

## ABSTRACT

This thesis researches the accumulation and exchange of various forms of capital through the participation in two different ethnic organizations in Copenhagen. To answer the question, how social, cultural, economic and symbolic capital forms are accumulated and exchanged by the members of the mentioned organizations, I have applied the empirical data which thus conducted in form of 14 semi-structured in-depth interviews, 3 participant observations and document analysis. The empirical data has then been analyzed applying the chosen theory: Bourdieu's theoretical approach of forms of capital and Putnam's social capital theory. The analysis is carried out separately for both organizations, - first I am analysing LYS accumulation of social capital (bonding, bridging, linking), - then later I am reflecting of the outcomes of these forms of social capital, which are as following: information, employment and housing, skills, cultural capital as knowledge, sybolic capital. The same is proceeded with Lithuanian Society, only the bridging social connections are divided into cross-ethnic bridging and co-ethnic bridging connections. The outcome of LS social capital are cultural capital in taste and preferences, symbolic capital, information, support in case of fatality and other personal outcomes. The analysis is finished with conclusions.

Keywords: social capital, bonding, bridging, economic capital, embodied cultural capital, symbolic capital

## Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	4
<b>1.1. Research question</b> .....	5
<b>2. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	5
<b>2.1. Participant observations</b> .....	5
<b>2.2. Semi-structured interviews</b> .....	9
<b>2.3. Document Analysis</b> .....	11
<b>2.4. Organizations and their activity</b> .....	12
<b>2.4.1. Lithuanian Youth Society</b> .....	12
<b>2.4.1.1. Structure, goals and membership</b> .....	12
<b>2.4.1.2. LYS events and activities</b> .....	13
<b>2.4.2. Lithuanian Society</b> .....	16
<b>2.4.2.1. Lithuanian Society in Denmark: structure, goals and membership</b> .....	16
<b>2.4.2.2. LYS events and activities</b> .....	16
<b>4. ANALYSIS</b> .....	23
<b>4.1.1. Accumulation of social capital through participation in LYS</b> .....	25
<b>4.1.1.1. Bonding social connections within Lithuanian Youth Society</b> .....	25
<b>4.1.1.2. Bridging social connections through the participation in LYS events</b> .....	30
<b>4.1.2. LYS Social Capital's Outcomes</b> .....	33
<b>4.1.2.1. Information</b> .....	33
<b>4.1.2.2. Employment and Housing</b> .....	34
<b>4.1.2.3. Culture capital in form of acquired skills</b> .....	36
<b>4.1.2.4. Cultural capital in form of cultural knowledge</b> .....	38
<b>4.1.2.5. Symbolic capital</b> .....	39
<b>4.2.1. Accumulation of social capital through participation in LS</b> .....	41
<b>4.2.1.1. Bonding social connections within Lithuanian Society</b> .....	41
<b>4.2.1.2. Linking Social Connections: LS and institutions</b> .....	45
<b>4.2.1.3. Bridging social connections through Lithuanian Society</b> .....	45
<b>4.2.1.3.1. Accumulation of cross-ethnic bridging social capital</b> .....	45
<b>4.2.1.3.2. The accumulation of co-ethnic bridging social capital.</b> .....	47
<b>4.2.2. LS Social Capital's Outcomes</b> .....	49
<b>4.2.2.1. Cultural capital in form of taste and preferences</b> .....	49
<b>4.2.2.2. Symbolic capital in LS</b> .....	54

4.2.2.3. Information.....	55
4.2.2.4. Support in case of fatality.....	56
4.2.2.5. Other personal favors .....	56
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	57

# 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Embassy of Lithuania in Denmark, there are 12 000 Lithuanians currently living in Copenhagen, around 900 of them – students<sup>1</sup>. All these people upon their departure from Lithuania have to some extent been deprived at least of one form of capital – their social connections they had formed in their homeland, - the social capital. And since navigating through life's challenges in a host country and taking advantage of opportunities that arise, require an immigrant to draw on a range of resources (*Arshad, 2011*), in order to do that, one might establish or involve into an informal ethnic network, which with the time might develop into a formal ethnic organization.

Such an ethnic organization might provide one with a set of resources, skills, knowledge, services and information that are central to the reconstitution, formation and management of immigrant's social, political and economic networks outside the organization (*Cordero-Guzmán, 2005*). Having necessary resources, one could, for instance, accumulate cultural capital that could be further invested to obtain the economic capital, the extensive amount of which could transmute to symbolic capital, - and being recognized, - isn't that what we all want?

However, social capital does not always sound that warm and cuddly (*Putnam, 2000:21*). The strong bonding social capital within an ethnic society might as well prevent integration into the host society (*Cheong et al. 2007*), - if people only interact amongst people like themselves, they may form prejudices against others and this might lead to unsocial capital (*Levi, 1996*), that is, towards segregation (*Bourdieu: 1986*).

When all comes to all, participation in ethnic organizations, as in any other network, might have both positive and negative consequences, - and might result or may not, - in accumulation of other forms of capital that could be exchanged to one another and thus could facilitate the immigrants' integration into the host society.

Thus, the intention of this thesis is to investigate what the participation in Lithuanian organizations' activity in Copenhagen brings to their members in terms of capital.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data provided per e-mail.

## 1.1. Research question

RQ1. What forms of capital do the members of LYS and LS accumulate through their participation in their respective societies' general activity and arranged events?

RQ2. How do they convert these forms of capital to the others, and what consequences does the conversion bring?

## 2. METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the research questions, *participant observations*, *semi-structured interviews* and *document analysis* have been employed as qualitative empirical data collection methods.

### 2.1. Participant observations

According to anthropologist Greg Guest, participant observation as a data collecting method is useful “*for gaining an understanding of the physical, social, cultural, and economic contexts in which study participants live; the relationships among and between people, contexts, ideas, norms, and events; and people’s behaviors and activities – what they do, how frequently, and with whom*” (Guest, G. et al., 2005: 22), thus it was very natural to me, a researcher that is studying how the social capital is gained through the participation in two ethnically similar, yet in other ways very different organizations, to aim to carry out several observations from the ‘insider’s’ perspective of the societies I was studying.

It appeared very easy to become an ‘insider’ in LYS, where I have conducted three participant observations. All I had to do was to express my wish to be a part of LYS activity, - and I got an immediate access. However, there was no similar opportunity within LS. In fact, at the time I have proceeded my fieldwork (since beginning of April 2016 till July 2016), there was no opportunity to carry a participant observation at all, - there were no events arranged. Thus, in order to slightly compensate for the lack of data I could have collected through the participant observations in LS, I have tried to make sure that as many as possible interviews with the LS participants happen at their home. I have intentionally aimed to arrange the interviews in the evenings, hoping that by this time the whole family will be at home, and I will at least be able to

observe their interaction with each other (my expectations to meet the families of the informants have been fulfilled six out of seven times).

The participant observations that I have carried out, took place in various LYS gatherings in several different settings. The first observation was carried out in a social setting, at café Retro, where LYS members were celebrating LYS's 4<sup>th</sup> birthday in the end of March, 2016. The birthday celebration has been advertised on LYS Facebook page and was open to attend for everyone independently of attendee's nationality. The event started at 7 pm, and the first attendees were five current board members. However, in the next half an hour other members and non-members fellow Lithuanians started gathering one after another. The board members immediately took the role of hostesses: the arrived non-members were warmly welcomed, introduced around and taken a good care of through the whole evening. Two of the first-timers have been brought to chat with me, as far as the former chairman have gotten to know that they were pursuing the same studies I've graduated, and thought that we will have some topics in common.

The majority of participants knew each other, - most of them, however, seemed to haven't seen each other for some time, - one could hear a lot of catching up going on all around. Some of the people arrived in groups of three-five people, and were mostly chatting in between. However, they have also shortly chatted with few board members as well as with some other LYS members. By 9 pm, when the location was filled up with people (the crowd was by large extent Lithuanians, except a Spanish girlfriend of a LYS member and some Danish guys who have come to the café for a beer), the birthday cake with four candles was brought in. The whole crowd all together sang 'Happy birthday' song, then blew out the candles and shared the cake. There were chatted for couple of hours more, then, around 11 pm, people started splitting up and heading home or to the nearby pubs.

The second participant observation took place approximately a month after LYS birthday celebration, this time in a private setting: I was invited to a Sunday gathering at one of the board member's place. The purpose of gathering was to check up on how the last preparations for Lithuanian Days are going as well as to divide the tasks that had to be re-allocated due to the sudden withdrawal of some LYS members. Last but not least, there was a clear intention to reconnect with each other socially, to get to know each other better or, in other words, to 'glue the team' (a natural aspiration, having in mind the fact, that some of the LYS members have left the organization a couple of weeks before the Lithuanian Youth Society's biggest event).

Out of around 15 invited members, nine showed up. All but one arrived 10 min – an hour late. The main organizers came earlier than others and started coordinating the tasks straight away. When the last participants arrived, the tasks have already been allocated a while ago, thus the ones that came in late had missed the opportunity to have their say in the organizing. However, they were gladly welcomed to join the social part of the evening.

Upon the allocation of the tasks, the main organizers have been very attentive to the rest of participants, none of the tasks were forced upon one or other member. In accordance, the members have actively volunteered to do the tasks. Each time one would volunteer for a task, he or she was cheered up and commended: *“Cool, you are, like, the best at it!”*, *“You will do that? That’s awesome, what would we do without you!”* (Participant observation 2). Any advice and constructive criticism seemed to be taken into consideration and overall appreciated. The members who have organized Lithuanian Days the previous years, have pointed out the challenges they have encountered, so that the current organizers would be able to prevent them from happening once again.

As soon as the tasks were divided in between, the conversations flew, - the participants shared the memories of their travels, exchanged the comical situations they have experienced in Denmark, evaluated the current music trend in Lithuania, chit-chatted about personal matters and in general seemed to be having a great time.

The following and the last observation I have attended was the biggest event arranged by LYS, - Lithuanian Days which took place in World Culture Center on the 20-21<sup>st</sup> of June, 2016. I have joined the event just a bit before the main part of the Friday’s arrangement, - the conference-discussion. Prior the conference and during it, all the participating organizers seemed to be thoroughly carrying out the practical assignments they have been allocated, - none of them was active in the discussion, - so to speak, the floor was given to the audience, that did not hesitate to discuss the Lithuanian emigration issues with all three conference speakers.

At the end of the discussion, the speakers and the audience were asked not to leave yet, but to enjoy the next arrangement, - a musical performance of a modern artist that was going to sing out the narratives of the conference attendants (arriving to the conference people were asked to describe what being Lithuanian means to them by few words, that were supposed to be used in the performance). However, as soon as the conference was over, people rushed out in crowds. The ones that stayed to chat with the speakers, have also left as soon as the speakers headed out for the

dinner arranged by the Lithuanian Embassy in Denmark. The musical performance was watched by no more than 15 people, most of whom were the organizers and their relatives. Meanwhile approximately 50 to 70 conference attendees were chatting outside in the yard, mostly interacting with the people they came with or with the acquaintances and colleagues they have met in the event. Most of attendees have left the World Culture Center in the next hour, however the organizers of the event and some other active LYS members stayed for a couple of hours more and then headed home or out to the city to further celebrate the opening of the event.

During the second day the organizers started meeting around the 10.30 am to prepare the outside scene for the musicians, to decorate the yard with Lithuanian and Danish symbols, and to hand out the fliers around the location (which I helped with). The morning for the organizers started with the quick collective breakfast, while conversing about the organizational tasks, and in about a half an hour everybody split to take care of their assignments. The majority of the assignments were managed in time, the preparation of the scene, however, took longer than planned and resulted in a delay of the 2<sup>nd</sup> day program by an hour. There were seven bands/musicians performing, two of them were Lithuanian, others – from other countries. The musical part of Lithuanian Days have attracted not only a fair amount of Lithuanians (both active and passive members of LYS as well as non-members), but have also been visited by some foreigners and Danes who either lived/happened to be in the neighborhood at the moment of the event, and were curious about what's happening there (few of them, however, have stayed for longer than a half an hour), or have been brought to the event by their Lithuanian spouses, friends or acquaintances. The families with children had been offered an entertainment inside the premises, - there were shown cartoons about Lithuanian mythology. During both days the attendants of the event could buy some Lithuanian beverages and snacks in the center's café.

The LYS members, present at the event, have tried their best to talk to every new person they would see around, - explain them a bit more about the purpose of the event, introduce them to LYS organization and their activities, however, not always there was a possibility to do so, as far as the majority of them had to take care of the organizational matters and/or had their own families and friends to entertain, thus, the interactions with the new attendants were mostly rushed through.



The second day of the event came to the end around 10 pm, although the majority of the organizers have further interacted with each other alongside their families and friends in the nearby bars.

During each and every of the above described participant observations or straight after them, I made sure to write down detailed fieldnotes, as far as “*Producing fieldnotes is the observer's raison d'être: if you do not record what happens, you might as well not be in the setting.*” (Gilbert, 2008: 273).

The data collected through the participant observations have not only given me wider perspective on how the members of the organization interact with each other and the non-members they meet in the activities arranged by LYS, but has also helped me to design the interview guide I have used to conduct the semi-structured interviews.

## **2.2. Semi-structured interviews**

During the data collection phase, I have conducted 14 semi-structured in-depth interviews, seven of them with members of LS (two men, five women, age range 32-50), and seven of others with members of LYS (three men and three women, age range 24-27). The informants were chosen by using snowball sampling technique, that is, the informants are obtained “*through referrals among people who share the same characteristic and who know of each other*” (Seal, 2012: 145). The choice of the technique was heavily impacted by inaccessibility of member lists in both researched organizations. When asked for the access to the member list, the chairman of LYS has informed me that the list has not been updated since the beginning of 2015. Having in mind, that the organization is in a constant change, that is, people join and leave the organization very frequently, the usage of non-updated data did not seem to be a reasonable choice. LS have on the other hand never provided the member list, - each member, asked about it, have directed me to one person, who, although asked for the list several times, have each and every time ignored the request. Under the circumstances as described above, I have chosen to pursue snow-ball sampling. Thus, starting with the respondents for the pilot interview, each person has been further asked to suggest a couple of other informants, preferably a woman and a man. The following informants were asked to do the same, thus with the each informant the probability to obtain similar to the first interviews data has been declining. My main concern regarding the snowball sampling

technique, that is, that I might happen to interview people within the same network, who spend might therefore have similar experiences, my fears appeared to be meaningless in case of LYS, - where although some people have known each other and were friends, their experiences have shown to be rather different. However, my concern was confirmed with respondents from LS, - they all happened to know each other very well, one could say they all were from the same circle, thus had rather similar position regarding the participation in the society.

Snowballing sampling technique seemed to work perfectly and smoothly when interviewing LYS members, - the recommended informants have gladly agreed to participate, all the interviews went as planned, in the arranged time, none of them have cancelled the scheduled interview or postponed it, even if the chosen timing for some was in the middle of their thesis project or exams.

However, the situation with members from LS has been more challenging. Although it was quite easy to get in touch with my pilot-interviewee, and he has kindly recommended a couple of other members I should contact, it has been rather difficult to get them to answer to my e-mails and then, afterwards, to find time to meet me. The explanation would be all the same, - busy at work and busy after work at home with the family. However, when offered to be interviewed at home, most of them gladly agreed to help me.

