Luin Goldring (2001) has greatly advanced our understanding of the ways in which constructions of masculinities and femininities organize migration and migration outcomes.

3. This chapter includes certain materials previously published in Pessar (1999a and b) and Mahler and Pessar (2001).

4. It should be noted that for several decades the United States has attracted proportionately more female migrants than other labor-importing countries and that women constitute the majority among US immigrants from Asia, Central and South America, the Caribbean, and Europe (Donato 1992; Houston, Kramer, and Barrett 1984).

5. Researchers neglected Ernst Ravenstein's (1985, 1989) early observations on the differences between women and men in his "migration laws." In the 1880s, for example, he declared that women were more likely than men to migrate short distances.

6. B. Bozzoli (1983) argues that gender relations proved central to households' resistance to full proletarianization. However, this move depended on male appropriation of female labor.

7. See Jones-Correa (1998) for an analysis of the contrastive social benefits Latin American immigrant men and women seek from organizational life. The author argues that in an attempt to recapture pre-emigration social status (in the context of current male downward mobility in the United States), men tend to join transnational immigrant organizations. Women fill the breach by assuming the role of intermediaries between the immigrant community and the surrounding society.

2003 American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigrants. Nancy Foner Ed. Santa Fe: School of American Research

4

The Centrality of Ethnography in the Study of Transnational Migration

Seeing the Wetland Instead of the Swamp

Nina Glick Schiller

Anthropologists were among the first scholars to propose "a transnational perspective for the study of migration" (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992b). Today the study of transnational migration is a shared project that stretches across disciplines, with scholars in anthropology, sociology, geography, and history employing the same terms and, to some extent, citing one another's work. However, terms such as *globalization, transnationalism, transnational community, transnational network, transnational social field, deterritorialization,* and *transmigrant* often are deployed differently and are undefined. The definitional jungle is difficult to traverse because within it lies a methodological quagmire. Although one scholar's wetland is another's swamp, the current moment seems an appropriate time to survey the development of the field, clarify concepts, and explore issues of methodology. In this chapter I explicate theoretical, methodological, and substantive contributions ethnographers have made to the study of transnational migration and suggest future directions for research. Exploring the epistemological assumptions residing within ethnographic approaches to transnational migration, I briefly note the

venerable but often forgotten history of migration studies within anthropology. Before beginning these various explorations, I define some of the key terms of transnational migration studies.

To underscore the ethnographic perspective on transnational migration, I contrast it to the way the same topic appears when approached by means of social surveys. Even though the ethnographers who study migration are not a homogenous lot and there has been valuable cross-fertilization among the practitioners of different methodologies, ethnography is, I argue, the most appropriate methodology for the study of transnational migration. Ethnography is a methodology that includes more than participant observation. Ethnographers obtain and use a variety of quantitative data and utilize various kinds of questionnaires. However, they do this in a very different relationship to theory, and their understanding of the ways in which categories of data are defined differs from the positivist approach of other social scientists (Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte 1999).

DEVELOPING A TRANSNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE FOR THE STUDY OF MIGRATION

At the end of the 1980s, scholars in a number of disciplines, including anthropology, cultural studies, and geography, became fascinated by the various flows of people, ideas, objects, and capital across the territorial borders of states. Anthropologists working in the United States proposed a new paradigm for the study of migration, called "transnationalism" (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992b and c; see also Kearney 1991; Rouse 1991). As early as 1916, Randolph Bourne had used the term to describe the transborder relations of immigrants to the United States. Political scientists addressed the topic in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* in 1986. By 1990, anthropological use had begun (Georges 1990; Glick Schiller and Fouron 1990).[1] However, not until the 1990s did the term refer to an approach to the study of migration and become a topic of sustained interest in migration studies. The new paradigm in migration made visible the multiple, cross-border relationships of many migrants, enabling researchers to see that migration can be a transnational process.

