❚ Article ❚

Framing the Transnational Mobilities of Two-step Migrants within a Heideggerian Perspective*

Chi Hong Nguyen
FPT University, Vietnam

Abstract

Transnational mobilities of skilled migrants are said to be interrelated. However, the extent to which this interrelation is addressed remains ambiguous among extant literature. One of the reasons for this ambiguity is that skilled migrants often negotiate to make sense of their mobilities based on a wide range of influences from various aspects of life, and the ways they follow their life course are not always rational or consistent. Exploring the interrelatedness of influences in transnational mobilities requires researchers to go beyond explicating separate socio-economic, political or individual scales, but take a holistic approach instead. This article proposes a theoretical framework used to examine such relationalities. By adopting Heidegger's (1962) philosophical concept of "being-in-the-world", this framework allows migration and transnationalism researchers to explore the negotiation of transnational mobilities with respect to migrants' interrelated interactions with things and others in a social milieu where they sometimes follow public norms and at other times break with these regularities to make sense of their migration as an on-going process. An examination of skilled migrants' specific ways of being-in-the-world also enables researchers to challenge the relation between spatiality and temporality which has been conventionally seen as separate entities. This framework has the potential to systematize the relationality of transnational mobilities that sporadic studies have mentioned but been unable to theorize in terms of migrants' everyday interactions with things and others across multiple spatio-temporal locales.

❚ *Keywords* : being-in-the-world, Heidegger, skilled migration, transnational mobi-
                lities

Introduction

Many international students "migrate to learn" and "learn to migrate" by considering their international education sojourns as a necessary strategy to acquire permanent residency (PR), and this creates a "PR industry" (Baas, 2006) within international higher education. Students' decisions to study overseas for subsequent skilled migration are also affected by the push and pull of factors such as wage differentials between home and host societies and social welfare attractions (Nguyen, 2006). However, many studies in demography and international education policy, as well as government-commissioned reports, often associate two-step migration with a linear process from international education to skilled immigration in which migration policies influence international students' choices of study programs and decisions to migrate (Birrell & Perry, 2009; Hawthorne, 2010). Transnational mobilities are treated as disembodied and homogeneous brain flows from home to host societies that are enacted and controlled by governments.

In policy discourse, attracting education migrants is one of the strategies that governments have used to create competitive advantage in the global race for talent. In receiving nations, skilled migrants are often considered engines for economic growth. The operation of such engines is evaluated through capabilities of innovation, earnings of remittances, and labour market outcomes. For example, a study commissioned by the World Bank shows that skilled immigrants contribute a "significant and positive impact" (Chellaraj, Maskus, & Mattoo, 2005, p. ii) on patent applications and innovations in the US. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has reported that migrants accounted for 47 per cent of the increase in the US workforce and 70% in Europe in the 2000s, filling "important niches both in fast-growing and declining sectors of the economy" (OECD, 2014, p. 1). Accordingly, skilled migration is said to boost the working-age population, as well as contribute to human capital development and technological advances.

In countries of origin, the return of skilled people is similarly asso-

ciated with dynamism, bringing possibilities of "technological entrepreneur-ship, access to leading clusters of research and innovation" (Guellec & Cervantes, 2002, p. 71) and "social remittances" of ideas, behaviors, iden-tities, and social capital (Levitt, 1998, p. 927). The effectiveness of "brains" contributed by expatriates is evaluated through technological transfers, remittances, and numbers of returnees. The group of countries receiving remittances, such as Albania with 8.5%, Armenia with 21%, or the Philippines with 9.8% in 2013, has emerged as a sign of develop-ment (World Bank, 2014), and of achievements of intergovernmental ne-gotiations between brain drain and brain gain. These contributions are often translated into financial values or numbers of technological in-novations per (im)migrant. Skilled migrants seem to have been quantified, as if they were brains generating technological and financial contributions to national economic development.

By challenging this conventional equation of skilled migrants to dis-embodied objects in the policy discourse, this article argues that migrants negotiate their mobilities under effects of their interactions with others and things in a social milieu across many spaces and times. It draws on Heidegger's (1962) concept of being-in-the-world, which delineates our entwinement with the world which we share with others and things. We live our everyday lives in the world with familiarity through our inter-actions with things and others by following routines and public practices, which Heidegger describes as "publicness" and "norms" (1962, p. 127). In sharing our lives with others and things, things take on meanings through our engagement with them as equipment to achieve our purposes. Our interactions with things are not limited to a particular piece of equipment. Instead, things are related in a totality in which we can find things are related to other things and people. In other words, we are always absorbed in the world. Our absorption is that the world is spatial in that we move across and towards space with certain purposes to achieve our everyday lives. The ways in which we are involved in the world are simultaneously temporal, because we always project into the future in revealing possibil-ities grounded in space. We are not confined to the present, but we live

our lives through an opening of possibilities and imposition of constraints that are made by our past involvement in the world and enabled by our present activities to accomplish something for the future. In this sense, we share the world with others and things in various relational aspects of our lives (Heidegger, 1962).

Based on this philosophical perspective, this paper theorizes the transnational mobilities of two-step migrants through their engagement with the world in intersecting social domains. It does so by first highlighting the relationality of transnational mobilities that extant studies on transnationalism have discussed but have not yet theorized in a systematic way. Then the article puts forward the Heideggerian theoretical framing that unpacks the relation of human activities to things and other people before it conceptualizes the relationality of mobilities within this perspective. This theoretical framework allows researchers to both theoretically and methodologically examine various interrelated aspects of mobilities as a negotiated on-going process. This paper also echoes Shubin's (2015) argument against understandings of time and space as "mind-dependent entities" (p. 350) that are often said to be enacted through migrants' rational choices. However, their decisions to migrate and relocation experiences across spaces and time are shaped by a multitude of influences and factors, some of which lie beyond their control.