Thus, all the interviews with LS members, except one, have been conducted at their home, while the interviews with LYS members have been conducted in various places, starting from the cafes to parks and ending with two of them at informants' home.

The interviews with LYS members were conducted during the period from the 10<sup>th</sup> of April to the 5<sup>th</sup> of June, while the interviews with LS members have been conducted from the 9<sup>th</sup> of June to the 19<sup>th</sup> of June. The first interview in each of the societies has been so called pilot interview, the purpose of which was primary to get more comprehensive knowledge about the organization's structure, activities and goals. That does not, however, mean that the information gained through the pilot interviews has been only organization-oriented, - the pilot interviewees have been additionally asked the questions from the same interview guide as the rest of the interviewed members.

Before the interviews, the participants were informed of the nature of the research and were asked for their consent to record them as well as to quote them. The interviews were recorded by mobile phone recorder, and lasted approximately an hour (the shortest interview lasted 37 min,

the longest one was 1 h 50 min long.). In the beginning of each interview, the basic demographic information, such as, for instance, age, education, employment was collected. Further the informants were have asked questions from the interview guide that consists of 23 questions (for the interview guide, see *Appendix 1*). The majority of the questions asked were open-ended, although couple of questions could be answered by simple “yes or no” (these closed-ended answers were, however, were followed by the request to explicate, why the informant has given that particular answer). As far as the interviews were semi-structured, all the informants have been asked the same major questions (if they were relevant), only in different sequence. Some supplementary questions have been asked in order to obtain new information that came accidentally into the picture during the informant’s responses to the major questions.

During the interviews, I was very observant of my, as the interviewer’s, role. Since “*relaxed, unself-conscious interviewers put respondents at ease*” (Gilbert, 2008: 249), I have focused on showing my interest in a way that is not intrusive. Although I have followed the interview guide, sometimes I had personalized the dialogue to get underlying attitudes.

Ethical considerations have as well been taken into the account. In the beginning of the interviews, I have presented the purpose of my research and have explained the publicity regarding it. All my interviewees were asked, if I could record them and quote them. All of them has as well been offered anonymity, however, none of them asked it to be granted.

The Lithuanian interviews were translated to English and transcribed (*Appendix1*). The English ones are attached as audio files.

### **2.3. Document Analysis**

Document analysis was in thesis used a supplementary method to collect information about the societies’ organizational structure and the events arranged (the documents that have been analyzed: the regulations of each of the societies). As Bowen asserts, “*document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents – both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material*” (Bowen, 2009: 7), that has to be thoroughly examined and interpreted in order to elucidate meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The analytic procedure of documents, according to Labuschagne (2003), consists the following steps: finding, selecting, appraising, and synthesizing data contained in documents. Following these steps, I have drawn some data that I, just as

*Goldstein & Reiboldt (2004)*, have employed to generate some of the interview questions. Furthermore, the document analysis helped me to contextualize data, collected during interviews, and, finally, through the analysis of documents I could as well verify some of the information, acquired through the interviews.

Thus, the above described document analysis have been employed for the description of the organizations and their activity, which is presented in the subchapter below.

## **2.4. Organizations and their activity**

### **2.4.1. Lithuanian Youth Society**

#### **2.4.1.1. Structure, goals and membership**

*Lithuanian Youth Society in Denmark* has been established on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March, 2012, by three Lithuanian friends, natural science students at DTU. In its current form, the *Lithuanian Youth Society in Denmark* (further in the thesis abbreviated as LYS) is “*financially independent, non-political, non-profit youth organization*“(Lithuanian Youth Society regulations, 2015). As it is stated in LYS regulations (2015), the goals of organization are as following: unite and represent the Lithuanian youth living in Denmark; uphold Lithuanian identity, language and culture; cultivate youth’s professional skills and develop the enterprise among the Lithuanian youth living in Denmark; contribute to the cultivation of business relationship between Lithuania and Denmark.

The aforementioned goals should be pursued by fulfilling the following objectives: to organize, and pursue as well as to participate in educative, cultural and social events and projects; collect and distribute the information that is relevant to the youth; to collaborate with other Lithuanian or foreign youth organizations of similar profile, governmental and private institutions as well as with the press; to form the positive opinion about Lithuania and Lithuanians (*Lithuanian Youth Society regulations, 2015*).

Although in the LYS regulations (2015) is clearly stated that the society can be joined both by young Lithuanians as well as young foreigners that are interested in Lithuania and in the activity of LYS, the members of the organization are entirely Lithuanians. The exact number of LYS members at the moment of the data collection was unknown due to yet not updated member

list, but the approximate number has been declared to be between 150 to 200 members. The members of the organization are mostly recently graduated or students in their twenties, only few members are slightly over thirty (*Int: Dominykas*).

To become a member of LYS, one has to pay a membership of 50 DKK. When filling the form for the registration, the members-to-be have to choose, if they enroll as active or passive members. Both passive and active membership gives access to participation in all the events and activities organized by LYS as well as the right to participate in the board meetings and take part in the activity or/and get information about the activity of all LYS divisions, the right to arrange an activity (if the activity has been approved by the board), the right to call for a special convention and others. However, the active members have the right to elect the members of the board and be elected to the board themselves (*Lithuanian Youth Society regulations, 2015*).

The board arranges, plans and encourages LYS activity in Denmark, searches for funding opportunities and takes care of LYS finances. The members of the annually elected board appoint one of themselves to be the chairman. The chairman “*is the leader of LYS, responsible for the activity of the whole organization*” (*ibid*). The chairman’s duties are as following: to coordinate the activity of the board, to call for convention and board meetings (with the affirmation of the board), to initiate and maintain the relations to other Lithuanian youth societies and organizations, to present a yearly report on LYS activity and a yearly report on the allocation of LYS funds to the convention. Although there are no regulations on how many times in a row the same board members can be re-elected to the board, the same chairman can be appointed only twice in a row.

#### **2.4.1.2. LYS events and activities**

As mentioned in the previous subchapter, Lithuanian Youth Society arranges professional, cultural and social activities.

The professional activities encompass various conferences, seminars and “*LYS University*” project. The conferences and seminars, arranged by LYS, are mostly focused on how to pursue a successful career or establish and maintain a successful business in Denmark. The purpose of “*LYS University*” is to enrich young Lithuanian migrants with a series of lectures on various topics that would expand their knowledge in different professional areas and would encourage them to generate and realize their own ideas. “*LYS University*” has so far invited for lectures, like “*Danish*

*legislation for business establishment and trading issues”, whereat the relevant legislation has been reviewed as well as was touched upon the various forms of taxation and possible ways of funding a company; “I got lucky. I’ve got interview! What’s next?“, whereat a human resource specialist taught the participants how to tackle the questions at the job interview, how to leave a memorable impression, and how to avoid the most common mistakes the interviewees make; and similar. However, at the current moment “LYS University” has been put on hold, as far as, according to Elvinas, the activities of a social aspect are of a higher demand and easier to arrange (Int: Elvinas).*

The social events, arranged by LYS, are of a wide range. The most common and most regular of them are Lithuanian pub evenings, arranged once a month in “Retro” café in the center of Copenhagen. These pub evenings are, for instance, spent on members’ catching up with each other, - since members, who work on different projects, do not meet each other very often within the organization, - networking, exchanging various information and simply socializing with other Lithuanians and, occasionally, foreigners. (Participant observation 1)

Couple of other social activities are directly connected to sports, specifically, running. “5 km for Lithuania” is a worldwide running event held in June and aiming to unite all the Lithuanians living abroad for a yearly physical activity, - 5 km run in their respective countries as a symbolic expression of the remembrance of homeland. The other running event, - “LYS weekend run and brunch”, - is arranged twice a month, on Sundays. The runners meet by one of the lakes in Copenhagen, and run three, five or more kilometers around the lakes. After the run the participants head to a café to have brunch together (Int: Saulius)

The last, but not the least social activity arranged by LYS – “LYS Dinner”. The purpose of this recently started social project is to meet new people in a comfortable environment. The participants are divided into small groups (usually 4 people), who prepare and eat dinner together at one of the participants’ place. None of the participants know whom they are going to prepare dinner with or where at. Only couple hours before the event each participant is texted the meeting location, where he/she meets others. The participants together choose what dishes they will prepare for the dinner, but to make the activity even more interesting, each dinner event encompass a challenge which might be certain task or a secret ingredient that must be used in dinner preparation (LYS Dinner, Facebook page).

The third category of LYS activities, - the cultural activities, - are represented by a yearly event *Lithuanian Days* (further abbreviated as LD), a two or three-day celebration of Lithuanian culture that traditionally takes place in the end of May. The aim of the event is to reveal the traditional and modern aspects of Lithuanian culture and identity, leave the lasting impression about Lithuania, introduce the concept of “*Street music day*” to the Copenhageners and city guests and at the same create a socially involving space whereat visitors would have an opportunity to express their own artistic skills and experience the skills of the others, and least, but not last, - strengthen friendship and mutual understanding between Danes and foreign societies in Denmark (*Lithuanian Days*, <http://ldays.dk>).

One of the main activities during Lithuanian Days is the conference attended by the speakers from Lithuania as well as Denmark. The conferences have all, but the last year, been held in English, and the topics were addressing Danes, foreigners and Lithuanians in Denmark (for instance, the conference in 2015 focused on the development of Danish and Lithuanian societies during the last 25 years). The participants of Lithuanian days were also given an opportunity to get a better insight into Lithuanian culture by watching short films that each year introduced a certain aspect of Lithuanian culture (in 2016 the cartoons about Lithuanian mythology were shown on the second day of the event). In addition to that, Lithuanian Days have also offered plenty of open-air and inside live music (each year there are around ten Lithuanian and international bands/musicians playing, one of them as a rule is a very-well known and popular Lithuanian band that performs at the opening or closing the event), artistic workshops (some usually oriented towards children, as, for instance, kite making) and exhibitions (photography, painting). On top of that, the attendees of Lithuanian Days were able to taste traditional Lithuanian food and drinks. (*ibid*).

The Lithuanian Days in 2014 were arranged in Christiania, the two following years the event was held in the premises of The World Culture Center in Nørrebro neighborhood. The Lithuanian Days have been funded by some private funds as well as by Embassy of Lithuania in Denmark, the Municipality of Copenhagen, and Lithuanian Society in Denmark (*Int: Dominykas, Elvinas*).

## **2.4.2. Lithuanian Society**

### **2.4.2.1. Lithuanian Society in Denmark: structure, goals and membership**

Lithuanian Society in Denmark (further in the thesis abbreviated LS) has officially been established in 1997 by an initiative of a Lithuanian archeologist who gathered into an organization other five like-minded Lithuanians (*Int: Inga*).

As it is stated in LS homepage, society currently has 101 members, and welcomes everyone who “*wants to find friends and like-minded people, to intersperse weekdays and weekends with interesting events and excursions, needs some useful information or simply wishes to meet fellow-countrymen*” ([www.lietuva.dk](http://www.lietuva.dk)). “*Work together with us, have fun together with, be together with us!*”, - says LS slogan, and promises that LS members will have an opportunity to influence LS activity, will be able to embody their own ideas, will have the priority upon the registration to LS events, free entrance (or a large discount) to LS events and 10% discount for the translation service of on the LS webpage advertised translators. In LS regulations, LS is described as a non-profit, non-political organization that gathers Lithuanians and people of Lithuanian origin, as well as those who are interested in Lithuania, and fosters the societal as well as national consciousness (*LS Regulations, 2008*). To become a member one has to pay an annually paid fee of 200 DKK. Members are obliged to act according to the LS regulations, pay the membership fee and not to engage in any hostile to LS activity. Apart from obligations, members have right to get any information regarding the LS activity, appoint oneself or be appointed to the LS board, to hand in the suggestions for the board activity and others (*ibid*).

LS board consists of 5-7 members and is elected for the period of two years. The members of the board choose the chairman (*Int: Inga*). The board is responsible for organization’s activity, its finances, archives as well as the whole organization’s administration. The chairman of the board cannot be reappointed for the second term right after the first one (*LS Regulations, 2008*).

### **2.4.2.2. LYS events and activities**

If one checks LS homepage, one would think that LS is incredibly rich in events. However, most of the activity, presented on the website, has ceased years ago. The social events



such as quire and dancing or book club, - are no more taking place (*Int: all LS*). However, members can socialize after the cultural events (the only sort of events offered!), or during the annual Summer tour or yearly Christmas event, - sometimes, after the official part of a cultural event, there is a social interaction by a cup of coffee and such (*Int: Reda*).

The cultural events, arranged by LS are usually either various commemorative events, as Coronation day of King Mindaugas; 16th of February, the 11th of March, National Jewish genocide day or calendar events as Shrovetide or other, After-Easter or Christmas Eve. The latter is usually arranged separately for children and adults. During the above mentioned events, there is usually arranged a concert or a theatre play (sometimes also for children, - for instance, the puppet theatre). There are as well arranged some concerts, however, they are usually oriented towards those who like classical music. There is as well arranged yearly summer tour, during which LS members travel somewhere together with their families, for instance, to visit some bunkers, the monuments from the Cold War, like this year.

The main activity of the society is children schooling (*Int: Inga*). At the current moment there are two groups of children attending Saturday classes. The group of preschoolers, or so called Little Ones' Club, has started its activity in 2014, and is focusing on teaching children Lithuanian language through social interaction, - children learn Lithuanian playing, singing and drawing together. The other group has started this September, the children who attend it are older, and speak Lithuanian on various levels. Their schooling is thus focused on improving each of children's linguistic abilities individually, thus they interact less with one another. The older kids as well are taught Lithuanian grammar and have reading exercises as well. Both groups of children are only allowed to speak Lithuanian during their classes (*Int: Inga, Reda, LS homepage*).

To sum up, one could see immediately, that although both of the above mentioned organizations are ethnic organizations, the range of their events and, in general, activity differ widely.

In the next chapter I am presenting the theory that will be applied for the analysis.

### **3. THEORY**

In this section of the thesis I am going to reflect on the theoretical notions I consider to be relevant for researching how members of two Lithuanian ethnic organizations accumulate and exchange various forms of capital through the participation in their respective organizations' activity. I will start with presenting Bourdieu's forms of capital, and will further proceed towards Putnam's social capital of bonding and bridging. Afterwards, I will finish with the presentation of social capital's connection to integration.

### **3.1 Bourdieu's forms of capital**

In his "*The forms of Capital*" French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu argues that one cannot understand the social world without considering capital, but it is capital in all its forms that counts (*Bourdieu, 1986*). Thus, Bourdieu developed the concept of social capital during the 1970-80's as one of four forms of capital, present in the structure and dynamics of societies (*ibid*). These forms of capital, - economic (money, property), cultural (knowledge, skills, educational qualifications), social (kinship, connections, membership of a group) and symbolic capital (prestige, reputation, honor) (*Faber et al., 2012; Ihlen, 2007*). The economic capital, the only capital that is characterized as physical and material (*Rosenmeier, 2007:9*), is directly convertible into money and institutionalized in the form of property rights; cultural capital may be convertible into economic capital and institutionalized in the form of educational qualifications; and social capital, which consists of social obligations, and can be convertible into economic capital and institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility (*Bourdieu, 1986: 243*). The extensive amount of the aforementioned capitals, may have a positive outcome in a form of symbolic capital (for instance, a person that has a large amount of economic capital might be considered a very important person whose opinion is highly valued in society) (*Rosenmeier, 2007:14*). Symbolic capital, according to Bourdieu, is both the instrument and the stakes of collective strategies seeking to conserve or increase it as well as individual strategies seeking to acquire or conserve it, by joining groups which possess it (*Bourdieu, 1998: 104*). One of the dimensions of the symbolic capital, in multi-ethnic societies, is "*ethnic identity, which, with names or skin color, is a percipi, a being-perceived, functioning as positive or negative symbolic capital*" (*ibid*).