Building on research on Caribbean migration that Basch had conducted with Caribbean sociologists (Basch et al. 1990), Linda Basch, Cristina Blanc-Szanton, and I (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992c:1) called persons who live their lives across borders "transmigrants." Not coincidentally, some of the first scholars to conceptualize transnational migration worked in the Caribbean and Mexico, two areas of the world that had long, continuous histories of migration and cultures of migration. It was easier for scholars working in those two settings to break out of the dominant paradigm that assumed that persons could belong to only a single country and that US migrants had to choose between their home country and the new land.

Anthropologists emerged as key theorists of transnational migration by drawing on a heritage of ethnographies of migration. This heritage may surprise persons in various disciplines who believe that anthropologists' concern has been with social actors living in local, "traditional" settings (Morawska 2001b:3–4). Even in anthropology, the long, rich history of migration studies often goes unacknowledged, and one can find anthropologists who write as if the ethnographic study of migration, complex societies, and transborder processes is something new to their discipline (Marcus 1986; Rosaldo 1989). In fact, ethnographers of migration have long maintained a creative tension with certain mainstream currents in anthropology and sociology and offer a critique of both.

The ethnographic study of transnational migration is rooted in a different, older definition of culture than that adopted by prominent anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz and Arjun Appadurai and an increasing number of anthropology textbooks. Many contemporary anthropologists define culture as a system of meaning, discarding or downplaying the study of social relations and social action. Because social relations are at the foundation of transnational migration, it is not surprising that most ethnographers who study people living their lives across borders deploy a broader, older, Tylorian concept of culture that encompasses social relations, social structure, and transgenerationally transmitted patterns of action, belief, and language. Utilizing this more encompassing approach to culture, anthropologists who studied migration in past generations developed several topics central to the current study of transnational migration, including the diffusion

of ideas and material culture through migration, social networks, and social fields.

Transnational migration studies focus on the nature and impact of relationships—economic, religious, political, and social—that embed people in two or more societies. In 1990, a network of scholars, most of whom were anthropologists, met in a conference at the New York Academy of Sciences and established four vital points: (1) Nation-states continue to shape transmigrant actions and identities, (2) the nature, pattern, intensity, and types of transnational connections of migrants vary with class, gender, and generation, (3) states often try to encompass and redirect the transnational activities of migrants, and (4) continuities, as well as differences, exist between contemporary and past patterns of transnational migration (Feldman-Bianco 1992; Georges 1992; Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992c; Lessinger 1992; Ong 1992; Richman 1992; Rouse 1992; Sider 1992; Sutton 1992; Wiltshire 1992).

Subsequently, many scholars embraced the concept of transnational migration articulated at this conference and cited the resulting publication. However, the focus on the multiple social relationships of migrants sometimes became lost in the general excitement over the new paradigm. The tasks of distinguishing patterns of variation within transnational migration and comparing past and present periods of transnational migration were not prioritized. Also ignored were the previous several decades of research, much of it ethnographic, that documented (but did not highlight) transnational connections.

Instead, scholars turned to a celebration of the contemporary moment of globalization. In the euphoria sparked by the new, rapid, global flows of ideas and information via computers, satellites, and the Internet, a small but significant core of scholars spoke of a postmodern moment (Appadurai 1990; Kearney 1991). This sparked what I have called the "dissing" of previous paradigms. We heard about disjuncture, dislocation, displacement, disengagement, disconnection, deterritorialization, and the dismantling of the old stabilities, knowledge, conventions, and identities. The past was static; the present was fluid. The past contained homogenous cultures; we lived in a world of hybridity and complexity. Before, anthropology studied small isolated societies; now the world was our terrain.

Both those who emphasized the postmodern moment and those who were less sanguine about the libratory potential of transnational processes linked these processes to a new stage of capitalism. Marked by the restructuring of production, distribution, and consumption, the new stage of capitalism was understood to be globally stimulating increased levels of migration and inducing and facilitating both the home ties and diasporic connections of persons who had migrated across international borders.