Relationality of Transnational Mobilities

Transnationalism studies consider mobilities to be embodied practices of migrants' embeddedness in transnational spaces in a range of scales, producing heterogeneous experiences of mobilities. For example, the negotiation of transnational mobilities within intra-national legal domains shapes migrants' decisions to migrate and transnational practices, unsettling their belonging and membership in more than one society (Baas, 2010; Robertson, 2008; Robertson & Runganaikaloo, 2014). Two-step migrants (those who apply for permanent residency [PR] upon the completion of their degree programs in a university outside their home na-

tions) negotiate their mobilities with national agendas of human capital with their own circumstances through diaspora strategies, visa restrictions, and citizenship rights (Biao, 2011; Robertson & Runganaikaloo, 2014). The negotiation of transnational mobilities is known to extend to cosmopolitan lifestyle and infrastructure in global cities that influence two-step migrants' aspirations for self-development and exploration (Tseng, 2011). Some two-step migrants' transnational mobilities are shaped by the influences of intermediary agents' services in luring potential students for the prospect of migration (Baas, 2010; Biao, 2007). In addition, some migrants decide to migrate under the influences of their involvement in familial and communal domains that also influence the ways in which they sustain their transnational practices across borders (Robertson, 2008; Waters, 2006). Some skilled migrants straddle their lives and shuttle between two countries to juggle their transnational businesses for economic reasons at the stage of early career, seek educational purposes for their children and earn a better quality of life at retirement in Western countries (Waters, 2006). Asian parents also influence children's international education and decisions to migrate after graduation (Waters, 2006). Migrants' interactions with others involve the ways they follow communal norms and practices of mobilities that influence students' imaginations of studying overseas for migration (Biao, 2007). Their mobilities are shaped by and shape the relative immobilities and mobilities of others.

Some of their engagements with others are experienced through their interactions with things. For example, some two-step migrants use Australian education credentials as tickets to apply for PR to meet their desires, which are formed by their families and communities in home societies, as well as friends in host societies (Baas, 2006). Others use their new citizenship to achieve pragmatic pursuits offered in the host society, whereas failures to obtain ostensible achievements in migration may impede them from returning to countries of origin for a visit (Teo, 2011). Transnational spaces with particular places and things such as expatriate clubs, houses, and souvenirs also affect migrants' emotions and belonging (Liu-Farrer, 2011). Their interactions with others and things through their

involvement with public norms and regularities lead to constraints and possibilities for their mobilities. Some are known to use cultural practices of marriage to enable skilled migration through international education (Biao, 2007), whereas others suffer employment precariousness in confronting ethnic discrimination in seeking employment and waiting for the grant of legal status from PR to citizenship (Robertson & Runganaikaloo, 2014). In transnational spaces, migrants contemplate further mobilities or navigate in the destination society within "social-cultural-political matrices" (Yeoh & Huang, 2011, p. 684) in which things and people matter to the meanings of mobilities. The meanings of mobilities are shaped and re-shaped through migrants' embeddedness in and across spaces which "[allows] people to be themselves and validate their distinct identities" (Florida, 2005, p. 7). The embodiment of their mobilities is constituted by and constitutes their embeddedness in the world in a range of scales. Urged by the need to attend to migrants' entwinement with the world, a number of migration scholars (e.g., Collins & Shubin, 2015; Yeoh & Huang, 2011; Yeoh, Leng, Dung, & Yi'en, 2013) are calling for innovative methodological approaches that look into migrants' holistic life course from the past to present and even future rather than examining discrete events, as migration is a fluid process rather than linear progression. This requires researchers to deeply explore the relationality of migrants' experiences in various domains. The theoretical framing proposed in this paper can be seen as a timely response to these calls.

Migrants' experience confluences from their engagements with other people and things in various interrelated scales and domains which by borrowing the philosophical term proposed by Dall'Alba (2009, p. 35), the author refers to as migrants' "entwinement with the world." Addressing the relationality of transnational mobilities requires a relevant theoretical and methodological approach that allows attending to confluences of two-step migrants' entwinement with the world. Exploring the relationality of transnational mobilities in and through migrants' entwinement with the world enables researchers to understand the complex articulations of their hopes, desires, aspirations, and formation of hybrid selves, as

well as negotiations of belonging at various intersecting social scales. Attending to the migrants' entwinement with the world also broadens understandings of spatial and temporal linkages in migration in which migrants exercise choices and make decisions through their experiences of multiple times and spaces.

Our Relation to Others and Things as "Being-in-the-World"

This paper primarily draws on Heidegger's (1962) ideas in his famous book *Being and Time* with some occasional references to his later thoughts. Heidegger (1962) asserts that we are already intertwined with our world through our specific ways of being-in-the-world. According to Heidegger (1962), the "being-in" does not necessarily denote the location of an object in a defined space as water in a glass. We are not simply included or located alongside a system of objects in a place (Blattner, 2006). Instead, things make sense to us through the ways in which we interact with them by following routines and norms or taken-for-granted knowledge. Our knowledge of going about in the world through following public norms consists of "dispositions to respond to situations in appropriate ways" (Dreyfus, 1991, p. 117). We live in the world with familiarity in the way we go about our business and make sense of our lives as being-in (Blattner, 2006). However, when we encounter new things, or things are broken, we find them strange or different. An uneasy feeling may appear when we are placed in an unfamiliar situation or locale with unknown people. We "flee in the face of uncanniness" or being "not-at-home" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 234). Even in the same locale when interacting with the same people, we sometimes face an uneasy feeling, as we need to act in ways that cannot be predicted or planned. Being at-home and not-at-home show our absorption in the world in the way we live our lives in relation to others and things in the world.

By being involved in the world, we do not experience space as a container of objects. According to Heidegger (1962), we exist spatially. In everyday activities, we move from one location to another for certain

purposes. Our movements, which may include imaginations or be enacted through communications technologies, are embedded with meanings. Space shapes the possibilities of our activities. It is "space-of-action," which is embedded with a "referential organization with respect to our context of activities" (Arisaka, 1996, p. 37), or as a "field of potential action" (Harrison, 2007, p. 635). When we engage with our activities, we make "the farness vanish" and "the remoteness of something disappear, bringing it close" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 139). The notions of farness or nearness are not geographical, but address our involvement with the world. By using the example of a craftsman working in his workshop, Heidegger (1926) points out that the work produced by this worker is intended to entail useability for consumers whom he may know or never meet, but who nonetheless influence his work. The assignment in this handiwork expresses "an immeasurable distance" (Harrison, 2007, p. 631) when this craftsman's relation to space makes sense through his interactions with the handiwork. In this vein, our interactions with things and people show how we are immersed in space. Our absorption in space is temporal. According to Heidegger (1962), because we always project into the future in realising possibilities grounded in space as dwelling, our relations to space are temporal.

