dualisms: Irish return migrants as home-comers or newcomers? *Translocations* 4 (1), pp. 35-50.
- . (2008b). 'Settling back'? A biographical and life-course perspective on Ireland's recent return migration. *Irish Geography* 41 (2), pp. 195-210.

Noble, G. (2002). Comfortable and relaxed: Furnishing the home and nation.

Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies 16, pp. 53-66.

———. (2005). The discomfort of strangers: Racism, incivility and ontological security in a relaxed and comfortable nation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 26 (1), pp. 107-120.

Nowicka, M. (2006). *Transnational professionals and their cosmopolitan universes*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

———. (2007). Mobile locations: Construction of home in a group of mobile transnational professionals. *Global Networks* 7 (1), pp. 69-86.

Paspastergiadis, N. (2001). *The turbulence of migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L., and Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22, pp. 217-237.

Pratt, G. (1999). Geographies of identity and difference: Marking boundaries. In: Massey, D., Allen, J., and Sarre, P. A. (eds) *Human geography today*. Cambridge: Polity. Pp. 151-168.

Pratt, G., and Yeoh, B. S. A. (2003). Transnational (counter) topographies. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10 (2), pp. 159 – 166.

Pred, A. (2000). *Even in Sweden: Racisms, racialized spaces, and the popular geographical imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Probyn, E. (1996). *Outside belongings*. New York: Routledge.

Ralph, D. (2009). 'Home is where the heart is'? Understandings of 'home' among Irish-born return migrants from the United States. *Irish Studies Review* 17 (2), pp. 183-200.

Read, P. (2000). *Belonging: Australians, place and Aboriginal ownership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rouse, R. (1991). Mexican migration and the social space of postmodernism. *Diaspora* 1 (1), pp. 8-26.

Salih, R. (2000). Shifting boundaries of self and other: Moroccan migrant women in Italy. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 7 (3), pp. 321-336.

———. 2003. *Gender in transnationalism: Home, longing and belonging among Moroccan migrant women*. London: Routledge.

Savage, M., Bagnall, G., and Longhurst, B. (2005). *Globalization and belonging*. London: Sage.

Staheli, L. A., and Nagel, C. R. (2006). Topographies of home and citizenship: Arab-American activists in the United States. *Environment and Planning A* 38, pp. 1599-1614.

Tolia-Kelly, D. (2004) Locating processes of identification: studying the precipitates of re-memory through artefacts in the British Asian home. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29(3), pp. 314-329.

Tolia-Kelly, D. (2006). Mobility/stability: British Asian cultures of 'landscape and Englishness'. *Environment and Planning A* 38, pp. 341-358.

Tsuda, T. (2001). From ethnic affinity to alienation in the global ecumene: The encounter between the Japanese and Japanese-Brazilian return migrants. *Diaspora* 10 (1), pp. 53-91.

———. 2003. *Strangers in the ethnic homeland: Japanese Brazilian return migration in transnational perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century*. London: Routledge.

Valentine, G., Sporton, D., and Nielsen, K. B. (2009). Identities and belonging: A study of Somali refugee and asylum seekers living in the UK and Denmark. *Environment and Planning D* 27, pp. 234-250.

Varley, A. (2008). A place like this? Stories of dementia, home, and the self.

Environment and Planning D 26, pp. 47-67.

Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge

Walsh, K. (2006a). British expatriate belongings: Mobile homes and transnational homing. *Home Cultures* 3 (2), pp. 123-144.

———. (2006b). Dad says I'm tied to a shooting star!' Grounding (research on)

British expatriate belonging. *Area* 38, pp. 268-78.

Walter, B. (2004). Irish women in the diaspora: Exclusions and inclusions. *Women's Studies International Forum* 27, pp. 369-384.

———. (2006). English/Irish hybridity: Second-generation diasporic identities.

International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations 5, pp. 17-24.

Wessendorf, S. (2007). 'Roots migrants': Transnationalism and 'return' among second-generation Italians in Switzerland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (7), pp. 1083-1102.

Yau, N. (2007). Celtic Tiger, Hidden Dragon: Exploring identity among second generation Chinese in Ireland. *Translocations* 2 (1), pp. 48-69.

Yeoh, B. S. A., and Huang, S. (2000). 'Home' and 'away': Foreign domestic workers and negotiations of diasporic identity in Singapore. *Women's Studies International Forum* 23 (4), pp. 413-429.

Young, I. M. (1997). *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy and policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3), pp. 197-214.

Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., and Kofman, E. (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (3), pp. 513-535.