With the celebratory postmodern rhetoric now behind us, we can sort out the relationship between contemporary globalization and the emergence of the transnational framework for studying migration. It is now clear that in the 1990s we were experiencing two discrete but interrelated types of novelty. First, we were shifting our paradigm; we had changed the analytical framework we used to conceptualize migration. Second, although globalization is not new, the end of the twentieth century marked a period of intensive global restructuring of capitalization that facilitated, and again made necessary, a large number of migrants' maintaining some type of home tie or other transborder connection and organizing their lives around these connections. Extensive migrant interconnection across state borders had been part of an earlier period of globalization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries but had been obscured by the assimilationist paradigm that came to dominate migration studies (Foner 2000, 2001c and e; Glick Schiller 1999a, b, and c; Goldberg 1992). With a new period of globalization, the transnational ties of migrants were again visible and even more significant.

The enthusiastic reception of David Harvey's *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Conditions of Cultural Change*, published in 1989, marks the moment when the paradigm changed for many in anthropology and related fields such as cultural studies. Harvey, a geographer, explicitly linked changing structures of capital accumulation, which he called "flexible accumulation," with transformations in the nature of cultural processes. The paradigm change spawned the development of several other related fields of study: transcultural studies, diaspora studies, and globalization studies. Soon studies developed of transborder family, business, and historical connections that stretch across multiple nation-states and connect sets of individuals to one

another by means of identity narratives (Nyiri 1999; Ong 1999; Smart and Smart 1998).

As various interdisciplinary studies of cross-border interconnections developed, some scholars did not distinguish transnational migration from other forms of transnational connection (Cohen 1997). However, there are good reasons to view transnational migration studies as a distinct field of research within the more general study of transnational processes. Transnational migrants, or transmigrants, establish sets of social relations across borders and maintain them over time, even across generations. Diaspora studies began by identifying narratives of identity legitimated by myths of common origin and global dispersal (Clifford 1994; Tölölyan 1991; the journal *Diaspora*). Globalization studies focus on the worldwide flow of capital, goods, and ideas.

DEFINING THE TERMS

Before going further, I will define my terms. The definitions I propose emerged from comparative ethnography that documented the existence of the phenomenon. *Transnational processes* can be defined as political, economic, social, and cultural processes that extend beyond the borders of a particular state and include actors that are not states but are shaped by the policies and institutional practices of particular states (Glick Schiller and Fouron 1998, 1999; Mato 1997).[2] These processes are much broader than migration and include flows of goods, information, and political influence. In contrast to transnational processes, *global processes* affect the earth's inhabitants, wherever they may reside. These processes cannot be reduced to specific networks of connection across the borders of specific states. They vary greatly, affecting cultural and biological processes and their interface and shaping our environments, as well as our relationships to our physical and cultural environments and to one another. Global processes include cultural transmission such as media messages via satellite television or the Internet, environmental changes caused by increased emission of gasses into the atmosphere, and the dissemination of ideologies, from neo-liberalism to religious fundamentalism. At different times in the past 500 years, the intensity of global processes has varied. The term *globalization* is most useful as a way to speak about the periods

of intensified integration of the world through systems of production, distribution, consumption, and communication (Mittleman 1996).

In our initial work, my colleagues and I spoke about transnationalism to emphasize the qualitative changes brought about when migrants develop a multiplicity of transnational relations. We argued that migration can be conceptualized as transnationalism when migrants develop and maintain multiple relations—familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political—that span borders (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994a; Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992b and c, 1995). Transnationalism is fully developed only when people establish transnational relationships and interact with persons other than kin, but kin ties are often the foundation for myriad types of non-kin social relationships.

The term *transnationalism* proved problematic, however. There are many forms of transnational processes beyond migration, and migrants themselves participate in a range of transnational processes and connections. Moreover, migrants may engage in multiple, ongoing connections across borders without engaging in political activities that link them to the nation-state.

Distinguishing transmigrants from migrants who have very different experiences of connection and incorporation has proven useful. *Transmigrants* are those persons who, having migrated from one nation-state to another, live their lives across borders, participating simultaneously in social relations that embed them in more than one nation-state. Activities and identity claims in the political domain are a particular form of transmigrant activity that is best understood as *long-distance nationalism* (Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001a). In some cases, individuals maintain hometown ties but avoid a connection with any form of a nation-state–building process, although states are increasingly striving to encompass such relationships (Kearney 2000).