Thus, Bourdieu's key insight was that all forms of capital, material as well as immaterial, are convertible (*Calhoun, 1993: 69*), that they can be traded for each other and actually require

such trades for their development, as, for instance, social capital can seldom be acquired, for example, without the investment of some material resources and the possession of some cultural knowledge, enabling the individual to establish relations with others (*Portes, 2000: 2*). Therefore, naturally, some people, as, for instance, the specialists and/or the businessmen with a post-graduate degree might have more useful social connections, and therefore, through the conversion of their social capital into other forms of capital, may gain an easier access to certain resources, such as valuable information or a well-paid job position (*Gečienė, 1997: 170*).

Bourdieu represented social capital as an “*aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition*” (*Bourdieu, 1983: 249*). He underlined as well that access to social capital occurred via the development of durable relationships and networks of connections especially those among prestigious groups with considerable stocks of economic and cultural capital (*Bourdieu, 1986: 248*).

### **3.2. Putnam’s theory of social capital: bridging and bonding**

Robert Putnam, who currently stands out as the most widely recognized proponent of the social capital (*Field, 2008: 32*), began his work on social capital studying institutional performance in Italy where he explored the differences between regional administration in the north and south of the country (*Putnam, 1993*). After analyzing the evidence of institutional performance and levels of civic engagement, he used the concept of social capital to explain the differences in civic engagement he discovered. At that moment Putnam referred to social capital as to “*features of social organizations, such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions*” (*Putnam 1993:167*). However, later on, after studying American civil society, he modified the previous definition to “*features of social life—networks, norms, and trust—that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives*” (*Putnam 1995: 664-665*). Finally, in his book “Bowling alone” (2000), he argued that social capital, “*refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them*” (*Putnam 2000: 19*). Networks encompass mutual obligations and foster sturdy norms of, mainly, generalized reciprocity, which is based on

the assumption that today's good turn will be rendered some time in future (sometimes, however, the reciprocity might be specific: "*I will do this for you, if you will do this for me*") (*Ibid*: 20).

Putnam distinguishes *bonding* and *bridging* social capital. As he states, bridging social capital consists of open, outward looking networks that "*encompass people across diverse social cleavages*" (*Putnam, 2000: 22*). Bridging social capital "*links people to more distant acquaintances who move in different circles from their own*" (*Field, 2008:73*). Bonding social capital is composed of inward looking networks that tend "*to reinforce exclusive identities and homogenous groups*" (*Putnam, 2000: 22*). Thus, bonding social capital is based around family, close friends and other near kin, - it binds people from a similar sociological niche (*Field, 2008:73*). And although the bonding social capital emerges "*naturally*" owing to people's preferences for socializing with those who are like them" (*McPherson et al., 2001*), and thus is good for mobilizing solidarity and undergirding specific reciprocity, that might benefit the members in the form of social and psychological support (*Putnam, 2000:22; Halpern 2005:19-23*), it may however lead to limited information flow across the network borders and reinforcement of social division along racial, religious and class lines (*Woolcock, 1998; Fukuyama, 1999; Adler &Kwon, 2000; Portes, 2000*). Meanwhile the bridging networks are better for information diffusion and for linkage to external assets (*Putnam, 2000: 22*). The bridging capital, that can generate broader identities and reciprocity, and is more presumably to result in positive political and economic outcomes (*Woolcock & Naryan, 2000*), for Putnam himself seemed to be of a higher value than the bonding one: he believed that although bonding social capital is good for 'getting by', the bridging social capital, which brings together individuals from quite distinctive groups, is crucial for 'getting ahead' (*Field, 2008:73*). However, "*bonding and bridging are not "either-or" categories into which social networks can be neatly divided, but "more or less" dimensions along which we can compare different forms of social capital*" (*Putnam, 2000: 23*). As a matter of fact, many groups bond along some dimensions and bridge across others (for instance, ethnically homogenous group may bridge across education or religion), thus "*under many circumstances both bridging and bonding social capital can have powerfully positive social effects*" (*ibid*).

Putnam's approach of *bonding* and *bridging* has later been supplemented by "missing link", - a one more form of social capital, that brought state into the picture. The so called *linking social capital*, was introduced in 1998 by Australian sociologist Michael Woolcock, in whose opinion, social capital could not be properly understood separately from society's cultural,

economic and political context (Ødegård, 2011: 151). Thus, linking social capital refers to “...norms of respect and networks of trusting relationships between people who are interacting across explicit, formal or institutionalized power or authority gradients in society” (Szreter & Woolcock, 2004: 655). The linking capital lifts the interpersonal bonding and bridging connections a level up, - individuals and their network gain access to the resources through vertical relations with, for instance, public institutions. Quite opposite to Putnam’s idea of voluntary organizations as producers of social capital, this approach points out the need of public involvement, necessary to ensure individuals’ access to the resources that might be useful in order to increase their active role in civil society (Ødegård, 2010: 151). Thus, the linking social capital is particularly important for ethnic minorities groups that have arrived to their host country recently, and therefore are in need of a lesser or bigger degree of social support or financial aid (Ødegård, 2011: 132; Woolcock & Szreter, 2004). Due to its nature, linking capital could be related to the concept of empowerment, the two-dimensional process of which is to empower and to enable citizens (Goul Andersen, 2004). Empowering is hereby pursued by strengthening citizens’ formal and institutional rights, whilst the process of enabling is related to mere subjective participation dimension, which encompasses not only the opportunity to participate, but also the opportunity to impact the surrounding social conditions (Ødegård, 2011: 133).

### **3.3. Social capital and integration**

There integrating effect of the participation in an activity of an organization is closely related to the concept of social capital through the assumption that participation in the life of a voluntary organization may underpin the growth of the capital. As far as the social capital in this sense is understood as the resources in form of generalized trust and social network, which hereby signifies that the participation in an organizational activity through the membership or voluntary work in a voluntary organization, would gain one access to the social capital (Lin, 2005). By participating in a homogenous network of like-minded people, one is accumulating the bonding social capital which is developing through the connections based on trust between similar people, who, due to their homogeneity, might form a strong “us” feeling. This feeling can at some point turn one’s attention to the difference between “us” and “them” that are outside the group, to the difference between our interests and their interests which do not contribute to participating in the society’s picture, integration and aim for bridging. Thus, there is being built a within-group

solidarity that at some point might fuel already existing social, political and cultural disagreements between the two groups (*Paxton 2002: 259*). The bridging social capital would, on the contrary, support the collective action in the outer society, - simply because it encompasses trust-based connections within a heterogeneous group of quite different people. Such *between-group* solidarity opens an individual's horizons and encourages to accept the differences that exceed the "us/them" perspective (*ibid*). The bridging social capital thus is considered having a positive effect on further inclusion, while the effect of bonding capital is either neutral or negative (*Segaard, 2011: 184*).

Despite the outcome, immigrants initially involve in the network of bonding capital within which they can experience the desired personal, social and cultural security, essential to gather courage to a forthcoming involvement into a more open network. (*Handy & Greespan, 2009, Segaard, 2011: 184*). The time in bonding network is usually used to figure out whom one belongs to, to set up the boundaries between oneself and the fellow members as well as the outsiders, to strengthen collective and individual identity through practicing common history, culture and talking in mother tongue (*Segaard, 2011: 185*).

Joining the network of a bridging social capital would seem like a natural next step to take. This step, however, for some might be almost impossible to manage due to the linguistic, cultural and economic barriers, - these individuals choose not to become a member of a bridging network and often suffer of the lack integration into the wider society (*Handy & Greespan, 2009: 976*). Some others, however, take the hindrances as individual challenges that they have to overcome to improve their socioeconomic position. Such people start learning the language and get familiar with the culture, step by step gain the initial knowledge, and thus slightly improve their socioeconomic status (*ibid*). The better socioeconomic status, according to *Enjolras & Wollebæk (2010), Hagelund & Loga (2009), Kumlin & Rothstein (2010)* and others, is directly connected with a greater opportunity of such an individual entering a volunteer organization, and thus accumulating a larger amount of social capital.

## 4. ANALYSIS

As it might have crossed one's mind already reading in the methodological part of the thesis, - the respondents of the two Lithuanian societies have one very evident difference, - the age. All Lithuanian Youth Society respondents are in their mid-twenties, whilst the Lithuanian Society respondents are all over 30 (to be more precise, Ieva, 32 years old, is the only respondent in her 30-ies, and the rest of the interviewed members are of age 40-46). In addition, all but one of the interviewed LS members are married and have children.

The respondents from both societies mentioned the age and family status disparity, when asked, why they do not join the other society as members or as participants in the other society's arranged events. In LYS member's Viltautė's opinion, *"It is for a bit older people. People who have kids. They are organizing events more like Sunday school for Lithuanians or Christmas for kids"* (Int: Viltautė). However, Viltautė added that she would consider joining them *"in maybe five years or three years, four years, when I have kids, and my focus will be more to introduce my kids with other kids"* (ibid). Ieva, member of LS, asked, if she ever thought of becoming part of LYS, replied that she didn't, as far as *"they are oriented towards young people, maybe people yet without children. They are oriented towards people, who are still searching for themselves, searching for a carrier"* (Int: Ieva).

Thus Ieva as well mentioned another clear distinction between LS and LYS respondents – their different position in career path. LYS members have either finished their university studies in Denmark not earlier than a couple years ago (Viltautė, Paulius, Karolina, Saulius) or at the moment of the interviewing were pursuing their master degrees (Simona, Dominykas, Elvinas). Although all of them were employed, their jobs were either temporary student jobs (Simona, Elvinas) or rather satisfactory permanent full-time positions, which were, however, less or more mismatching the qualifications obtained, and, therefore, the subject for a change in the nearest future (Karolina, Viltautė), or their jobs were very promising, interesting and corresponding to one's qualifications, yet too freshly assumed to be properly evaluated (Dominykas, Saulius). Of all LYS respondents only Paulius, working as a business controller in a Danish company, felt

completely in his shoes: his responsibilities matched his qualifications and his employment conditions fully corresponded to his wishes (*Int: Paulius*).

Out of the above mentioned clarifies, that the interviewed LYS members are just starting to walk their career paths, and although some of them are further forward than others, they are still in the very beginning in accumulating the baggage of their economic capital.

The LS members, who, as well as LYS members, have finished one or other part of their studies in Denmark, have at the moment of the interviewing been rather advanced in or on the top of their careers. All of them, except one, have been working according to the qualifications since they entered their first job position in Denmark (7 or over 20 years ago), and seemed to be completely satisfied with the employment they had: *“There is no such a moment in my life that in some form I would not continue that activity which I have as a profession. That's, of course, a privilege, when one's hobby becomes one's profession” (Int: Inga); “I have come here as an economic migrant, and have always worked as a doctor. For more than twenty years now. And I am rather satisfied with it” (Int: Darius); “And since 2005 I am working here as mother-tongue teacher. I like being a teacher” (Int: Reda)*. The employment position of the only LS respondent that does not have a job according to her qualifications, Ineta, meets her expectations as well, - she has been employed in the administrative department of a large company for many years and is overall content with her duties, colleagues and working environment in general (*Int: Ineta*).

The above mentioned differences distinguish LYS respondents from LS respondents, but within each of the societies these are actually the similarities that respondents have in common with one another, these are the dimensions (apart from the most obvious one, the one of the ethnicity) which the respondents initially bond along. However, these obvious, by the naked eye seen bonding features, connecting the respondents and other members superficially with one another, do not indicate that they develop equally strong relationships to each other within their respective societies. Indeed, they are alike, but not alike in all the same ways, - thus, although all belong to the same society network, some bond more, some bond less, - let's look further into the social capital embedded in each of societies, and the outcomes it results in.

#### **4.1. Accumulation of Social Capital in LYS and LS**



Both societies seem to be keen to gather as many Lithuanian migrants of their target group as possible (young Lithuanians in their 20-ies till beginning of their 30-ies for LYS, and Lithuanians of any age group in case of LS) to participate in their activities, hoping to engage them sufficiently to join the societies, thus increasing the number of social connections and enhancing the overall social capital in their respective societies. And as for the current situation, it looks like one could not call it a draw in this game for social capital, - LS, despite its remarkable history of representing Lithuanians in Copenhagen through slightly over 20 years, is quickly decreasing in number of members (although officially the number of members has yearly been fluctuating few members over or few members below the round 100, both Darius and Reda mention that LS becoming way smaller, somewhat around 30-50 members all in all), while only a four year 'old' LYS has already over 120 members, and, according to Elvinas, the number is constantly increasing. Thus, LYS as such has more volume as a network in itself, and has more physical power to pursue its activity as well as to arrange the events. However, that does not mean that the social capital, accumulated by LS members, is of a lesser value, - the connections, established through the participation in LS might result in greater overall and personal gains. Thus, in the next subchapters I will take a closer look upon the development of these social connections in each of the societies, and by the same I will as well reveal their outcomes for each of the societies as a whole and for my respondents individually.

#### **4.1.1. Accumulation of social capital through participation in LYS**

##### **4.1.1.1. Bonding social connections within Lithuanian Youth Society**

As mentioned by Dominykas and underlined by couple other LYS respondents, LYS has been founded by three Lithuanian friends and was initially meant to be the “*organization of friends for friends*” (Int: Saulius), - a network where young like-minded Lithuanians could meet other like-minded Lithuanians, share their experiences, learn from each other and grow together aiming to become the role models for young Lithuanian migrants and thus improve the image of Lithuanians in Denmark and worldwide (Int: Dominykas, Saulius).

Knowing that LYS started as a gathering of friends, it does not come as a surprise that couple of LYS respondents explain their entrance into the society as following: “*My friend ‘forced’ me to join*” (Int: Paulius); “*My friend Sandra was running for the board, she asked me to come to support her*” (Int: Viltaute). Such an entrance-through-the-friends into the society corresponds with Putnam’s assertion that “*friends in general have a powerful effect on civic involvement, partly because friends are likely to ask*” (Putnam, 2012: 471).