In sharing the world with others through space and time, we encounter it through rituals and habits. Things become so familiar for us that we do not even recognise their significance (Heidegger, 1962). Instead, we focus on the task (Dreyfus, 1991). However, when something goes wrong, we immediately realise the function of something we take for granted. We may choose to replace it with something else, try to fix it, or simply use it in a different way for another purpose. In other words, what concerns us is not the thing itself, but the purpose that it fulfils for our lives (Blattner, 2006). Things take on meanings through our engagement with them as equipment. Heidegger (1962) defines equipment as things with which we engage as "something 'in-order-to'" (p. 97). The encountering of equipment expresses human agency and purposiveness in our ways of being. The use of equipment is not limited to a single piece

of equipment, but a "totality in which the equipment is encountered" (p. 99). One thing that is useful can never show itself without relation to other things and those who use it. Things that we use are related to other useful things. Things only gain significance from concrete contexts. They are already interconnected as belonging to other things in the world. The interconnection of equipment we use makes up a totality, which is constituted by a system of "reference of something to something", such as "serviceability, conduciveness, usability, manipulability" (p. 97).

As we dwell with others in the world, we "fall into the at-home of publicness" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 234), where we do what other people do by conforming to social norms and routines with familiarity. Through our involvement with the world, we may emulate others in engaging with the world without being aware of the ways we follow the crowd. We act as others do. By simply conforming to public norms, we lead an inauthentic life where we do not own our lives (Heidegger, 1962). We tend to "succumb to tradition, to accept inherited concepts, doctrines, and ways of looking at things without subjecting them to adequate independent scrutiny"; we "do, say, feel and think" as others do (Inwood, 2000, p. 52).

However, we are sometimes faced with a situation where we are challenged to take responsibility for our ways of being (Heidegger, 1962). Finding possibilities to deal with such a situation becomes important for us. We break with public rituals by taking a stand on our being by following other public norms, or looking for possibilities opened up from our interactions with others and things. We need to be responsible for doing something for ourselves, and are faced with the need to own our lives. This is the time when we hear a call to live an authentic life. Focusing on what we desire and attempt to become forms our concrete ways of being. We take up possibilities opened by the past in order to achieve something for the future at the present point. The ways we make sense of our being are "always [our] own or in each case [ours]" (1962, p. 450), and our being allows us to enter the world by doing things with purposes and intentions although some of these might be simply our actions ac-

corded with social norms. In other words, we are engaged in the world with commitment.

The author of this paper acknowledges that Heidegger's later work (1996, as cited in Shubin, 2015) shows that life is seen as happening and journeying, rather than flowing as he articulates in *Being and Time*. Heidegger later sees that human beings keep finding themselves in a world that they may not yet encounter or master. Taking this idea on board, this paper is congruent with Shubin's (2015) argument about the in-completeness of human beings' subjectivity by highlighting migrants' openness to their encounters with others across spaces and times. This understanding challenges views on migration as a staged and linear proc-ess from decisions to migrate to resettlement. Instead, migrants live their lives through various activities across unfolding time and space. Further, Heidegger (1975, as cited in Malpas, 2012) argues that "space" is differ-ent from "place" in that the former contains no concrete space or location while the latter implies specific locales where we encounter our being with others and things. Space seems to be the bridge between abstract space or space in thinking and specific places. We are always located in a place where we can experience familiarity in doing things in accord-ance with socio-political and cultural norms. In this sense, space may include imagined mobilities that are shaped prior and even within migra-tion, and it is translated into a place that always includes those of our activities in which we sometimes find unfamiliarity as in a foreign land. This is the time when we begin to seek our authentic being through our encounter with things and others by following our former familiarity. The nexus between familiarity and unfamiliarity through spaces and places can allow researchers to examine how migrants enact their agencies to confront challenges and seek opportunities in migration. Although this paper does not use much of Heidegger's later thoughts, it takes his notion of space and place into consideration as these two concepts help migration researchers unpack the translation of migrants' imagined spaces into ac-tual mobilities in concrete destinations or even transit places. In this sense, space and time are not merely objective domains, but they carry "experiential

and dynamic" (Shubin, 2015, p. 352) characteristics that enable migrants to seek familiarity in the places they have been to. Also, the understanding of place and space allows us to examine the meaning of place and space as the stretching of migrants' social relations instead of just travel determined by "geometry and measurable distances (Shubin, 2015). Geographical places, in this sense, can be understood as tied knots that migrants experience during migration processes, rather than discrete events in discrete locales.

Our past, present and future matter to us in the care-structure, which Heidegger (1962) considers as having a "temporal" dimension. According to Heidegger, the care-structure consists of three elements: itself, already-in-the-world, and being-alongside-within-the-world (1962). The first component, *ahead-of-itself*, is seen as our projection into the future in terms of our possibilities, which are not yet actualised. Nevertheless, our future is shaped by who we have been and what we have done in the past. We cannot choose to be born or to be born in a particular circumstance, but our past experiences and conditions as being *already-in-the-world* shape who we are at present. We are always already thrown into a situation where we realise ourselves as *being-alongside-within-the-world*. Our present ways of being are shaped by our past as well as what we want to become in the future. As Dall'Alba (2009) argues, "We are the persons we were yesterday and will be tomorrow, but also not the same" (p. 39). Our present and future ways of being are shaped by our past, and we may find that possibilities opened up through our interactions with the world have an impact on who we are and want to become.

In short, for Heidegger, being-in-the-world is the way we share the world with others and things. The being-in of this concept shows how we engage in the world with familiarity by following social norms and taken-for-granted knowledge. The world implies concrete contexts where we interact with things and others. The ways we interact with things and others by inauthentically conforming to public norms enable us to accomplish everyday activities. However, when following some social norms becomes problematic for us, we may take responsibility for

our lives. We authentically take a stand on who we are and define our "self" by seeking possibilities opened up from our interactions with the world or other social norms. As such, we are not contained in a world with separate entities but rather, the world where we dwell as we make sense of our interactions with things and others. In being-in-the-world, we are never detached from the world. Our entwinement with others and things allows us to make sense of our everyday activities in relation to who we are and what we want to be.