Some writers have taken up the term *transnationalism* for both transnational migration, which they term *transnationalism from below,* and the cross-border activities of states and multinational corporations, which they label *transnationalism from above* (Smith and Guarnizo 1998). Again, the attempt at clarity has opened another set of problems and debates. *Transnationalism from below* is often used to signal transmigrant practices that constitute a transgressive or grassroots type of transna-

tional connection. In actuality, migrants represent a wide range of classes and political and economic interests. Many transmigrants work to maintain existing systems of power. Even poor migrants may support or participate in struggles against oppressive circumstances in one location while being committed to status hierarchies and systems of exploitation in another (Goldring 1998).

Whatever terms are adopted, the decade of discussion has made the following four points clear. First, not all persons who migrate become embedded in more than one location. Some are truly immigrants, cutting their ties and refusing to look behind them. Others are sojourners, who circulate, earning money or temporary political protection outside a homeland. They maintain transnational networks but do not become simultaneously incorporated in two or more nation-states (Diminescu 2002; Morokvasic 1996). Second, people may be incorporated in both the old land and the new and may publicly identify with only one of these locations. That is, a gap can exist between incorporative behavior and a conscious political project. The degree to which a person who has emigrated maintains transnational connections or becomes embedded in more than one location varies over time. Third, migrants can participate in transnational political networks that evoke a homeland without maintaining political relationships to that homeland. Often, it is only when people become well embedded in their new land that they participate in transnational political connections to the old one and become long-distance nationalists.

Fourth, certain identity processes of migrants are global instead of transnational. For example, people who live in disparate parts of the world and imagine themselves as a single, diasporic people who share a common history but do not maintain any form of social networks that connect them to one another or to a specific homeland state are engaged in a global, not transnational, process of identity construction. A diasporic consciousness that develops after movement and oppressive conditions, such as the aftermath of seventeenth-to-nineteenth century African slavery, can create potent imaginaries that motivate political action and personal self-presentation. Some members of a population who share a diasporic identity not focused on a homeland, in particular conditions, may become involved in a specific project of transnational nation-state building. This describes the transformation

of much of US Jewish life during the development of the Zionist movement and the growth of the state of Israel. Some members of the African diaspora may become committed to building a particular African state. On the other hand, other members of the same population, who maintain a diasporic identity and see themselves as part of a global population, may never engage in specific transnational processes linked to that identity. They neither build transnational networks nor participate in any form of transnational connection to a particular homeland. For example, I maintain a Jewish identity, built on a sense of common history, but do not personally participate in transnational networks that connect me to Israel or to people organized around a Jewish identity in other states.[3]

To facilitate the conceptualization and analysis of the multiple transborder relationships within which transmigrants live their daily lives, my colleagues and I suggested the term *transnational social field* (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994a; Glick Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992b and c). (Rouse [1991, 1992] preferred the term *circuit.*) *Social field* is a more encompassing term than *social network.* Networks are generally understood to be chains of social relationships that extend from a single individual. Network analysis is egocentric; it directs our attention to the density and types of relationships of a specific individual. In contrast, the analysis of *social field* is sociocentric. We focus on alterations in social actions, ideas, and values as people are linked together by means of multiple interlocking networks (Glick Schiller 1999a). The concept of a social field enables us to visualize the simultaneity of transmigrant connections across the borders of two or more states. We investigate the ways in which transmigrants become part of the fabric of daily life in more than one state, simultaneously participating in the social, cultural, economic, religious, or political activities of more than one locality (Fouron and Glick Schiller 1997; Glick Schiller and Fouron 1998, 1999).