In need of support or in need of assistance, friends are indeed the ones to involve, - Saulius’, Dominykas’ and Viltaute’s friends (none of them members of LYS) were helping them out during LD 2016 (Po:3), and Simona had a whole bunch of friends joining her team for organizing LD in 2015 (Int: Simona). And although, as Simona says, “*I was very afraid when I’ve invited them to be part of my team, I was afraid something can go wrong*”, but “*when we were organizing event together, we became even stronger friends, our links are even stronger*” (ibid). A part of Simona’s friends that helped to organize the event, have later joined LYS, as did some Dominykas’ and Viltaites’ friends as well (Int: Dominykas, Viltaute). Thus, the above mentioned respondents, that engaged their friends into organizing the activities together with them, not only have reaffirmed those strong mutual bonds they have had formed in advance, but have as well established an opportunity for those bonds to be reaffirmed and strengthened further in future through the membership in LYS, since “*Social bonds have to be periodically renewed and reconfirmed, or else they lose efficacy*” (Adler & Kwon, 2000: 94). Finally, such practice of bringing friends into the society in a way creates more of overall bonding social capital within the society itself: friends of LYS respondents meet other members, and gradually evolve bonding connections to some of them as well (Int: Dominykas, Simona, Paulius).

However, one might wonder, if bringing friends into the society is all that positive as described above. The existence of a strong initial bonding capital between certain people within the society could lead to formation of separate groups of close friends who would always tend to work on the same tasks together, who would communicate for the most with each other, and thus induce the fragmentation inside the society. Fortunately, that is not the case in LYS. Quite on the contrary, - Viltaute, who joined LYS invited by her friend, LYS member Sandra, has developed very strong connection with Dominykas and Simona, whose team she joined to organize LD 2015;

Paulius, who came into organization ‘forced’ by his friend Viltaute, did not work with her on the same team, but has chosen a team according to his interest (communication). And, as far

as: *“The more others are like us in terms of social identity and characteristics, and the more they share our interests, the more trustworthy their behavior towards us, and ours towards them.”*(Newton, 2004: 17), thus, naturally, the members of communication team, who had further worked closely together on few various projects, have gradually developed strong bonds of friendship (*Int: Paulius*).

Not only Viltaute and Paulius feel strongly connected with their team members. The interviews with LYS respondents and the observations I have participated in, reveal the tendency of the tightest social bonds being formed among the members working together on one or other project. As Saulius put it: *“When you work together with the people on something, you naturally become close”* (*Int: Saulius*). Working together usually means spending a lot of time with each other: at the time when Dominykas, Simona and Viltaute organized LD 2015, they were meeting nearly every day (*Int: Simona*); couple months before LD 2016, Saulius and his team met at least once a week, the last few weeks increasing their meetings till several times a week, - all them lasting for a few hours and more (*Po2, Int: Saulius*). These meetings, that lasted for hours, however, did not seem long, as far as, according to the board member Karolina: *“We have a great time chatting all together, we do things, but we have fun as well, somebody always has a good story to share, so usually we do spend the first hour on just catching up on our lives”* (*Int: Karolina*). Karolina’s statement fully corresponds with what I myself have experienced during the second participant observation at a preparatory meeting at Saulius’ place: the members that attended the meeting did not hurry to jump to the meeting agenda, - rather on the contrary, - they have spent around an hour chit-chatting about their lives, political actualities, music and such, and only afterwards, when everybody seemed socially ‘warmed-up’, the topics of the meeting were brought up for discussion. Couple of hours later, when the meeting was finally finished, all the participants stayed for a spontaneously improvised after-meeting party (*Po2*). Such informal interaction, associated with meetings, encourages the development of mutual understanding and respect as well as helps to reach consensus and compromise where necessary (*Gilchrist, 2003: 214*), - thus, when during the informal part of the preparatory meeting the participants find out that Karolis is struggling with his study project, some participants offer to drive him around, so he could faster complete the duties he has been allocated in regard to LD 2016, just as well as when Aiste, who has spent the whole after-meeting party talking about how excited she is to go for a study exchange semester in Spain, asks if she could skip next meeting to attend the gathering of

the exchange program students, her request is easily approved on the condition that she *does not utter a word about Spain again*<sup>2</sup> (Po2).

Thus, even if planning of an event, especially of an event of such a large extent as Lithuanian Days, is definitely challenging and overall time consuming, LYS respondents seem to be incredibly good at balancing the workload with informal social interaction, - therefore, for some of them, the process of working together on a project results not only in reaching collective goals, obtaining new skills and boosting confidence, but also in forming strong, long-lasting bonds with those members whom they worked with, the bonds that do not end up with the end of the project, but, contrarily, stretch over the borders of the society (*Int: Dominykas, Viltaute*):

*"I made really really good friends with Dominykas and Simona. We planned Lithuanian Days together. Now we also meet up, because we were used to meet almost every day or three times per day for organizing Lithuanian Days, so we still keep that tradition, we still try to meet as much as we can, just three of us. Just to catch up how it's going, what's new, how is the boyfriend, girlfriend... So I think...These two connections I very much value and I really enjoy that we can also be friends besides LYS. I mean, we can also talk about our free time and studies, and work or internships and such" (Int: Viltaute).*

Such strong friendship bonds, as Viltaute, Dominykas and Simona have developed, might have never been formed, if the above mentioned members would not have been engaged in LYS activity as energetically as they were. Just like them, all the other LYS respondents are active members, that is, not only they do participate in the events, arranged by the society, but they either are the main organizers or the main organizers' team members that are entrusted to carry out various tasks during the arrangement. Although, as the empirical material reveals, even if all the respondents are active members, those that have been in the society for a year or longer (*Simona, Dominykas, Viltaute, Paulius*), have slightly pulled aside to give ground for the newcomers (*Saulius, Karolina, Elvinas*), thus giving them an opportunity to acquire new skills and to test their capacities. However, as I happened to observe during two latter participant observations, though the new board members seemed to have overtaken the rein of the organizational carriage, the 'old' members were still to be found sitting in the passenger's seat, helping to steer LYS 'carriage' towards the desirable direction: like, for instance, guiding the new board members on what activities to encompass into Lithuanian Days to better meet the goals of the society (*Int: Elvinas*)

---

<sup>2</sup> The sentence part in *italic* was meant as a joke (author's remark).

or being that extra pair of hands, needed to push the LYS carriage out of the potholes on the road, as for instance, when the new team members suddenly have no one to carry the microphone around to the speakers during the discussion part of the conference, the situation is saved by Simona who takes the task upon herself (Po3).

Thus, even if the things sometimes get out of the control, LYS respondents back one another up, and are there for each other when any support or assistance is needed (Int: Elvinas, Karolina). Moreover, as ready they are to help each other, as ready they are to ask for help, if their tasks suddenly seem to be too complicated to be managed on their own: “*We were always together. If I'd have problems with my, like, responsibilities, things, like, that I was responsible for, I've always asked: "Guys, what to do?"*” (Int: Simona). And: “*They have always helped*” (ibid). Knowing that fellow members will offer their assistance in case of necessity makes it easier to ask for it, when necessary, and thus creates the circulation of trust within the society: “*We had some challenges together and we helped each other and that constitutes me a friend. I can trust these people*” (Int: Saulius); “*I feel like people trust me, show respect*” (Int: Karolina). As the interviews reveals, LYS respondents trust is not limited to trusting one’s team members or those one had spent most time with, or, finally, the board members, - any LYS member is initially trusted, simply because he/she has chosen to be a part of the society, and “*If you join a volunteer organization, you have common values, things to share*” (Int: Paulius), or as Viltaute explains: “*<...> you kind of already know that people join it, because they probably have similar values to your values, right?*” (Int: Viltaute). Thus, sharing the same values, having the similar goals and common interests that are realized through in terms of time rather expensive, regular face-to-face interaction, - as it takes person-to-person contact over time to build the trust and mutual understanding (Putnam, 2003; Ahn & Ostrom 2009), - and intensive collaboration with one another, creates tight bonds between my respondents and their society members. However, these tight-bonded members in LYS do not exclude others, that can’t that actively participate in the activity of the society, - they are always welcome to help as volunteers during Lithuanian Days, they are encouraged to present their ideas and thus make an impact on the direction of the society; the events of society - cultural, educational and social, - are as well arranged in a way, so that a wide range of members’ expectances would be at least partly satisfied, thus that through the common interests the social connectedness within the society would further grow and benefit the LS community as a whole as well its members individually.

All above described bonding connections are exceptionally connecting the members of the society with one another, however, even if LYS (for now) is an ethnic society, it is not a closed fraternity club, arranging events exceptionally for its members. Thus, the bonding social capital, accumulated through the membership in LYS, can as well be enriched by bridging connections established with other event attendees through the common participation in LYS arranged events.

#### **4.1.1.2. Bridging social connections through the participation in LYS events**

Although the LYS activity's direction and the events to be arranged can only be decided by LYS members, the participation in the events through volunteering, or simply by attending them is open to anybody. Thus, as I have mentioned in the chapter above, LYS members tend to involve their friends (*Int: Simona, Saulius; Po3: Aiste, Mindaugas*), and even family members (*Po3: Karolina*). Most of the LYS members' friends, who attend the events or help to arrange them, get acquainted with other LYS members, and repeatedly keep meeting them through the events. However, as far as these friends of the LYS members are in no distinctive way different from LYS members, their connections could not count as bridging. Nevertheless, the main LYS event, Lithuanian Days, is usually attended by diverse groups of Lithuanians, - of different age, various socio-economic statuses: these co-ethnics could be built bridges to, but LYS respondents' engagement with them has no repetitive continuity (*Int: all LYS*). Some weak bridging ties are, however, connecting LYS respondents with couple current LS board members, - they time to time financially support LYS events and spread information about these events within their own society (as well as advertise them on LS website) (*Int: Dominykas, Darius*).

As Dominykas and Saulius assert in their interviews, - although the primary goal of LYS is to gather Lithuanians together, the society as well aims towards building the bridges between Lithuanians and Danes/foreigners living in Denmark: "*Let's be open as much, as much as possible <...> It is necessary to show that we, Lithuanians, are nice people, there are some stereotypes to fight*" (*Int: Saulius*). And indeed, due to the large extent of the English-spoken events, arranged by LYS, the members of society have as well an opportunity to establish cross-ethnic ties with the multicultural community of Copenhagen. The yearly LD event, promoting Lithuanian culture, is usually attracting a numerous crowd of Danes and foreigners, who can listen to Lithuanian and international bands, taste specialties of Lithuanian cuisine, appreciate various

Lithuanian art forms, - get to know Lithuanian culture and interact with Lithuanians, in between of them and the organizers of the event, LYS members. Through my third participant observation during LD 2016, I have noticed Simona, Karolina and Elvinas engaging into several first-time conversations with foreigners, - a bunch of international students, couple of elderly Danes and few Danish families. Other members seemed busy pleasantly chatting with visitors as well (*Po3*). However, as it has later been confirmed by the empirical material, none of these initial interactions (nor others of the same kind they had during the event), were of a repetitive character, that is, none of my LYS respondents have repeatedly met the people they communicated with, again. Nor, in fact, they have had any further personal contact with the foreign attendees of LYS arranged conferences, - all interaction that took place during them, have ended when the conferences did (*Int: all LYS*). Thus, one can nothing but agree that: “*After all, birds of feather flock together*” (*Putnam, 2003:3*). Finally, on top of that, none of my LYS respondents could remember ever developing cross-ethnic connections to the people, they have engaged into the conversation with during LYS events, - with an exception, - if these foreigners were somehow related to their fellow members (*ibid*). And indeed, the majority of LYS respondents are time to time bringing to the events their foreign significant others (*Karolina, Viltaute, Dominykas*), roommates (*Saulius*), or friends (*Elvinas, Saulius*). However, their interaction with other LYS members only takes place when the LS respondents, who brought them along, are attending the event as well. And as a matter of fact, in all the cases, except the one of Viltaute’s husband Martin, the respondents do not interact with the mentioned fellow members’ significant others outside the borders of the society. But when it comes to Martin, Viltaute’s Danish husband, the situation seems to be slightly different, - as he has developed a rather close relationship with Simona (who, by given moment, is his and Viltaute’s upstairs neighbor), whom he as well introduced to some of his very good Danish friends, - now they time to time meet at Martin’s and Viltaute’s place to watch a movie or two (*Int: Simona, Viltaute*). Thus, the bonding social connection Viltaute and Simona has developed through their common participation in LYS activity, has led to Simona’s and Martin’s repetitive bridging connection, which through the time transformed to the mutual bonding ties due to which Simona is engaging into bridging connections with Martin’s Danish friends.

Another bridging opportunity that has been available until the beginning of 2016, but, unfortunately ceased, was established through the interaction with the other youth societies, - Polish and Ukrainian, - with both of them through arranging the quiz evenings at a student café

Studenterhuset. The collaboration with the societies was initiated by former chairman Dominykas, who was a ‘connector’ between the societies, that is, built bridges between them and encouraged the members to share their ideas and to join forces to implement them (*Gilchrist, 2000*). However, the collaboration with Polish society has, according to Dominykas, ended, because “*We could see that we were far more advanced than they were, and that was a bit funny how it all worked*” (*Int: Dominykas*), and the Ukrainian society happened to be “*<...> a bit strange youth society, - people that belong to it are over 50 years old*” (*ibid*). After the collaboration amongst societies ended, none of the LYS respondents, who participated in arranging the quiz evenings, have kept the contact to any of the members of two other societies (*Int: Viltaute, Dominykas, Simona*). And although one might have thought that bridging could have been “saved” by “*finding, emphasizing, or creating a new dimension of similarity within which bonding could occur*” (*Putnam: 2003, 282*), in this case, unfortunately, all similarities seemed to be turned into differences (*Po1: Dominykas*).

Although the cross-cultural bridging with the above mentioned societies has come to an end, and no new permanent cooperation with other ethnic societies has been yet discussed nor planned, LYS is instead continuously accumulating the social capital in form of links.

#### **4.1.1.3. Linking social connections: LYS and institutions**

LYS linking connections with the formal institutions in Denmark are fairly flourishing. However, if the bonds and bridges in the society could be created by any member, the accumulation of linking social capital mostly happens through the LYS board members’ engagement. They act as the representatives of the society in relation to Copenhagen municipality, Lithuanian embassy in Denmark, banks, diverse educational institutions and such, when LYS apply for funds (*Dominykas, Paulius*), ensure the smooth financial transactions (*Karolina*), discuss the cooperation regarding the LD event (*Dominykas*), make arrangements regarding premises for conferences (*Elvinas*) and further. When it comes to more ordinary linking cases, such as getting event permission from the police, or handing in some documentation regarding a certain LYS project, - the link-producers can as well be project managers (*Simona, Viltaute*). In any way, the links to the institutions are usually produced and maintained by those LS respondents who speak Danish, due to the fact that: “*If you do speak Danish, you get answer right away*” (*Int: Viltaute*). Thus, for



those LYS members that speak Danish, Danish language skills work as the facilitator (*Ager & Strang, 2008*) to accumulate linking social capital through the society. In a way, that signifies that one has to be at least linguistically integrated into Danish society to have better chances to create links to the formal institutions in Denmark through their membership in LYS.

As it has been revealed above, the membership in LYS gives one opportunity to develop and reaffirm bonds with fellow members Lithuanians within the society, to build cross-ethnic bridges to foreigners through the participation in society's events, as well as, by representing society, to create links with formal institutions in Denmark. However, as the empirical material clearly points out, LYS respondents are rather forming strong bonds with one another through interacting within society than using the opportunity to establish bridging connections during LYS events (except those of bridging through bonding), although actively taking part in creating links with the local formal institutions. Let's see further what outcomes does that bring.