Framing Transnational Mobilities within the Concept of "Being-in-the-World"

The concepts identified above collectively elaborate being-in-the-world, so they are interconnected, rather than standing alone. This paper considers transnational mobilities as reflective of migrants' committed entwinement with the world through confluences of various scales. These confluences are explored through influences of economic, social, and political transformations in the host and home societies on migrants' decisions to migrate, as shown in some previous research (e.g., Baas, 2010; Biao, 2005, 2007). In particular, research has shown that transnational mobilities are affected by migration infrastructure in host countries, such as migration policies and influences of other actors such as migration brokers on recruitment and documentation (e.g., Biao, 2005, 2007; Collins, 2008), social and cultural norms (e.g., Singh, Robertson, & Cabraal, 2012; Yeoh et al., 2013) and political ideologies (Ho & Bedford, 2008; Nguyen, 2013, 2014). Family traditions and parents' choices for mobilities as well as personal circumstances (Waters, 2006) are also taken into consideration. Locating migration experiences as part of migrants' entwinement with the world enables a fuller description of the complexity of their migratory life trajectories. Adopting a research perspective that focuses on migrants' entwinement with the world can help explore transformative changes associated with their migration from pre-departure to relocation and future aspirations. Migrants may or may not realize things surrounding them

in the social milieu, but when engaging in migration, migrants' interactions with interrelated things are "lit up" (Heidegger, 1962, p. 74) for them to notice the functionality of things as equipment. Their uses of things as equipment are also related to other people. Their engagement with the world through interactions with things and others allow them to experience migration with other people, some of whom can be their family members, colleagues, or even those whom they have never met. This perspective problematizes conventional approaches commonly used in government studies that tend to examine migrants' experiences alone either before migration or during relocation, thus neglecting migrants' intersubjectivity that shapes their mobilities.

This theoretical framing also allows researchers to examine migrants' uses of equipment in a totality while being with others, which constrain and open up possibilities for their transnational mobilities. In previous research (e.g., Baas, 2010; Biao, 2005; Robertson & Runganaikaloo, 2014), migrants' uses of tangible objects and relationships are often examined through their encounter with others. Although studies that examine the relation between migrants' uses of things and relationships focus on different aspects in migrants' experiences, they do not tend to directly or systematically point out methodological ways to explore such a relation. These relations can be related to another relation that produces the holistic relationality of mobilities. By following Heidegger's (1962) views on things as equipment in a totality as a holistic approach, migration researchers can systematically unpack the interrelatedness between tangible objects (and/or relationships) with others who matter to migrants' experiences. Their encounters with things and others may lead to the opening of possibilities and challenges the latter of which are commonly termed as precariousness or friction in migration. This point will be elaborated later in this section.

In particular, the totality of equipment may include uses of educational credentials (Baas, 2010; Waters, 2006), IELTS band scores (Birrell & Healy, 2008), and ethnic linguistic capital in host societies (Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003). Researchers may choose to look at ethnic features (Biao,

2005 & 2007), work skills and workplace experiences (Syed, 2008), citizenship (Nagel, 2005), and remittances and gifts in transnational practices (Yeoh et al., 2013). Migrants use various tools to initiate their migration, settle into new lives, address obligations from their past and present lives and aspire for the future, while they actively participate in transnational social fields mediated by "cultural politics of moving and belonging" (Yeoh & Huang, 2011, p. 683). The notion of equipment in a totality contributes to an understanding of how things become meaningful and are interconnected in two-step migrants' negotiations of transnational mobilities.

Education-related migrants' transnational mobilities are influenced by their interactions with others. Previous research has examined the influences of other people such as parents, friends, employers, and transnational networks on decisions to migrate and relocation strategies (e.g., Baas, 2010; Biao, 2005, 2007; Waters, 2006). These studies have indirectly and implicitly showed the relationality of migrants' interactions with others and practical uses of things. For example, Biao's (2005; 2007) work has continuously shown that by aspiring to seek overseas residency, some Indian male students utilise their ethnicity of belonging to the Kamma and Reddy castes to increase the monetary values of the dowries offered by future bridal families. These students then transfer the dowries into a means to support their pursuit of IT programs in Western countries with a migration purpose in mind. In line with the proposed theoretical framework, researchers can look into how migrants' being with others is reflected in their negotiations of transnational mobilities. They can investigate who and how migrants interact with in their uses of equipment. The people with whom they interact may include family members, colleagues, friends and those whom they have never met but who nonetheless influence their mobilities. Researchers may not solely explore with whom migrants interact, but investigate how they interpret such interactions to achieve what they aspire to achieve. As mentioned earlier, we always carry on our lives with a "history that has always already been influenced by the other" (Smith & Hyde, 1991, p. 448). Therefore, researchers need

to further look at migrants' past experiences, present activities, and future aspirations that involve their interactions with other people.

Migrants' interactions with things and others include the ways they follow and/or break with social norms. In sharing the world with others, how professional migrants negotiate public norms to live their migratory lives leaves space for an exploration of the Heideggerian concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity. The social norms researchers look at in migrants' experiences may include political ideologies, their engagements with official objectives of migration policies, ethnic, socio-cultural and communal values and practices, workplace practices, and family traditions. Doing this is similar to the approaches that have been adopted in previous studies. For example, some studies examine influences of social norms on migrants' agency in an objectivist stance or emphasise migrants' agency in responding to social structures in a subjectivist perspective. International students are described as being "pulled" by skilled migration schemes and salary structures offered by the employment system in host countries (e.g., Baruch, Budhwar, & Khatri, 2007). Other studies examine separate influences from migrants' interactions with social structures such as skilled migration policies and communal practices of mobility. However, the concept of being-in-the-world differs from the other approaches in that it emphasizes migrants' relational involvement with the world. We are always already involved in the world with taken-for-granted knowledge about going about with public norms. In this vein, the concepts of authenticity and inauthenticity enable researchers to investigate what social norms migrants follow or break through entwinement with the world. Rather than investigating how migrants experience themselves as "subjects standing over against an object" (Blattner, 2006, p. 12), such as social structures, researchers examine the extent to which migrants are immersed in the world in which they sometimes feel at-home with social norms and not-at-home with other norms. By looking into how migrants rationally choose to migrate and at the same time, may choose to follow social trends in migration or encounter influences from others in the social milieu, researchers may be able to examine the extent to

which they are committed to living their migrants' lives as well. The author believes migrants' being-in-the-world with commitment seems to allow researchers to investigate migrants' rationality in migration and how their experiences are concurrently shaped by following what others do. Under this theoretical framing, migrants can be viewed as active agents whose being matters to them and is made sense for themselves and by themselves.

To do this, researchers can look at the ways migrants dwell in places and enact social, cultural, and communal practices. Simultaneously, it would be fruitful if researchers might choose to examine how migrants relate these social norms to migrants' own circumstances, when they authentically take a stand to become who they want to be. For instance, researchers can explore how marriage practices (Biao, 2007) and/or cultural practices of filial piety (Yeoh et al., 2013), possibly pose constraints on the way migrants negotiate transnational mobilities. Attention should be paid to the ways they follow and/or break with social norms might lead to possibilities which open up their interactions with the world. Researchers can also look at how migrants mediate changes in the surrounding environment, such as family reorganisation arising from their physical relocation or changes in employment in receiving societies. Through seeking to grasp an understanding of the situations they encounter, researchers analyse how migrants take responsibility for their being through their specific actions. However, as mentioned earlier, researchers should consider migrants' experiences as happenings and journeys, rather than simply dwelling in places. To do this, researchers need to be attentive to at least two aspects. First, migrants' history, present lives and future aspirations must be explored as interconnection and having mutual dependence. Second, their intersubjectivity in and of experiencing space and place should concurrently be taken into account. Migration experiences are seldom made or encountered by migrants themselves alone but under the effects of their entwinement in the world with others and things in different places. An examination in this way will allow researchers to understand the connection of migration knots, thus increasing under-

standing of the meanings of geographical spaces embedded within migrants' encounter with mobilities across space.

Although migrants' interactions with the world can lead to further possibilities, these possibilities are not endless. Constraints and resistances can present as stickiness or "friction" (Cresswell, 2013) that may occur along the way as migrants live their lives. Cresswell (2013) has argued that the "by-product" of friction is "heat," which can increase mobility. How do researchers understand friction as constraints and heat as strategies migrants use to deal with constraints? They can begin by examining the constraints in both sending and receiving countries that migrants are faced with, as migrants may face everyday constraints in home and host societies as well as in transnational practices. Constraints while in the home country may appear in the form of socio-economic exclusion posed by an "increasingly stringent regime of migration control imposed by the rich countries of the global north" (King, 2012, p. 136), poverty, cultural and socio-political impositions family difficulties, or even personal limits (Nguyen, 2013, 2014). Constraints in the destination country may include labor exploitation and insecurity and vulnerabilities arising from transition such as deskilling, racial discrimination, unemployment, lack of language skills and networks, and precariousness in obtaining legal migrant status (Robertson & Runganaikaloo, 2014). Because their participation in transnational social fields is influenced by power differentials, migrants may face disparities, inequalities, as well as religious and racial issues that may facilitate, legitimise, and/or constrain mobility and fixity.

For Heidegger (1962), our engagement with the world is "temporal and also [⋯] spatial co-ordinately" (p. 418). Researchers can examine how migrants experience transnational mobilities in space through time, particularly with a focus on transnational practices. In their engagement with the world, migrants encounter distances and directionality in space through their specific activities. As such, this conceptualization brings together the different notions of space that previous literature has mentioned, enabling researchers to examine how migrants experience the rela-

tionality of spatiality, particularly in relation to temporality. In terms of spatiality, it is useful to investigate how migrants are immersed in the world as they seek to feel "at-home" through familiarity, possibly making the "unfamiliar" land "familiar" or the other way around. Researchers should explore how migrants encounter farness or nearness through their specific activities in making decisions to migrate, relocating, and forming aspirations for the future. Similar to methodological approaches that previous studies on transnationalism have followed (e.g., Basch, Glick-Schiller, & Szanton-Blanc, 1996; Faist, 2010), researchers can look into migrants' experiences of space as they engage in transnational practices. These practices include sustainment of (transnational) family relationships, receiving family support or giving support to their families, transnational business activities and transnational communication. In this sense, distances are experienced in relation to their interactions with others and things that matter to them.

An examination of migrants' feeling at-home is related to what dwelling-mobility means for them. Dwelling is not sedentarism or the stability of staying peacefully in a place. Instead, migrants initiate and maintain "dwelling-mobility" through transnational relationships among the home, host, and even transit societies. In some instances, influences of others in host and home societies who are relatively immobile shape how migrants experience dwelling-mobility with regards to transnational activities, imagined returns, or sustainment of ethnic identities (see also Baas, 2010). Therefore, researchers can examine the extent to which transnational mobilities are influenced by the relative immobility of others and of themselves in interactions with families, friends and colleagues, as well as others who influence their mobilities.

This framework also adds nuance to understanding of time and space, which has similarly been addressed in Shubin's (2015) work. It is noticed that many studies in geography, development, transnationalism, and migration have examined spatialities in various manners, including investigation into migrants' negotiations of sovereignty and territory through citizenship, uses of their transnational networks, and gift-giving practices.

While this paper acknowledges these contributions and by taking a Heideggerian approach on board, it is argued in this paper that migrants encounter space in and through their embeddedness in place with others and things over time. For example, in a study on the Vietnamese diaspora in Australia and their gift-giving practices in the late 1990s, Thomas (1999) contends that these migrants use gifts as objects to compensate their absence from home, to fulfil their nostalgia, as well as to offer their relatives a sense of foreignness from Australia. In contrast, those who receive the gifts express their disappointment, because they want to receive money instead of consumption products due to the economic turmoil the Vietnam War had ended in 1975. The contradiction in gift giving and receiving shows that these migrants experience spatiality across Australia and Vietnam, from the past with memories about their relatives and hardship after the war to their present extension of familial relationships. These migrants encountered some degree of dislocation when they knew that their relatives were not happy to receive the gifts and later sold them for money. The space the Vietnamese diaspora experience involves their interactions with their relatives, material objects, past memories, as well as affections. In other words, not only does space manifest itself in measurable distances, but it also is negotiated through migrants' interrelated interactions with others and things in a multiplicity of spaces and times. Space exists within "their intersubjective-making of places with others and things" (Shubin, 2015, pp. 352–353). Space and time in migration together are neither objective nor completely subjective entities, but intersubjective co-constructs within affective domains.