## **4.1.2. LYS Social Capital's Outcomes**

### **4.1.2.1. Information**

According to Robert Putnam, "*The networks that constitute social capital also serve as conduits for the flow of helpful information that facilitates achieving our goals*" (*Putnam, 2000: 289*). Bonds within LYS primary work as a conduits for dissemination of valuable educational, social and job-related professional information. As Saulius asserts: "*It is always beneficial to talk to people, - you talk about things that are relevant. Some people have some information that might be useful*" (*Int: Saulius*).

Educational information constitutes the largest part of the disseminated information, and is especially valuable to LYS members, as far as many of them are still students, and are in process to acquire their educational credentials. The usual information of this type to be shared – the information regarding LYS University events, various conferences, lectures, books, exams and similar (*Int: Elvinas, Karolina, Viltaute*). The flow of educational information within society is as well reached to by Lithuanian non-members students from whole Denmark, as well as Lithuanians, who are still living in Lithuania or abroad, but in a short while are coming to study in Denmark (*Int: Karolina, Dominykas*).

Paulius, who is for the most interested in going out and having fun with his friends, during the interview reveals that he created a closed online chat group, which LYS members use to reach one another in case somebody of members decides to play volleyball or wants to grab a pizza (*Int: Paulius*). Each time there is a social gathering, LYS members share with one another relevant information about the visit-worthy clubs, local pubs, cozy cafes and restaurants in Copenhagen, - Simona, as well as Paulius have taken their friends to the recommended places, and have yet never been disappointed (*Int: Paulius, Simona*).

Finally, LYS members also focus on spreading a job-related/professional information within the society network (*Int: Elvinas*). All LYS members get a daily email with available job positions from a company list, created by current and previous LYS members, as well as they share job-related information during the networking after the labor market-oriented conferences (*Paulius*), or through face-to face interaction at social gatherings and other LYS events (*PoI: Saulius, Dominykas, Karolina*), and that sometimes lead to more tangible outcomes.

#### **4.1.2.2. Employment and Housing**

All the above described bonding occurrences, the strong ties with friends, as mentioned by LYS respondents or registered during the observations, may, according to Putnam, “ <...> ensure the chicken soup when you're sick, but weak ties with distant acquaintances are more likely to produce leads for a new job” (Putnam, 2000: 363). Although, it looks like in LYS case, this statement does not hold water: during the interview Saulius mentioned he has recently started a new job that fully matched his qualifications (*Int: Saulius*). He told he did not expect to be hired, because he had no relevant job experience. The employer, however, was so impressed by an outstanding recommendation received from Dominykas, that, despite Saulius' lack of experience, offered him the position on the very same day (*Int: Saulius*). Dominykas himself has admitted helping LYS members to find a job, - the week we had interview, he has managed to find employment for two other society members (*Int: Dominykas*). Thus, although it would be hard to argue that the social capital of bridging type wouldn't result in greater number of employment options than the bonding connections provide LYS members now, the bonds within LYS might lead (and indeed do lead) not just to any type of employment, but to the employment according to one's qualifications (*Int: Saulius, Dominykas*). And that makes perfect sense, having in mind that the bonds that are established within LYS, are the result of many hours spent together not just

socializing during LYS pub evenings, or at LYS dinner and such, but, most importantly, working together on different projects, and thus getting to know each other's personal strengths as well as weaknesses, and at the same learning about one another's abilities and skills. Therefore, in comparison to LYS members' bridging connections, LYS respondents might indeed have a better idea on what type of job would suit their fellow members, so that both their and their employers, expectations would be fulfilled, and the reputation of the 'headhunter' wouldn't suffer: *"If you recommend somebody, and that person cannot live to expectation, then me, who recommends it, my validity will go down, and I don't want that. You can be more sure when you recommend a friend"* (Int: Viltaute). Thus, the bonding ties in LYS might lead, and according to some of my respondents (Dominykas, Saulius, Simona), lead, to gaining an employment, thus, in a way, the social capital, accumulated in LYS, can through assistance in finding an employment (as described in cases above) be converted to a member's economic capital, quite conforming with Dale Southerton's statement that: *"Conversions of social capital into economic gain are most obvious in relation to favor, for example in the job market <...>"* (Southerton, 2004: 97).

To have an employment in a host country (and thus to be able to accumulate economic capital) is one of the main indicators of the successful integration (Ager & Strang, 2008), - thus, one could say that bonds within LYS not only can provide access to an employment, but through providing access to the employment, as well can facilitate successful integration.

The bonding connections within society can provide not only employment, but, as in Viltaute's case, housing as well. Actually, it does not come as surprise, when Viltaute, asked if she could name any personal benefits as an outcome of her participation in LYS activity, immediately mentions that Simona has arranged her to get an apartment she currently lives in, which is, as a matter of fact, situated just a floor down from Simona's: *"I think I have got it more because she is my friend, you know"* (Int: Viltaute). And indeed, it might be rather instinctively that one as an immigrant, whose social connections were devalued by emigration, strives to conserve social capital (Putnam, 2000: 390) by surrounding oneself with the people one bonds to. Simona as well admits that she was very keen on having Viltaute nearby, - now, according to her, they can meet almost every day for a cup of coffee or a glass of wine (Int: Simona), and in that way steadily reaffirm their bonds outside the society, in case they would choose to work on different projects in LYS and would not spent as much time together there as they were used to (*ibid*). Thus, although co-ethnic neighborhood may not necessarily be the best choice in terms of integration, to Simona

it brings physical and emotional well-being, the ability to feel ‘at home’ (Ager & Strang, 2008: 171).

#### **4.1.2.3. Culture capital in form of acquired skills**

The way LYS respondents describe their society reveals that the majority of them sees LYS not only as a purely social space one takes part in to meet “*highly-educated, like-minded people*” (Int: Dominykas), but as an organization “*of intelligent people that gathered together and are working with something that is interesting for themselves and could be interesting for the others as well*” (Int: Karolina). The wording used in Dominykas’ and Karolina’s description of the society, points out towards the assumption that LYS, although a voluntary organization, is as well perceived as an alternative to a working place, where individuals can gain some experience in the area they find interesting, whether it is something directly connected to one’s education (Int: Karolina, Elvinas), or some new skills one would like to acquire for the future use in gaining the economic capital (Int: Simona, Saulius). However, as Dominykas asserts, these are highly-educated people that are gathered together, thus, they have already attained a high level of an educational cultural capital, which now can be supplemented by accumulation of cultural capital in form of skills, and the sum of both might in future be converted into economical capital.

Elvinas, a soon-to-be-graduate in finances, sees his participation in the society as a way to gain some experience outside the area of his professional field: “*I saw the opportunity for myself to learn some things. I do not know what exactly, but I thought I’ll probably will have an opportunity to learn something for sure*” (Int: Elvinas). By learning some leadership skills in the position of the chairman of the society, Elvinas expects to supplement his educational credentials, his cultural capital of institutionalized form (Bourdieu, 1986; Veenstra, 2009), and that, in his opinion, will expand his employment opportunities, - that is, will give him an easier access to the preferred job position, whereat he would be entitled to a higher salary, thus, would gain higher amount of economic capital: “*All the activities that I did for the past half a year, a bit more maybe, I was trying to invest in myself, I was trying to build my, kind of, portfolio, and I still do this, because I know how tough is that*” (Int: Elvinas). Thus, Elvinas invests his energy and labor here and now, by learning skills and building relationships, to be able to use them in future (Jenkins, 2007).

Saulius, as well as Elvinas, perceives his activity in LYS as clearly beneficial for his future career in labor market:

*“It’s actually very good, because when you go to the interviews, it is actually very good to say that you already have something to do, you know. I am a project manager, and I am doing this and that, I am responsible for 5 people, you know... Rather than go and say: “I am unemployed, I am looking for a job” (Int: Saulius).*

Just as Elvinas, and Saulius, all others LYS respondents, except Paulius, who is solely interested in socializing with like-minded youth, as far as he feels: *“I know substantially enough, they could not give me more than I could find out myself” (Int: Paulius)*, think similarly as Simona, to whom the society is *“very social, professional, friendly environment, and also very good platform for the beginners, professional beginners, who want to do something more in this field, in organizing leaderships, social work, something like that” (Int: Simona)*, a *“platform to develop own ideas” (Int: Dominykas)*, where, if one wished, one could arrange a concert, an exhibition or any kind event one wished, - and *“<...> we will find a way how to get you money, and we will help you with contacts, with know-how, with the all the resources we have, just to help you push it through” (ibid)*. Moreover, as Dominykas adds, the person who proposes the idea, is always offered to be a project manager, because *“It’s your project, you are the owner” (ibid)*.

Thus, LYS members are empowered to learn of one another, to act together, to collaborate with one another and, under the umbrella of the society, follow their interests and accumulate their cultural capital in the form of skills. The current volume of LYS skills, however, could be expanded, if, as Viltaute mentions during her interview, LYS would be better at keeping in touch with their alumni, - they are very likely much more forward in regard to accumulation of social, cultural and economic capitals, as *”<...> they have so much knowledge, they have so much, maybe already, contacts, if they work in the big companies, Maersk, Dong Energy, Nordea, whatever” (Int: Viltaute)*. And even if none of their contacts would be able to offer an employment, the alumni could counsel the current LYS members on, what exactly the companies, they work for, are expecting their employees to be like, thus, the current LYS members would have a better idea, if they could see themselves working there. Moreover, alumni could as well give the current members some advices, on how to search for the jobs at their working places, and how to integrate best into the new work environment, if one gets lucky enough to be offered the position (*ibid*).

However, for now, those, who think that they can contribute more, who want to regulate direction LYS is heading towards, and obtain leadership skills (*Int: Dominykas*), are more than welcome to participate in the election to LYS board. The members of the board, when elected by the fellow members, can choose one of 6-7 various positions, - internal and external communication, finance, project management and so on, - thus one can acquire the exact skills one finds necessary (and by that can supplement educational capital, achieving the lacking skills, which might be obligatory to gain a job one desires, as far as that job might lead to a status one might strive to acquire outside the borders of LYS society) (*ibid*).

Being in the board does not add any privileges, apart from that board members might acquire more bridging and linking capital, as far as they are often functioning as the representatives of LS society in relation to other organizations, as well as to institutions. However, their bonding capital within society does not devaluate, since they still actively participate in the arrangement of the events, as well as they attend LYS social gatherings, whereat they can potentially reaffirm and strengthen own bonding connections (*Int: Dominykas, Karolina, PoI*). That is only possible, because LYS board is continuously attempting to pull as many LYS members as possible into the active participation, because, "*If this is a society, then everybody has to contribute; both, and the board and the members, must be active and contribute and create events and do something*" (*Int: Elvinas*). And if a member is active in LYS, and performs her/his tasks with passion and heart, she/he is appreciated and given further opportunities to improve, learn and develop the skills: "*And we were kind of, really working, and we were really dedicated for the society, for the community, and every time there was some interesting event, he invited me to be part of it, to contribute.*" (*Int: Simona*). In addition, Simona's input as LYS society member was so remarkable, that she was offered an internship, so that her current and prospective skills, achieved through participation in society, would be acknowledged as institutionalized cultural capital (*ibid*). Thus, although it depends solely on the members themselves, how much they are willing to contribute to the society, however, - more they contribute, more they receive, - both in terms of bonding social capital as well as cultural capital in form of skills.

#### **4.1.2.4. Cultural capital in form of cultural knowledge**

The signature event of LYS, - yearly Lithuanian Days, which is an event, arranged "*to give them opportunity to find out maybe something or learn something about Lithuania, Lithuanian*

*culture*” (Int: Karolina), and therefore “<...> is supposed to focus more on foreigners” (Int: Paulius), thus the event usually consists of many modern Lithuanian art forms, a conference and diverse musical performances, - some of Lithuanian, although most of them foreign. There are usually represented various musical styles: pop and avant-garde, some rock, jazz, folk, indie and others (Po3)– a really wide range of different musical practices performed by Lithuanian, Danish and foreign musicians, - thus oriented to multi-cultural and multi-lingual crowd of attendees. Different musical styles attract more different people, some of whose presence in LD event might have gradually concluded in “weak” ties with LYS members, which might have been further converted “into cultural capital through the sharing of diverse knowledge about cultural practices <...>” (Southerton, 2004: 99). Although none of my LYS respondents have initiated any repetitive bridging connections neither with the event attendees of other ethnical/cultural background, nor, for instance, with Lithuanians of different generation, that, however, does not mean that none of other LYS members have taken the opportunity.

#### **4.1.2.5. Symbolic capital**

The social capital that LYS members have acquired, has the whole society encompassing, an overall outcome in symbolic capital, which, according Bourdieu, “obtains from the successful use of other capitals” (1990: 122). The social bonding capital within society has been accumulated to the degree that the reputation of LYS as a very active and skillful youth society in Copenhagen (Int: Karolina, Elvinas, Dominykas), has not only reached the Lithuanian community in Copenhagen, but has also stretched over the ethnic community, and have become well-known to young people of other nationalities as well - mostly due to the successful quiz nights, arranged together with Ukrainian and Polish societies, and yearly LD events (Int: Dominykas, Viltaute). This symbolic recognition of the society’s activity covers each and every member, despite the level of their involvement and actual activity, - all the members get the credit for being a part of a very active society, - even those, whose participation is, indeed, passive: “It means that I am a part of a bigger picture – one is not a warrior, it is easy to improve own name, if you are a part of a strong society that has a good name “ (Int: Viltaute).

The symbolic capital gained as a part of the overall society’s symbolic capital, might be individually beneficial applying for a job, or collectively, as well as individually, beneficial

creating bridges with other societies, and links with the formal institutions. This reputation the organization has as a whole (which is achieved by the input of previous and present members who worked and are working hard to shape the identity of young Lithuanians in Denmark as active, smart and talented representatives of Lithuania), - it attracts the attention of Lithuanian and foreign companies that are searching for the newly graduated employees (*Int: Elvinas*). The companies send their offers to the society, thus the members have a first-hand opportunity to join the labor market, where they could start or continue accumulating the economic capital in their qualifications corresponding labor market area (*ibid.*)

This socially derived symbolic capital of LYS, the outstanding reputation it has as an organization of young, bright, highly-educated Lithuanians, partly exchanges the scarce economic capital the society has in its disposal: *"A good part is that we have a good image, and there are many people that wanna come to Copenhagen just to give a speech, so we could invite basically anyone for free. We never pay speakers. We just cover their trip, and give them hotel or something"* (*Int: Dominykas*). And these economic resources, that would normally be spent covering the honorary of a speaker, can instead be used on arranging a social or LD event, to increase members' social and/or cultural capital that would again increase symbolic capital of the organization (as well as symbolic capital of each of its members). Moreover, being recognized as a young, active organization, might open more options for bridging with Danes or foreigners living in Denmark, and thus would make it easier for LYS to break stereotypes about Lithuanians, of whom the wider society might have a rather negative opinion due to the fact that *"<...> in media Lithuanians are not portrayed in the best way, you mostly hear that they robbed somebody"* (*Int: Elvinas*), but *"we have different mentality, different thinking, we do not come with bad intentions"* (*ibid.*).