In migration research, temporality has been defined as a "staged chronology of migration" (Shubin, 2015, p. 350) from deciding to migrate to relocating, or completion of migration after arrival in host countries (Cwerner, 2001). By following this perspective, some current studies examine how migrants experience time when they deal with the mobility governance that shapes their decisions to migrate. Others explore migrants' lived experience and duration of their stay in host countries. Migration is then seen as a series of fragmented events happening in temporal order

(from departure to arrival and relocation) in defined locations (from home societies to host destinations). In contrast, some studies taking trans-nationalism perspectives have conceptualized temporality as lived time that manifests itself in migrants' experiences. However, there are some problems in theorizing temporality in these studies of this strand. According to Robertson (2014), time tends to be examined separately from space when the former is seen as a "subordinate element" to the latter (p. 1917). Time and space are then considered as objective domains in which mi-grants are said to respond in separate events of their lives (see also Shubin, 2015, pp. 350–351, for a critique of timespaces as "mind-dependent enti-ties"). By focusing on migrants' responses to social structures and influen-ces of others, some studies tend to conceptualize spatiality and temporality within the frame of agency and structure that exist within migrants' con-sciousness (Robertson, 2014). However, like Shubin (2015), the author of this paper argues that time and space are encountered both internally in and externally from migrants' minds. Time and space involve migrants' interactions with "multiple and heterogeneous" actions shaped by their engagement with the world in "different and divergent directions across an uneven social field" (May & Thrift, 2001, p. 5, as cited in Shubin, 2015, p. 350). In addition, migrants' present engagement with the world and aspirations for the future are shaped by and through their interpretation of their past. In other words, migrants' interactions with others and things are not simply fixed within a specific time or space. Rather, they experience the world in non-linear time across spaces. By adopting the theoretical perspective on migrants' entwinement with the world across heterogeneous timespaces, this paper responds to Shubin's (2015) call for further studies that "better reflect the multiplicity of migrant futures created along with the past and present and conditioning present's fullness" (p. 360).

Migration is not contained in a single space or time, but is "the geographical stretching of social relations" with others over time (Massey, 1993, p. 60), constructing and reconstructing migrants' belonging. Migrants' fixities in host societies, which are associated with roots, may affect their further mobilities as negotiations of routes. While "roots" signify emo-

tional bonds with the physical environment, shared culture and locality as local anchorage into place, "routes" refer to ways that migrants are mobile yet attached to a place as "culturally mediated experiences of dwelling and travelling" (Clifford, 1997, p. 5). While some argue that these two concepts are intertwined (Clifford, 1997), others acknowledge that cultural and ethnic attachment as well as a sense of belonging may distract migrants from making roots in host societies (e.g., Basch, Glick-Schiller, & Szanton-Blanc, 1996; Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013; Smith, 2001).

These two notions are debated around the issue of belonging to place that migrants negotiate during their relocation and while forming aspirations for future lives. As mentioned above, current studies have presented various findings on migrants' attachment to place, generally suggesting that place attachment and mobility are contradictory and/or complementary. In addition, studies on transnationalism have explored migrants' attachment to place through ethnic and cultural attachments, as well as transnational practices. This approach raises a question of how migrants experience time through their embeddedness in place. While transnational mobilities involve an extension of space from one place to another, migrants concurrently encounter intersecting influences of their duty, responsibility, and desire which are shaped by their past experiences and future projection (King, Thomson, Fielding, & Warnes, 2006; Yeoh, Huang, & Lam, 2005; Yeoh et al., 2013). By adopting the perspective of migrants' entwinement with the world, the theoretical framing suggested in this paper allows researchers to explore the negotiations of migrants' "roots" and "routes" through their embeddedness in the interconnection of time and space. The methodological approach used to unpack this interconnection, which can shed light on "roots" and "routes."

In negotiating "roots" and "routes" in transnational social fields, migrants may have to face disparities, inequalities, religious and racial issues that facilitate and legitimise mobility and fixity (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013). Smith (2001), for example, argues that transnational practices enabled by the governance of dual citizenship limit migrants from assimilat-

ing in host societies. Instead, some migrants may incorporate in the new society and concurrently maintain their roots with the countries of origin, whereas others do not participate in transnational activities at all. Integration in host societies and commitment to home countries are not necessarily exclusive, but can be complementary (de Haas, 2010). Sustained transnational contacts, relationships, and practices are experienced as the routes they are making to maintain their roots that, in some cases, may not be necessarily grounded in receiving countries. As Chaney (1979) notes on the flows of Caribbean peoples to the United States during the 1970s, similarly, there are now people who experience having their "feet in two societies" (p. 209). In other words, through dwelling-mobility, migrants experience interconnected space, in which distances are experienced only through their interactions with others and things over time. Their dwelling in the world with others and things across space and time makes transnational mobilities fluid and complex, rather than fixed and unchanged.

When taking time and space together, research on mobilities postulates that movement is constituted by the "spatialization of time and temporalization of space" (Cresswell, 2006, p. 4). Mobilities are not seen as a "function" of time and space, but produce time and space (Cresswell, 2006) in terms of migrants' experiences of their relations to the world. Mobilities are not simply movements from one place to another, but rather, the strategies that migrants use and the meanings they embed in their movements, affecting how they experience mobilities. In directing themselves and being directed towards that place, they may arrive at the intended destination through the intended itinerary, change the routes and meanings, or even arrive at another destination as they find possibilities opening up in their routes (see also Baas, 2010). This paper views migrants' lives as open and unfolding into a diversity of experiences (Horschelmann, 2011), rather than being confined to a particular mode, place or time (see also Shubin, 2015, for a similar argument).

Not only do transnational mobilities involve the stretching of space from one locale to another, they also entail temporal features revealed as intersecting considerations of duty, responsibility, ambition, and hope

which are both retrospective and prospective. Accordingly, researchers can examine how migrants experience temporality with regard to their past experiences as already-in-the-world, present lives as being-alongside and aspirations for the future as ahead-of-itself. Migrants' past experiences include confluences of socio-economic, political, cultural, communal, and familial contexts that shape who they used to be prior to migration. Researchers also examine how these confluences open up possibilities for them during the initiation of migration and relocation by investigating what specific actions the participants take and what their activities mean for them. How their past and present lives shape their aspirations for the future can be explored through the ways they interact with others and things and for what purposes. Drawing on their past, their engagement in the world opens possibilities in the present that potentially influence their expectations of the future. The entwinement of migrants' past, present, and future is explored through an opening of possibilities arising from their interactions with others and things at intersecting scales. The confluences of the social and personal aspects and from the past to present and future can transcend particular periods and places which encompass their past trajectories and future continuities.