LYS respondents use their social capital (the connections) and their symbolic capital (that has been accumulated due to a huge amount of social capital) to increase the diversity and frequency of their events and thus strengthen their bonds with one another (as far as LYS empirical data shows that more time the respondents spend working on a project together, stronger bonds they make with one another, and since they choose or initiate the projects according to their interests, more diverse interests represented, - more chances to increase social bonding capital), and, hopefully, bridge with other groups in Denmark as well as to develop more links with the formal institutions.



All in all, the social capital of LYS respondents, accumulated through their participation in LYS activity, is being constantly converted to the cultural capital of skills and, occasionally, cultural capital of knowledge, - and that is already alleviating (and most probably will further alleviate) the accumulation of the economic capital, while at the same the symbolic capital of the whole organization will as well get multiplied. That is, the skills, gained through working together on diverse projects, might lead members to being hired for the positions, matching their qualifications, and that might further result in a successful career and corresponding material gains, till the point when the excess of the economic capital would generate exceptionally talented individuals (*Bourdieu, 1989: 14*). Such talented members would symbolize LYS network's capacity to succeed, which would attract more new members, willing to join a circle of successful people (being a member of which would in a way mean one being successful as well). Thus, the society would expand, and if the newcomers would be accepted, assisted and empowered as their predecessors, and if that would again lead them to the qualified employment, that would result in an excess of the economic capital, the circle would repeat, and with each such repetition, the symbolic capital of LYS would multiple.

## **4.2.1. Accumulation of social capital through participation in LS**

### **4.2.1.1. Bonding social connections within Lithuanian Society**

Lithuanian Society was Inga's idea. When she arrived to Denmark, back in early 90'sies, she tried to join a Danish-Lithuanian society, founded by a Lithuanian activist, who came to Denmark with the last post-war wave of Lithuanian migrants (*Int: Inga*). The society, which, according to Inga, was founded "*of some selfish interests*" (*ibid.*), consisted of only three people, who "*refused to accept any other new people, who came from Lithuania, and had no wish to interact with them at all*" (*ibid.*). Some kinds of bonds may discourage the formation of bridges (*Putnam, 2000: 362*), - a close and settled relationship of three elder men could have been challenged by inclusion of a young and energetic Lithuanian woman, - and thus, Inga was rejected. Rejection, however, did not stop her: raised by a highly patriotic family Inga, to whom being a part of Lithuanian society seemed a natural choice, decided to establish a society on her own (*ibid.*).

The newly established society, initially formed of five people "*was very harmonious, - we would gather together for a book club, went to visit museums together, had some trips*" (*Int:*

*Inga*). These few like-minded initial members of the society were bound to one another by their common cultural, or as Inga refers to them, 'intellectual' interests, and have regularly reassured their bonds by arranging and attending events corresponding their cultural taste, as well as by interacting with one another during the monthly social gatherings at a café in the center of Copenhagen (*ibid*). Until: "*<...> the new contingent has appeared, and it was cool, and we have openly accepted it, but all those gatherings have become transfused by alcohol spirit, and they have practically ended up, when a fight took place in a cafe, and that cafe has refused to have us as guests*" (*ibid*). Thus, the monthly social meetings were interrupted, and have never been revived again. Since then LS focuses on arranging cultural events, twice a year, however, supplemented by slightly more socially oriented arrangements, - Christmas event and summer tour (although these have their cultural part as well, therefore none of the arranged events could be described as purely social).

The events are arranged and the whole activity of the society is set by LS board, - all but one of my respondents are previous or current LS board members. The majority of LS respondents have been in it for years: Arturas joined the board in 2004; Inga was a part of the board since the establishment of the society; Darius is counting his fourth year, Reda, who has recently left the board, was its member for over five years. Thus, contrarily to LYS board, which is partly renewed every year, and fully, - every second year, LS board members not only tend to stay in the board for years, but also prefer to maintain their initial duties for as long as possible (*Int: Arturas, Reda, Darius*). Any change in duties, whether it would be an advancement to the position of the chairman or new responsibilities, are perceived as a disadvantage rather than an opportunity: "*They have appointed me. I did not want to take the position, but was appointed. Because it was my turn*" (*Int: Darius*); "*And the communication itself. I do not like to communicate, but as one of my acquaintances said to me: "You just try it". Of course, it is not the ideal situation, - it could be done by the person that likes writing, and such, - maybe someday we will have someone like that*" (*Int: Arturas*). As Arturas further revealed in his interview, he had overtaken communication responsibilities, because nobody else was willing to take them. However, that does not signify that every LS member, who has energy and will to participate in the activity of the board, can be appointed as one. To become the LS board member and thus to take a part in decision-making regarding the coming events and the direction of LS activity in general, one should have gotten approval by a current board member, who by "*<...> paying*

*attention to what person is capable of, to the competences” (Int: Arturas)* might have decided that her/his skills, could be an asset to the board (*ibid*). This was exactly how Ineta became the board member, - she was asked to join the board to administer society’s finances, - although till then LS finances were taken care of by LS treasurer Arturas, who, however, yielded ground to Ineta, and overtook communicative responsibilities instead. However, although Ineta’s access to the board was rather easy, the three other LS members, who wanted to join it, were denied this opportunity, as far as their perception of the significance of being the board member did not really match the perception the LS board members had themselves (*Int: Inga, Arturas*). As Inga explains it further: *“They understood the being part of a board as a certain prestige, like, that would be a general manager position in a successful bank, and they tried to become a part of it by all possible means, by slander and conflicts” (Int: Inga).*

The selection for the board, as described above, therefore guarantees that the board is filled with like-minded people, who in a way strategically further pre-select their future co-workers, making sure that the like-mindedness of the board is maintained. The homogenous board is, according to Darius, one of LS strengths, because having the same taste and understanding, the board members easily agree upon what events to arrange or whom to invite to perform in Denmark (*Int: Darius*). And since *“Homogeneity makes connective strategies easier” (Putnam, 2003:280)*, it does not come as a surprise, when the majority, who were previous or are current board members mention one another or previous board members, when asked, with whom from the society they have formed friendships (*Int: Inga, Darius, Ineta, Arturas, Reda*). Of all the LS respondents only Arturas, Ieva and Skirmante mention having friends among other LS members, those outside the boundaries of LS board. Most of other LS members are considered to be acquaintances, with whom LS respondents meet only during the events, and with whom they do not develop any further relationships.

My LS respondents, who by the current moment are the board members (*Darius, Inga, Arturas, Ineta*) hold at least four board meetings a year at Darius’ home, whereat they decide on LS forthcoming events, LS financial matters or other organizational questions while enjoying delicious dinner Darius always gladly prepares (*Int: Ineta, Inga*). Moreover, as Darius emphasize: *“We try to interact outside the society. Not always it has to be about work” (Int: Darius)*. Thus, they all, together with previous board members Reda and Ieva, as well as Darius’ wife Skirmante, reaffirm their bonds outside the society, - in their spare time they celebrate each other’s birthdays,

occasionally meet for dinner at each other's home, invite each other for a barbeque in summers, and go for mushroom picking in autumns (*Int: Darius, Ieva, Arturas, Reda*). They trust each other their property (Darius' family has few times borrowed Inga's summerhouse in Lithuania) and even children (Ieva has babysitted Reda's daughter), however, as Inga says: "*There exists an invisible line there, you feel that so far all goes well, everything is fine, you can socialize with them, and of course they would help to arrange funeral or something, but that I could call them every second day and cry a bit, that is not the case*" (*ibid*). Although even if the LS respondents bonds with one another might not be enough strong to be tapped for constant moral support (*Int: Inga, Ineta, Reda, Ieva*), they work perfectly fine in regard to collaboration and helping. In fact, those respondents that have a higher amount of the economic capital, as for example, spacious home, often offer the performers to stay at their place (*Arturas, Darius*), thus, the money that otherwise would be used for the accommodation, can be used for the future events, that is, converted to the cultural capital. So to say, by accommodating the performers, the better-equipped board members invest their personal economic capital to get returns in form of cultural capital, that is, LS activity and the events (*Int: Inga, Darius, Reda*), which is accessible to all the members. Some of the other LS respondents, the ones that have not been able to accommodate the performers due to the lack of space at their home, have often contributed by showing the guests around in the city and its outskirts (sometimes the sightseeing lasted for up to a week) (*Int: Reda, Inga*). In this way, these LS respondents were as well investing their economic capital, - partially directly, through taking care of transport, buying museum tickets, food, if needed, and partially by expenditure of their time (*ibid*).

The outstanding cooperation and assistance regarding the events or any kind of LS activity seldom reach further than the board itself: the regular members do rarely contribute with anything else than their membership fee and some snacks or a pie, if they are asked to bring some food for a social part of an event (*Int: Reda*). Some of them have also helped with transportation or to set up chairs, but "*one can feel the lack of hands*" (*Int: Ineta*): "*So usually what happens is that there are some five that pull the carriage and all the others, they do join somehow symbolically*" (*Int: Inga*).

Thus, the LS board is the society's axle, - board's members are basically responsible for the whole society, - its activity and the arrangement of events: they are the producers of the ideas and the implementers at the same. As far as they do not delegate any weighty responsibilities to

the regular LS members (as it is very common in LYS, where the main organizers have their teams and even their friends outside LYS ready to jump in and help at any moment), and have to arrange everything themselves, the events take place rarely, they usually are not of a large extent, and they are exceptionally oriented towards Lithuanians (*Int: Darius, Ieva*). However, during the interviews few LS respondents underline that their main focus isn't the events, but the continuous activity of children schooling, which would not be possible at all, if not society's links to Danish institutions.

#### **4.2.1.2. Linking Social Connections: LS and institutions**

As mentioned above, LS actively engage in Lithuanian children schooling. Since the schooling, provided by LS, is not covered by Copenhagen municipality (as it already covers schooling at Lithuanian Saturday school), LS board members hire the teachers and pay their salaries by themselves. However, due to LS and Copenhagen municipality's agreement, both little ones and older kids can have their Saturday classes at free of charge premises in one of the municipality's regular schools. Moreover, as Darius mentions, LS has as well possibility to book a free of charge location for the events of less than 80 people, - again, upon the agreement with Copenhagen municipality, - completely free of charge (*Int: Darius*). Apart from the contact with the Copenhagen municipality, there is little interaction with other institutions, - all that is, is digitized, and proceeded by respective board members, - the treasurer takes care of interaction with the financial institutions (*Int: Ineta*), the chairman takes care of the premises' booking and acts as society's representative in case any contracts or other documents should be signed (*Int: Darius*). Thus, society's social linking with state institutions is limited to borrowing premises and paying the taxes, - the extent of the arranged activity and events, differently than of also towards bridging oriented LYS, does not require many efforts. That, however, does not signify that LS members are therefore deprived of bridging social capital. As revealed in the next subchapter, - it's indeed quite on the contrary.

#### **4.2.1.3. Bridging social connections through Lithuanian Society**

##### **4.2.1.3.1. Accumulation of cross-ethnic bridging social capital**

Although in Darius' opinion LS is too little as an organization to be able to interest somebody else than Lithuanians (*Int: Darius*), my interview with Reda has revealed that about a decade ago LS had a decent chance to become more widely known for the local community as well as to increase the potentiality of cross-ethnic bridging social capital accumulation by its members. At that point Reda's Danish husband, who spoke fluent Lithuanian, has joined the board with the hope to talk the board members into arranging some joint Lithuanian-Danish activity: "*He wanted to initiate some activity that would introduce Lithuania and Lithuanians to Danes*" (*Int: Reda*), which, if welcomed and proceeded, could have brought some more opportunities for LS members to bridge with Danes. However, Reda's husband's good intentions did not materialize, as, in Reda's words, "*nothing was going on, all started and finished with a coffee drinking club, an old ladies' club*" (*ibid*). And indeed, "*Small groups and close relationships have the best potential to maintain existing norms by punishing those who deviate*" (Graeff, 2009: 143), thus, 'punished' with the rest of the tight-bonded board members' ignorance in regard to his propositions (which did not match the LS activity direction oriented towards fostering national consciousness and maintaining Lithuanian spirit), Reda's husband have finally pulled away from the board, and from the society as well (*Int: Reda*). Although no longer the member of society, Reda's husband, just as well as Ineta's and Inga's Danish spouses, participate in the LS board previous and current members' spare time gatherings and LS arranged events, but just as in LYS case, the LS respondents' significant others are only present at a gathering (or an event), if their spouses, LS respondents, are present themselves. In addition to that, none of the interviewed respondents have mentioned about developing a personal relationship with their fellow board members' Danish significant others. Thus, cross-ethnic bridging is definitely present in the society, but it mostly appears in parallel with bonding (*Int: Ineta, Inga, Reda*).

One does not necessarily have to be LS board member to cross-ethnically bridge with the representatives of other nationalities. LS members attend family oriented events, such as Christmas event, yearly summer trips and others, together with their children and significant others (*Int: Reda, Skirmante, Inga*), thus cross-ethnic bridging (or at least cross-ethnic bridging through bonding) might take place there as well.

However, since LS does not arrange any events oriented to bringing their members together with the other communities in Copenhagen, nor they do have any joint events with Danes, thus an individual, being LS member would most likely won't be able to engage into the bridging

interaction with a casual foreigner through the events (or activity) arranged by LS. The foreigners one meets in LS events are usually related to the LS members, and the cross-ethnic bridging interaction, if it takes place, would not appear, if not a co-ethnic LS members' presence. On the other hand, although LS does not create (and does not tend to create!) a suitable environment for cross-ethnic bridging to occur independently from already existing bonding, it provides a slightly more tangible opportunity of a co-ethnic bridging, which I am taking a closer look upon in the next subchapter.

#### **4.2.1.3.2. The accumulation of co-ethnic bridging social capital.**

When the purely social events that LS society were arranging have been stopped due to inappropriate behavior of some society members, for a while the society has continued having a choir and a dancing circle, as well as book club, but all these activities have been dissolved due to the 'lack of hands', - the choir leader has moved back to Lithuania (*Int: Arturas*), the dancing circle's organizers have left Denmark as well (*Int: Ieva*), the book club has ceased, because: "*Fewer and fewer would come, there was the lack of organizers*" (*Int: Skirmante*). By the current day, all events society arranges are completely or at least partly cultural, - the latter ones leaving space for some social interaction among the attendees as well. The social part of events, especially those, so called family events, - are of the essential importance, as far as they are the 'bridging grounds' between LS respondents and some other LS society members whom the majority of LS respondents refer to as the 'workers' (*Int: Ieva, Skirmante, Reda, Darius*).

A network, as Putnam (2000) argues, does not have to be exceptionally bonding or exceptionally bridging: many groups, indeed, simultaneously bond along some dimensions while bridging across others. In LS case, although all current LS members initially bond along their ethnicity, - my LS respondents and the so called 'workers' bridge across their cultural taste and preferences, that is, across their cultural capital in embodied state (*Bourdieu, 1986; 1989*) (although the cultural capital in embodied form is what bonds them together within their respective groups). Thus, one could say that LS is a society, ethnically uniting at least two completely different bridging inner-groups (or, according to Bourdieu (1984), who emphasizes culture as a separate axis on which class formation occurs, two different classes).

However, one would expect that as, according to LS respondents, the LS main goal is to gather all Lithuanians, living in Copenhagen, together, the society would strive to satisfy the wishes of all of them, whether they would share their cultural perceptions with LS respondents or with the ‘workers’ (especially when the number of members is gradually decreasing). This, unfortunately, isn’t the case. The homogenous LS board is deliberately avoiding to arrange the events that do correspond with ‘workers’ taste (*Int: Arturas*). According to LS respondents, not only have the preferences of the ‘workers’ been the reason why the society’s social gatherings have ceased (*Int: Inga*), but these times, when the LS has arranged events corresponding ‘workers’ taste (which happened years ago, when the board was less homogeneous (*ibid*)), the events were: “<...> very exhaustive. Simply because there is that particular audience that comes in. Let’s say, during Butkute’s concert, which I remember very well. We needed some guards. People come in drunk, start fighting and so on” (*Int: Arturas*). Although the events as the above mentioned were richly attended and quite profitable (and thus could increase the society’s economic capital which could be further converted to cultural capital by using the money to arrange cultural events, corresponding LS respondents and other like-minded LS members taste), nevertheless: “Well, yeah, but we have to think whom we want to interact with. Do we really want to meet up just for a drink?” (*ibid*). The LS board members must have agreed on the thought, as LS has not arranged any pop music concerts for already several years. Instead of inviting famous pop-stars, LS settles with “the events of a good quality” (*Int: Darius*), that is the events which correspond LS respondents’ preferences, or the family activities, “<...> to which people come together with their children. Then all are acting humanely, and the mood is totally different. And, I think, everybody’s mood is good” (*Int: Arturas*).

These events, oriented to family, are indeed where the most interaction between the two inner-groups take place. LS board members, who arrange the events, take a part in them together with their children, just as well as ‘workers’ take part with theirs. However, as Skirmante underlines: “Several evenings we all can interact together and have a great time, but it’s rather impossible to develop deeper connections” (*Int: Skirmante*).

Since the choice of the other than family-oriented events is not that extensive, and some of the cultural events do have after-event social part (usually with a purpose to discuss the event by a cup of coffee with the fellow members or to interact with the guests who took part in the event), some ‘workers’ attend ‘elite’ events as well. However, as Skirmante asserts:



*“But I know that there, at these events, there are sitting some women who, for instance, work here as housemaids, and who greatly criticize the events after they have ended. They think that the events are plain, and according to them, if “Aliukai” would come to perform, everything would be different. Thus, there are the social levels diverging here in the society in Copenhagen” (ibid).*

Let’s see further see, if that’s indeed the case.

## **4.2.2. LS Social Capital’s Outcomes**

### **4.2.2.1. Cultural capital in form of taste and preferences**

Once very homogenous and culturally concerted Lithuanian Society has drastically changed since the newcomers became a part of it (*Int: Inga, Arturas*). As Inga asserts: *“Well, the economic migrants started to come. All that happened before the EU, but there already were those that came, well, to work a bit and that...They did not really fit into our company of intellectuals” (Int: Inga)*. Thus to say, the newcomers did not possess the same amount of the cultural capital as the longtime LS members did, which has led towards the longtime members’ opposition towards the new entrants (*Bourdieu, 1993:133*), the ‘workers’, - the preferences of the workers, that did not match the preferences of the LS respondents, have gradually been more and more ignored, till they finally were not taken into account at all.

Preferences and taste, the elements of the embodied cultural capital, are indeed ‘a system of matching properties’ which can bring individuals together, just as well as separate them from one another (*Bourdieu, 1984:174*). During the interviews, LS respondents define their cultural preferences in constant opposition to those, embodied by the ‘workers’, thus the similarity among the LS respondents primarily arises through their pursuit to distance themselves from the other ones. And only through the initial perception that LS respondents aren’t anything the workers are, there is possible to reach to the actual similarities LS respondents share.

Thus, according to LS respondents, the ‘workers’ *“<...> usually need to have some feast with some music like, Aliukai<sup>3</sup>, and that it would be possible to have a drink as well. Two most important things for a celebration.” (Int: Ieva)*, *“They need bread and games” (Int: Reda)*, they *“<...> want to be entertained, but, unfortunately, they have no lively interest to communicate.”*

---

<sup>3</sup> Aliukai - vaudeville pop band: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qjyLm-Z3Muk>

Therefore, “*If socializing in cafes would not have stopped, it would probably have been the most popular event for ‘beets’<sup>4</sup>, but not for discussions and sharing the experiences, but tasting the beer, to put it gently*” (Int: Inga). Workers get drunk (Int: Arturas), and get into fights (Int: Inga, Arturas), workers love music of their youth pop-stars (Int: Ineta, Darius) – their preferences are marked by ‘taste for necessity’ (Weisinger, 2005), that privileges substance over form (beer is for drinking, not for admiring its subtle light color), the informal over formal (it’s funnier to celebrate than to commemorate), the sensual over the intellectual (pop-music concerts rather than historic quizzes), - and that, according to Bourdieu (1984), - points towards workers having little capital.

In opposition to the workers’ ‘taste for necessity’ stands my LS respondents’ ‘taste for freedom’, - an ‘aesthetic disposition’, a preference for cultural objects and practices that are removed from mundane material functions. In their freedom from material constraints, which they gain because of their high volume of capital, my LS respondents distance themselves from the workers: their freedom from material constraints permits them to stylize and formalize natural functions in order to invest them with the sense of distinction. (Shwartz, 1997:166). And indeed, my LS respondents, by ‘workers’ called ‘elite’, rather prefer museum visits, historical tours and book circles that enhance one’s knowledge (Int: all LS) and enjoy the forms of art, like theatre (as long as it is not commercial: “*I have always been against "Raganiukes" performances, because although the audience craves them, it is the theater that is...I do not know...Ordinary. I do not know. There is not much of art, the theatre in it.*” (Int: Reda)) (ibid.), opera (Int: Ineta, Arturas, Inga), classical music (Int: all) and ballet (Int: Inga, Skirmante. Arturas) - all that, what ‘workers’ find, according to LS respondents, plain and boring (Int: Inga, Skirmante).

Since the majority of LS respondents were or currently are LS board members, they arrange the activities according to their preferences, thus, they do constantly further accumulate the embodied cultural capital, increasing its amount and at the same increasing the distance between them and the others, - those with the different taste and preferences. And those others, who although do attend the events arranged by LS respondents, do not benefit of the attendance equally (nor even close to equally) as my LS respondents do, since they can’t “consume” the cultural goods, the meaning of which they can’t comprehend (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Swartz, 1996), - to be able to do that they should have the knowledge, inherited and acquired by LS respondents in their early childhood (Field, 2005; Swartz, 1997):

---

<sup>4</sup> Abbreviation for “beetroots”, another reference to ‘workers’.

*“I grew up in such environment, where...My parents would go to see Miltinis theatre performance from Vilnius to Panevezys. Thus, I’ve grown up knowing how to distinguish shit from corn. That has come from my family. I am of course open to the experiments and such, but that sense of knowing remains...” (Int: Inga).*

Not having that same understanding, what’s good taste and what’s bad taste according to LS respondents’, the ‘workers’ thus would not be able to perceive the world the way the LS respondents do, even although they would force themselves to attend each and every event the LS would arrange. By attending the events, ‘workers’ would, of course, gain more cultural capital, but unlikely would have any gain of it, - they still would not be considered one of their own by LS respondents. At the same, by gaining more cultural capital, ‘workers’ would not gain more acknowledgment in their own circle: one, who suddenly exchanges Friday nights out to a ballet, might be looked down on in his own environment, gradually loose his social connections and thus be exposed to devaluation of own social capital.

As mentioned above, according to Bourdieu (1984), those, equipped with high amount of cultural capital, start accumulating it in an early childhood, - and indeed, Darius, Skirmante, Reda, Arturas and Ieva remember themselves listening to classical music and regularly attending theatre since they were little. Moreover, as all of my LS respondents were brought up in patriotic families, - where Lithuanian heritage, traditions and Lithuanian language were highly valued, they have since their young days learned to appreciate their roots. Thus, in the interviews asked, if they would at some point in future exchange their Lithuanian citizenship for Danish, none of them replied positively. Although some acknowledged that Danish citizenship would be an asset, reflecting their bonds to Denmark (*Darius, Ineta*), that would expand the current voting rights (*Inga, Arturas*) and might guarantee a higher state protection in case of incidents while traveling in less safer countries outside of Europe (*Skirmante*), - it would only be considered as a supplementary citizenship to the Lithuanian one, - that is, the above mentioned LS respondents would only apply for Danish citizenship, if they would be granted the right to have a double citizenship, or, as Reda joked: *“I would only give Lithuanian citizenship away, if Lithuania would be occupied by Russians” (Int: Reda)*. Otherwise, *“The Lithuanian passport is, - because, maybe, that I have experienced the 11th of March and such, - very dear to me”, “My passport, - that's my history, my pride” (Int: Reda)*, *“I am a Lithuanian, born in Lithuania, raised in Lithuania, and I do not feel Danish, so I cannot see the meaning in changing it” (Int: Ineta)*.

The patriotic sense of one's own identity, the grasp of one's roots, the ability to perceive the meaning of the historic moments and the understanding of the importance to preserve own language are as well is encoded in my LS respondents 'habitus', - and just as LS parents did, they aim to reproduce it as part as their embodied cultural capital to their children. However, if love for theatre and classical music can be taught at home, the language learning, especially of those, whose one of parents is Danish, - is more likely to progress, if children interact with one another:

*“There is that one aspect that when you teach children the second language, they have to feel that the schooling they get is beneficial to them in some way. Otherwise they will not learn. Because it is, however, a supplementary burden to them. They have to use the language. If they will not be able to use it, they will not make an effort to learn it” (Int: Arturas).*

Thus, LS main activity is directed towards increasing their children's language capital (a subform of embodied cultural capital (*Bourdieu, 1977*)), - at their Saturday school they are encouraged to interact with one another by engaging them into diverse activities, - such as drawing, modelling together, producing a play (which can for instance be performed during LS Christmas event) or sight-seeing in the city. In this way, they do not only learn to communicate in Lithuanian, but learn as well to appreciate various forms of art (the way art is appreciated by LS respondents), thus, regardless their parents' taste and preferences, they are introduced to taste and preferences of LS respondents, and, in that way, they are given some knowledge (which their parents might lack), necessary to accumulate larger amount of embodied cultural capital in future. And sometimes, some of the workers' children get a double benefit, - if they are lucky to have Reda as their teacher, - they are introduced to some Danish history and culture, because, according to Reda:

*“Yeah... Workers, let's say. There are a lot of problems, because some of the children attend really bad schools, where the level of Danish language classes is very low, and these children, after a year of staying in Denmark, cannot even read an ordinary Danish sentence, have no Danish language skills, and know nothing about Danish culture. Thus, my mission is to expand the knowledge. I am not pro-blind-nationalism, - you have to be Lithuanian, but you also have to be a member of the Danish society” (Int: Reda).*

However, if for some children Lithuanian Saturday schooling can as well be a subsidiary source to attain knowledge about Danish culture, that can further be beneficial in terms of integration in the host society (*Ager & Strang, 2008: 182*), all of them accumulate linguistic capital by increasing Lithuanian language skills. And Lithuanian language is essential for communication with the relatives in Lithuania, because, as Skirmante asserts: “<...>even if you

*raise your children to be total Danes, they are still not 100% Danes, if their mom is Lithuanian. And it would be very beneficial for the identity of these children to have Lithuanian relatives, the understanding what is Lithuania, some cousins, as well as to be able to speak a bit Lithuanian to be able to communicate with these cousins, - so that they would understand themselves better” (Int: Skirmante); and, as Arturas seconds: “<...> if they will not learn Lithuanian language, they will lose the bond with Lithuania” (Int: Arturas).*

Thus, increasing their children’s linguistic capital with Lithuanian language skills, LS respondents make sure that their children are not deprived of the social bonding capital with the family members in Lithuania. In addition, LS respondents as well insure that, in case their children would decide to start a life in Lithuania, they would have an easier access to the education (as for instance, due to their fluent Lithuanian they could as well apply for the studies that are taught exceptionally in Lithuanian), that is, could further accumulate cultural capital, or/and would have an easier access to the labor market (for instance, would be able to get a job in the governmental sector, where speaking Lithuanian is obligatory), that is could convert embodied cultural capital’s subform, linguistic capital, into economic capital.

Finally, as mentioned above, LS respondents themselves, accumulating the cultural capital through the events they arrange in LS, do increase their own embodied cultural capital, at least partly compensating the reduction of their cultural capital they have experienced since their departure from Lithuania. In reality, the society for my LS respondents is one of the very few stable sources of Lithuania-related embodied capital, - the capital they would hardly achieve separately on their own. To gain more of this capital, LS respondents invest their own economic capital: they accommodate the performers at their places, show them the city, great them dinner, and, although *“it’s common that someone supports financially some event, mostly we fund the main cultural events ourselves” (Int: Darius).*

Similarly like with the economic capital, in order to gain more embodied cultural capital, the personal social connections are tapped as well: Reda has once arranged an event to commemorate the genocide of the Lithuanian Jews, whereto she invited some highbrow Jewish acquaintances, who were born in Lithuania, but during the WWII have managed to flee to Denmark, and have lived here since; Arturas, who has previously lived in France and wherein has actively participated in the activity of the local Lithuanian society, had invited one of its members, a well-known opera singer, to perform for LS in Copenhagen (*Int: Reda, Arturas*).

However, this intense accumulation of the LS respondents' embodied cultural capital is taking place on the expense of the other society members, the so called 'workers', - as their taste and preferences are neglected to satisfy the taste and preferences of my LS respondents, thus the LS exercise on them 'symbolic violence'. However, at the same the strategy the LS respondents employ by picking the events that accumulate their cultural capital in embodied form, is further benefiting them in terms of symbolic capital, which will be further reviewed in the next subchapter.

#### **4.2.2.2. Symbolic capital in LS**

During interview with Inga, she admits that her first years in Denmark are bitterly engraved in her heart: when she came to Denmark, she felt *"as significant as shit, - if I would have disappeared, nobody would have noticed or registered, - like, air, like very rare chemical element that exists 5 sec in the form of gas, after which it transfers into something else"* (Int: Inga), whilst in Lithuania *"I felt important, meaningful, necessary, all that"* (ibid). The situation with the years has changed, she, as well as other LS respondents, have established their lives in Denmark, have gained both bonding and bridging social capital (which could transmute to social-symbolic capital with the time) as well as the majority (Arturas, Inga, Skirmante, Darius, Ineta) have accumulated a satisfying amount of economic capital that, if accumulated further, in future might transmute to economic-symbolic capital. However, the cultural-symbolic capital on a level of a Danish person is, unfortunately, for LS respondents unachievable due to the simple fact – none of the LS respondents underwent Danish upbringing. Thus, although LS respondents economically and socially could amount to Danes, culturally they would still be a step behind, - and even if they would excel most of Danes in knowledge of their culture and would learn to behave as Danes do, they would not be acknowledged to be as culturally embedded, as Danes by origin are, by Danes themselves, thus, they would never obtain that cultural-symbolic (identity-related) recognition of complete cultural belonging in Denmark, - even if they would give up their Lithuanian citizenship in exchange for Danish, they could not obtain Danish roots. Thus, the only space where the LS respondents cultural capital can be accumulate to the extent that it becomes symbolic, that is, is recognized, is the society itself. And as the empiric data reveals, the recognition and acknowledgement are already granted by the LS respondents themselves to one another, as they refer to LS activity and the arranged events, as the "quality events" (Int: Arturas), or, by Reda's

words: *"I am glad as well, if the people that participated in the events, are glad seeing the "elite", the elite Lithuanian culture"* (Int: Reda).