Following Shubin's (2015) phenomenological approach in understanding spatialities and temporalities of mobilities, the author of this paper contends that time and space are experienced through migrants' multiple and heterogeneous involvements with the world. This argument responds to the need to develop a critical approach to understanding time and space as a "conjunction of separate phenomena" (Shubin, 2015, p. 351; see also Collins & Shubin, 2015; Smith & King, 2012). By responding to Smith and King's (2012) call for "more critical conceptualisations of space and time" (p. 130), this paper critiques the separation of time as past and present, and of space as place and placelessness. Time and space are encountered as happenings and incompleteness of migrants' lives. Migrants keep projecting themselves into the future based on their experiences of living across the past and present in various social and geographical spaces.

This paper is also congruent with some phenomenological studies (e.g., Collins & Shubin, 2015; Shubin, 2015) that critique the assumption of migrants' rationality as "internal to consciousness and subject to different mechanisms of ordering and manipulation" (Shubin, 2015, p. 350). Shubin observes that migrants' interactions with the world produce mixed emotions and feelings, as well as make their lives unfold instead of simply "flowing" (p. 351) from one place in a particular time to another. In the same vein, this paper conceptualizes migrants as embodied subjects manoeuvring in their life-course, rather than disembodied objects of state policies and political projects. Timespaces can be conceptualized as "intersubjective" domains in which migrants may face "unpredictability and precariousness" (Horschelmann, 2011, p. 379) that makes their lives unfold in complex ways. By situating migrants' embeddedness in multiple timespaces, this paper goes beyond the "descriptions of static presentnesss" or "staged chronology" of migrants' mobilities, which tends to depict an "orderable and measurable spatio-temporal structure" (Horschelmann, 2011, p. 359). Migrants' mobilities are always in the process of "journeying" (p. 359) or put another way, happenings with complexities, messiness, ambiguities, as well as challenges and possibilities. Drawing on the concept of being-in-the-world in relation to timespaces, this paper positions migrants as active people whose lives are always projective and unfolding, rather than objects of political discourse for "brain flows" from one country to another in a fixed period of time.

Conclusion

This article draws on a small number of earlier studies using a Heideggerian framework in exploring the relationality of spatiality and temporality in mobilities (e.g., Collins & Shubin, 2015; Shubin, 2015). It challenges some common perspectives on space and time as separate "sequential and geometrically measurable forms" (Shubin, 2015, p. 350) that reduce migrants' experiences to separate events. Drawing on the Heideggerian care-structure, researchers can explore the non-linearity of

time that migrants experience in their specific engagements with the world that make their lives incomplete and projective as an ongoing process. Migrants' involvement with the world across space over time potentially presents constraints and possibilities that can make their unfolding lives complex. Attending to the relationality of space and time allows researchers to challenge the notions of time and space as objective entities which exist separately from migrants' interactions with the world as commonly conceptualized in some current studies. Heidegger's concept of being-in-the-world enables researchers to examine migrants' encounters of time and space as being not simply constructed by the acts of migrants themselves but rather, their interactions with the world.

By examining migrants' entwinement with the world, this paper offers methodological advances for understanding the confluences of a range of scales from "family/household, community, national and the constellation of countries linked by migration flows" (King & Skeldon, 2010, p. 1640). An understanding of migrants' immersion in the world at multiple scales informs how diasporic lives are constituted through the hybrid self-formations in relation to others and things through space and time. The exploration of time and space particularly advances current research approaches in addressing the myriad ways in which migrants' everyday practices are not confined to fixed territories, but are parts of a multitude of spatial networks and temporal linkages" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 186). By examining the dynamics of transnational mobilities shaped by migrants' interactions with the world at multiple intersecting scales, this article adds nuances on understandings of "categorical opposites" (Glick-Schiller & Salazar, 2013, p. 188) including routes and roots, agency and structure, and spatiality and temporality.

References

Arisaka, Y. (1996). Spatiality, temporality, and the problem of foundation in *Being and Time*. *Philosophy Today, 41*(1), 36−46.

Baas, M. (2006). Students of migration: Indian overseas students and the question of permanent residency. *People and Place, 14*(1), 8−23.

Baas, M. (2010). *Imagined mobility―Migration and transnationalism among Indian students in Australia.* London: Anthem Press.

Baruch, Y., Budhwar, P. S., & Khatri, N. (2007). Brain drain: Inclination to stay abroad after studies. *Journal of World Business*, *42*(1), 99−112.

Basch, L., Glick-Schiller, N., & Szanton-Blanc, C. (1996). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, postcolonial predicaments and de-territorialized nation-states*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Biao, X. (2005). Gender, dowry and the migration system of Indian information technology professionals. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies, 12*(2/3), 257−380.

Biao, X. (2007). *Global 'body shopping': An Indian labour system in the information technology industry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Biao, X. (2011). A ritual economy of 'talent': China and overseas Chinese professionals. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37*(5), 821−838.

Birrell, B., & Healy, E. (2008). How are skilled migrants doing? *People and Place, 16*(1), 1−20.

Birrell, B., & Perry, B. (2009). Immigration policy change and the international student industry. *People and Place, 17*(2), 64−80.

Blattner, W. (2006). *Heidegger's being and time*. New York: Continuum.

Chaney, E. M. (1979). The world economy and contemporary migration. *International Migration Review, 13*(2), 204−212.

Chellaraj, G., Maskus, K. E., & Mattoo, A. (2005). *The contribution of skilled immigration and international graduate students to US innovation*

(World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3588). Washington DC: The World Bank.

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

Collins, F. L. (2008). Bridges to learning: International student mobilities, education agencies and inter-personal networks. *Global Networks, 8*(4), 398–417.

Collins, F. L., & Shubin, S. (2015). Migrant times beyond the life course: The temporalities of foreign English teachers in South Korea. *Geoforum, 62*(June), 96–104.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world.* New York: Routledge.

Cresswell, T. (2013, November). Friction. In B. S. A. Yeoh (Chair), *Theorizing mobilities in/from Asia*, Conference conducted at the Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

Cwerner, S. B. (2001). The times of migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 27*(1), 7–36.

Dall'Alba, G. (2009). Learning professional ways of being: Ambiguities of becoming. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 41*(1), 34–45.

de Haas, H. (2010). Migration and development: A theoretical perspective. *International Migration Review, 44*(1), 227–264.

Dreyfus, H. L. (1991). *Being-in-the-world: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I.* London: MIT Press.

Dustmann, C., & Fabbri, F. (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *The Economic Journal, 113* (489), 695–717.

Faist, T. (2010). Diaspora and transnationalism: What kind of dance partners? In R. Baubock & T. Faist (Eds.), *Diaspora and transnationalism: Concepts, theories and methods* (pp. 9–34). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Florida, R. (2005). *The flight of the creative class—The new global competition for talent.* New York: Harper Business.

Glick-Schiller, N., & Salazar, N. B. (2013). Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(2), 183–200.

Guellec, D., & Cervantes, M. (2002). International mobility of highly skilled workers: From statistical analysis to policy formulation in OECD. In OECD (Ed.), *Trends in international migration* (pp. 71–98). Paris: OECD.

Harrison, P. (2007). The space between us: Opening remarks on the concept of dwelling. *Environmental and Planning D: Society and Space, 25*(4), 625–647.

Hawthorne, L. (2010). How valuable is "two-step migration"? Labour market outcomes for international student migrants in Australia. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal, 19*(1), 5–36.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans). London: SCM Press. (Original work published in 1927)

Ho, E., & Bedford, R. (2008). Asian transnational families in New Zealand: Dynamics and challenges. *International Migration, 46*(4), 41–62.

Horschelmann, K. (2011). Theorizing life transitions: Geographical perspectives. *Area, 43*(4), 378–383.

Inwood, M. (2000). *Heidegger: A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

King, R. (2012). Geography and migration studies: Retrospect and prospect. *Population, Space and Place, 18*(2), 134–153.

King, R., & Skeldon, R. (2010). Mind the gap! Integrating approaches to internal and international migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(10), 1619–1646.

King, R., Thomson, M., Fielding, T., & Warnes, T. (2006). Time, generations and gender in migration and settlement. In R. Penninx, M. Berger & K. Kraal (Eds.), *The dynamics of international migration and settlement in Europe* (pp. 233–267). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Levitt, P. (1998). Social remittances: Migration driven local-level cultural diffusion. *International Migration Review, 32*(4), 926–948.

Liu-Farrer, G. (2011). Making careers in the occupational niche: Chinese students in corporate Japan's transnational business. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37*(5), 785−803.

Malpas, J. (2012). *Heidegger and the thinking of place: Explorations in the topology of being.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Massey, D. (1993). Power geometry and a progressive sense of place. In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson, & L. Tickner (Eds.), *Mapping the futures: Local cultures, global change* (pp. 59−69). New York: Routledge.

Nagel, C. R. (2005). Gender and skilled migrants: Into and beyond the workplace. *Geoforum, 36*(2), 197−210.

Nguyen, C. H. (2006). Brain drain or brain gain? The revitalization of a slow death. *Essays in Education, 16.* Retrieved January 9, 2019, from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.516.6511 &rep=rep1&type=pdf

Nguyen, C. H. (2013). Vietnamese international student mobility: Past and current trends. *Asian Education and Development Studies, 2*(2), 127−148.

Nguyen, C. H. (2014). Development and brain drain. *Migration and Development Journal, 3*(2), 181−202.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2014). *International migration outlook—2014.* Paris: OECD. Retrieved January 9, 2019, from http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/social-issues-migration-health/international-migration-outlook-2014_migr_outlook-2014-en#page1

Robertson, S. (2008). *Negotiated transnationality: Memberships, mobilities and the student-turned-migrant experience* (Doctoral dissertation, RMIT, Melbourne, Australia). Retrieved from http://researchbank.rmit. edu.au/eserv/r mit:6794/Robertson.pdf

Robertson, S. (2014). Time and temporary migration: The case of temporary graduate workers and working holiday makers in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(12), 1915−1933.

Robertson, S., & Runganaikaloo, A. (2014). Lives in limbo: Migration experi-

ences in Australia's education—migration nexus. *Ethnicities, 14*(2), 208−226.

Shubin, S. (2015). Migration timespaces: A Heideggerian approach to understanding the mobile being of Eastern Europeans in Scotland. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 40*(3), 350−361.

Singh, M., Robertson, S., & Cabraal, A. (2012). Transnational family money: Remittances, gifts and inheritance. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33*(5), 475−492.

Smith, C. R., & Hyde, M. J. (1991). Rethinking "the public": The role of emotion in being-with-others. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*(4), 446−466.

Smith, D. P., & King, R. (2012). Editorial introduction: Re-making migration theory. *Population, Space and Place, 18*(2), 127−133.

Smith, M. P. (2001). *Transnational urbanism: Locating globalization.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Syed, J. (2008). Employment prospects for skilled migrants: A relational perspective. *Human Resource Management Review, 18*(1), 28−45.

Teo, S. Y. (2011). 'The moon back home is brighter?': Return migration and the cultural politics of belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37*(5), 805−820.

Thomas, M. (1999). *Dreams in the shadows—Vietnamese-Australian lives in transition.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Tseng, Y-F. (2011). Shanghai rush: Skilled migrants in a fantasy city. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37*(5), 765−784.

Waters, J. L. (2006). Geographies of cultural capital: Education, international migration and family strategies between Hong Kong and Canada. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 31*(2), 179−192.

World Bank. (2014). *Personal remittances, received (% of GDP).* Washington DC: The World Bank. Retrieved January 9, 2019, from http://data. worldbank.org/indicator/BX.TRF.PWKR.DT.GD.ZS

Yeoh, B. S. A., & Huang, S. (2011). Introduction: Fluidity and friction in

talent migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 37*(5), 681−690.

Yeoh, B. S. A., Huang, S., & Lam, T. (2005). Transnationalizing the 'Asian' family: Imaginaries, intimacies and strategic intents. *Global Networks, 5*(4), 307−315.

Yeoh, B. S. A., Leng, C. H., Dung, V. T. K. & Yi'en, C. (2013). Between two families: the social meaning of remittances for Vietnamese marriage migrants in Singapore. *Global Networks, 13*(4), 441−458.

Biographical Note

Chi Hong Nguyen is currently working as a Head of the English Language Division at FPT University on Can Tho City Campus. His main research areas include transnational mobilities of skilled migrants, international student mobilities and international education. E-mail: chinh6@fe.edu.vn