At the same, all my LS respondents, except Skirmante, were or are the board members, that is, they were and are able to direct Lithuanian society a certain way, and thus gain it a certain overall reputation. That overall reputation, which, if decided from the culturally rather uniform events and activity, is the perception of a society of culturally 'narrow interests' (Int: Ieva), might attract more people that consider themselves having the same interests. That, however, means that the people with different interests, who are still taking part in LS, might have to meet even more opposition than they do know, - which, in case of 'workers' withdrawal from the society, would put an end to the accumulation of the co-ethnic bridging social capital through the participation in it. However, in such case, the accumulation of the cultural capital, corresponding to LS preferences, would have flourished, since the like-minded new members could theoretically have had compensated the "lack of the hands", and thus would have been able to arrange more cultural events corresponding to their preferences. And finally, an extensive amount of embodied cultural capital, accumulated in LS society, would probably to some extent decrease the gap between a LS respondent and her/his circle in case she/he would decide to return to Lithuania, - higher amount of cultural capital in embodied form they would have, quicker they would be able to accumulate the supplementary amount of the cultural capital necessary to transmute it to culturally-symbolic capital in Lithuania.

Apart from the above mentioned symbolic capital and cultural capital, the participation in LS activity and events can as well end in rather smaller, but slightly more tangible outcomes, which will be reviewed further.

#### **4.2.2.3. Information**

If LYS respondents' share with one another wide amounts of information, the flow of information is way less extensive within LS. The information, one can get access to through the membership in the network is for the mostly culturally or socially oriented (Int: Arturas). None of the respondents themselves have tapped LS network for any other kind of information, however, they themselves have by other society member's been tapped for specific information, that is, have been providing them professional advices: Darius was asked to recommend a good heart specialist who could give a second opinion on LS member's health, Skirmante was pled to treat one of the

members' acquaintance, Inga was inquired about the application procedures to enter certain studies at the same university she is employed at (*Int: Skirmante, Darius, Inga*). Thus, one could say that the professional status of LS respondents, their economic capital, accumulated through many years, has been transformed to the symbolic capital within society, - they are considered professionals of their field and therefore sought for an advice in case of need.

#### **4.2.2.4. Support in case of fatality**

During the interviews, Reda, Inga and Arturas have mentioned helping the families of LS members to arrange the funeral, supporting them financially as well as by taking care of the formalities instead of them. The support in case of fatality has been provided independently of the position in the society, - that is, the regular society members' families were helped as much as the board members' families. The families of departed members' are supported financially (*Int: Reda, Int: Arturas*), they are helped with the documentation (*Int: Inga*), and, if needed with accommodation as well (*Int: Arturas*).

#### **4.2.2.5. Other personal favors**

Although as, according to Reda: "*Society is not a job center!*" (*Int: Reda*) and at least on the level of my LS respondents, it does not provide any kind of employment-related favors (*Int: Reda, Int: Ineta*), my LS respondents do indeed use their circle for personal favors, that is, Darius' family use Inga's summerhouse (*Int: Darius*), Reda's children have been babysitted by Ieva and previous board member Milda. However, as my empirical data reveals, such personal favors as mentioned, are only taking place between the LS members connected with one another by bonds.

Although even if participation in LS can result in personal favors, as it has been mentioned above, LS respondents, differently than LYS respondents, through their participation in the society do not aim towards an increase of their economic capital (in fact, they are decreasing it by exchanging it to the cultural capital), but are instead strategically accumulating the cultural capital in embodied form, - and thus, bonding with those, who have the same preferences and therefore can be allies in cultural capital accumulation, and only slightly bridging with those, whose taste, manners and behavior are distant to theirs, - who lack necessary knowledge to perceive LS respondent's perception of culture the same way as they themselves do.



## 5. CONCLUSIONS

1. LYS respondents, as well as LS respondents, through their participation in their respective societies' activities, accumulate bonding social capital, - although LS respondents, in addition to that, also accumulate co-ethnic bridging social capital.
2. Although some of LYS respondents joined the society through their friends, with whom thus they were able regularly to reaffirm their bonds through the participation in society's activity, the strongest bonding connections are, according to my empirical data, developed among those LYS members, who have experienced most face-to-face interaction through the longer period of time, working together on the projects of shared interest. More interests one shares with others, - more projects one works on, - more social bonding capital one creates.
3. The bond-developing within LYS is facilitated by frequent informal social interaction: socializing encourages the development of mutual understanding and respect as well as helps to reach consensus and compromise where necessary, - and thus increases members' capability to spend an extensive amount of time with one another, - which is essential in order to create strong ties among them.
4. Informal social interaction is, however, rarity within LS, - the lack of socializing through the events with other LS members does limit LS respondents' social interaction to those within the board (or previous its members). Thus, although the board members' 'old' bonds are reaffirmed, the new ones aren't created.
5. LYS members back each other up, - they collaborate, trust one another and support each other within the whole society. LS respondents act the same, - however, solely within the board (previous board members included).
6. Bonding within LYS not only can help one to 'get by', but just as well to 'get ahead': the social capital within LYS might get one a job, might gain one a housing, some cultural knowledge, and – surely, if one is an active member, – will provide one with information, and an opportunity to acquire skills, - a form of cultural capital that can further be used to get a job, thus, can be converted into economic capital. In LS, - apart from that previous and current board members do one another small favors, as babysitting or summer house lending, - all members get access to the inside

information, and an opportunity to use LS provided children schooling. However, only some of them can actually enjoy LS organized events.

7. LS events are decided by LS board which, due to their same taste and preferences, arrange the events according to their liking, deliberately depriving a part of other members, the so-called 'workers', of their preferences, - since these preferences are considered to be of a 'bad' taste.

8. Thus, depriving 'workers' of events corresponding to their 'taste of necessity', LS respondents, the 'elite', accumulate the embodied cultural capital, arranging the events that correspond their 'taste of freedom', - in that way, the bonding social capital within the organization, - of an inner group of LS respondents, - has a negative effect on the outer group of the 'workers', who are exposed to 'symbolic violence' executed by the 'elite'.

9. There are clear opportunities for members to obtain cross-ethnic bridging capital through the participation in by LYS arranged, towards foreigners oriented, yearly LD events and educational events, like, conferences, - however, LYS respondents do use this opportunity, only if the foreigners are somehow related to the other LYS members. Thus, when it comes to LYS respondents, - they only obtain casual social bridging capital through the bonding. Equally to LYS respondents, LS respondents behave the same, - the only difference is that all their events are oriented exceptionally towards Lithuanians, thus regular cross-ethnic bridging would be more difficult to obtain through their activity.

10. Both LYS and LS accumulate linking social capital, however, one can only create links in LS as a board member, while in LYS some linking connections can be created by the regular members as well. Moreover, having less frequent contact with the Danish formal institutions, LS creates less social linking capital than LYS does.

11. LYS strong inner bonding capital has already transmuted to social-symbolic capital, - that is, - the multicultural society outside the organization knows LYS as a strong organization of young active people, - thus, each LYS member, active or passive, gain the same reputation as well. This social-symbolic capital could further serve searching for a job, and by this be converted to economic capital. Furthermore, the reputation of the society, whose members have a large amount of economic capital, would attract more members, who, in turn, would again acquire skills, and, starting the circle from the beginning, would multiply the symbolic capital of the organization.

12. LS divided social capital does benefit my respondents and their like-minded fellow members, as far as they can further accumulate their embodied cultural capital, which due to stratification

inside the society and possibility to further distance from the 'workers', is by LS respondents themselves acknowledged as a culturally derived symbolic capital (LS respondents refer to each other's preferences as to those of 'elite'). The embodied cultural capital, further accumulated in the society might at least partially fill the gap, if one would decide to move back to homeland and recover the social capital one had. And if one's children would be willing to move as well, they would at least have a decent amount of Lithuanian linguistic capital, acquired through attendance to LS arranged schooling, - which would further facilitate the accumulation of the social capital in Lithuania.

13. Thus, LYS and LS, two co-ethnic societies, oriented to gather Lithuanians to maintain their Lithuanian spirit, might offer to them two different things: might give them wings, - strong social bonds of friendship one could use to acquire some skills, which could lead to a job one is proud of, and a respectable place in Danish society, or might cut them by denying one's way of life, if one's family have not granted one with tastes and preferences, equal to those of the higher ones'.

## 6. REFERENCES:

Ager, A. and Strang, A. (2008) 'Understanding integration: a conceptual framework', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2): 166-191.

Ahn, K.T., Ostrom, E. (2009). The meaning of social capital and its link to collective action. In G.T. Svendsen & G.L.H. Svendsen (eds.) *Handbook of Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science and Economics* (pp 17-35). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.W. (2000). Social capital: The good, the bad, and the ugly. In E. L. Lesser (ed.) *Knowledge and Social Capital: Foundations and applications* (pp.89-115). Boston: Butterworth Heinemann

Angrosino, M. V. & Pérez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation: From method to context. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.)*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 673–702

Arshad, I. (2011). It's not what you know it's who you know that counts: The Interplay between Informal Social Networks and Formal Organizations in Connecting Newcomers to Canada. Toronto: Policy Horizons

Atkinson, P. A. & Coffey, A. (1997). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*, London: Sage, 45–62.

Babbie, E., 2016. *The Practice of Social Research*. 14th ed., Boston: Cengage Learning.

Berg, B.L. (2004). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the Theory of Action*. Oxford: Blackwell publishers Ltd.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1989), Social Space and Symbolic Power, in: *Sociological Theory* (7), nr. 1, pp. 14-25

Bourdieu, P. (1987). What Makes a Social Class? On The Theoretical and Practical Existence Of Groups. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 32, 1-17. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.zorac.aub.aau.dk/stable/41035356>, [Accessed: November 30, 2016]

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp.241-258). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, 16(6), 645-668.

Bowen, G.A., (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), pp.27–40.

Calhoun, C. (1993). Habitus, Field, and Capital: The Question of Historical Specificity. In: Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., Postone, M., *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 61-88). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cambell, D., Putnam, R. (2012). *American Grace*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cordero-Guzmán, H. (2005). Community-Based Organisations and Migration in New York City. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies*, 31 (5):889-909

Dimaggio, P., Mukhtar, T. (2004). Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982-2002: Signs of decline?, *Poetics*, 32, pp 169-194. Available at: [https://www.princeton.edu/~artspol/orchestras/suggested\\_readings/dimaggio%20and%20mukhtar%20paper.pdf](https://www.princeton.edu/~artspol/orchestras/suggested_readings/dimaggio%20and%20mukhtar%20paper.pdf); [Accessed October 30, 2016].

Faber, S. T.; Prieur, A.; Rosenlund L. Skjøtt-Larsen, J. (2012). *Det skjulte klassesamfund*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.

Feldstein, M.L, Putnam, R. D. (2003). *Better Together*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gečienė, Ingrida. (1997). Social Capital in Transforming Society of Lithuania. In M. Taljūnaitė (eds.) *Everyday Life in the Baltic States*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Filosofijos ir sociologijos institutas: 194-212.

Gilbert, N. (2008). *Researching social life*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Gilchrist, A. (2000). The well-connected community: networking to the "edge of chaos", *Community Development Journal*, vol.35 (3), pp 264-75.

Graeff, P. (2009). Social capital: The dark side. In G.T. Svendsen & G.L.H. Svendsen (eds.) *Handbook of Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science and Economics* (pp 143-161). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

Greg, G., Name, E., Mack, N., Woodson, C., Macqueen, M.K. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's field guide*; North Carolina: Family Health International. Available at: <https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Qualitative%20Research%20Methods%20-%20A%20Data%20Collector's%20Field%20Guide.pdf>; [Accessed October 30, 2016]

Goldstein, A. E. & Reiboldt, W. (2004). The multiple roles of low income, minority women in the family and community: A qualitative investigation. *The Qualitative Report*, 9(2), 241–265. Available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR9-2/goldstein.pdf>, [Accessed: November 30, 2016]

Harvey, Ch., Maclean, M. *Capital theory and the dynamics of elite business networks in Britain and France*. Remembering Elites (eds) Savage, M., Williams, K. 105-121, 2008, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.)*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 703–715

Hooghe, M., Stolle, D.(2004). *Social Capital: Civil Society and Institutions in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Palgrave

Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative research: Airy fairy or fundamental? *The Qualitative Report*, 8(1), Article 7. Available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-1/labuschagne.html>; [Accessed: November 30, 2016]

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCall, G.J., Simmons, J.L. (1969) *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader*: Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Newton, K. (2004), Social trust: individual and cross-national approaches, *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 3, pp. 15-35.

Portes, A. (2000). *The Two Meanings of Social Capital*. *Sociological Forum*, Vol. 15, No. 1 pp. 1-12

Putnam, R. D. (2015). *Our Kids*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Robson K., Sanders C., (ed.) (2009) *Quantifying theory: Pierre Bourdieu*; chapter 5 -> Transmutations of Capitals in Canada: a “Social Space” approach by Gerry Veenstra; Springer Science: Toronto

Rosenmeier, S. (2007) Den sociale kapitalers fædre. In P. Hegedahl & S.L. Rosenmeier, (eds.) *Social kapital – som teori og praksis*. Frederiksberg: Forlaget Samfundslitteratur

Southerton, D. (2004). Cultural capital, social networks and social contexts: Cultural orientations toward spare time practices in a new town. In A. Graham, D. Morgan & C.

Phillipson (eds.) *Social networks and social exclusion: Sociological and policy perspectives* (pp. 97-117). Hants: Ashgate.

Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, The University of Chicago Press, London

Swartz, D. (1996). Bridging the Study of Culture and Religion: Pierre Bourdieu's Political Economy of Symbolic Power, *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 57 (1), pp. 71-85.

Weininger, B.E., (2005). Foundations of Pierre Bourdieu's class analysis. O.E. Wright, (eds.) 82-119, *Approaches to class analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Woolcock, M. (2001). *The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/innovation/research/1824913.pdf> [Accessed October 30, 2016]

Wollebæk, D. (2011). Norges sosiale kapital i nordisk og europeisk kontekst. In D. Wollebæk & S.B. Seggaard (eds.), *Sosial kapital i Norge*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Wollebæk, D. (2000). *Participation in Voluntary Associations and the Formation of Social Capital*, dissertation. Bergen: Department of Comparative Politics, University of Bergen

Lithuanian Society in Denmark regulations (2007)  
[http://www.lietuva.dk/documents/DLB\\_Istatai\\_2007\\_m\\_redakcija.pdf](http://www.lietuva.dk/documents/DLB_Istatai_2007_m_redakcija.pdf)

Lithuanian Youth Society regulations (2015): [file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/Istatai-2015%20\(3\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/Istatai-2015%20(3).pdf)

Lithuanian Youth Society homepage <http://lietuva.dk/>