Transnational social fields are not metaphoric references to altered experiences of space; they comprise observable social relationships and transactions. Multiple actors with very different kinds of power and locations of power interact across borders to create and sustain this field of relationships. Persons who live within transnational social fields are exposed to a set of social expectations, cultural values, and patterns

of human interaction shaped by more than one social, economic, and political system. Noting that the multistranded social networks make up a transnational social field enables us to distinguish between transmigrants, who have direct personal networks that stretch across borders, and those who live within social relationships shaped by transnational connections but do not, themselves, maintain such connections.

In the effort to popularize the concept of transborder social connection, many researchers turned to the term *transnational community*. The term is user-friendly but also poses difficulties. First, various researchers use *transnational community* to describe very different kinds of social formations. Portes (1997:812) refers to transnational communities as "dense networks across political borders created by immigrants in their quest for economic advancement and social recognition." Vertovec (n.d.) argues that a transnational community is a collectivity that lies between networks of individual actors, or transnationalism from below, and the cross-border activities of states, or transnationalism from above. Faist (2000a:196) has categorized the transnational community as one form of "transnational space," using the term to encompass various instances of connection through "collective representations." In his approach, the same term applies to the transnational village described by Levitt (2001a and b), linked by ongoing forms of observable connections, and the Jewish diaspora, an ideological construction of collectivity.

After several decades of community studies in which the community was approached as both object and sample, many anthropologists concluded that the term *community* obscures more than illuminates, confounding ideology with sociality and impeding the analysis of political and economic power (Silverman 2002). (The concept of community as object and sample comes from Conrad Arensberg [1965].) Rather than describe a location or local political unit, the word *community* evokes an ideology of shared interests. The term *community* leaves unmarked the exploitative class relations and divisions of wealth and status that stratify a population. It also obscures the various links between the state and community elites that enable these elites to constitute and maintain their exploitative relations within the "community." By deploying the term *transnational community* to encompass all

studies of transnational social fields, researchers begin with an assumption of commonality before it has been demonstrated through research. A transnational social field does not necessarily constitute a community. Certainly, some people who maintain transborder relations invoke an ideology of community, and in those instances it makes sense to use the term and investigate the reasons for this invocation of solidarity.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL ISSUES—THEORY, METHOD, CONCEPTS, QUESTIONS

As the study of transnational migration matured, debate on questions of theory and method commenced. Survey researchers and social researchers trained to dismiss ethnography as "vignettes" ignored, misunderstood, or even derided the developing study and theory building of the initial research on transnational migration (Kivisto 2001). Portes, Guarnizo, and Landholt (1999:218–219) state that "it is not enough to invoke anecdotes of some immigrants investing in businesses back home or some governments giving their expatriates the right to vote in national elections to justify a new field of study." They insist that the study of transnational migration is legitimate only if evidence exists that "significant proportions of persons are involved in the process and that the process persists over time." The implication of these statements is that ethnographic research has not provided and cannot provide these forms of empirical evidence. Underneath the dismissal of ethnographic data as anecdote are significant differences in epistemology and notions of the way theory is developed and tested.

Addressing methodology, Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller (2002:2) state that "the main difficulty with the field of transnationalism, as developed so far, is that its empirical base relies almost exclusively on case studies. While useful, these studies invariably sample on the dependent variables, focusing on those who take part in the activities of interest to the exclusion of those who do not take part in them. The result is to exaggerate the scope of the phenomenon by giving the false impression that everyone in the studied communities is becoming a transnational."

In point of fact, most ethnographic studies of migration have not been studies only of transmigrants. They have been case studies, but

case studies of migrating populations that included, but were not limited to, transmigrants and their social fields. The difference between ethnographic and survey approaches to transnational migration is not an exclusive focus on "the dependent variable" but a distinctively different idea about how to build and test theory and about what migration theory is trying to explain. The choice of the dependent variable reflects the question under investigation. Ethnographers and survey researchers studying transnational migration have approached the topic of migrations with a different set of questions from that of many other survey researchers.

There are three domains of difference between ethnographic and survey approaches to the study of transnational migration: (1) theory and hypothesis testing, (2) the influence of methodological nationalism in defining the questions studied, and (3) the nature of data.

Theory and Hypothesis Testing

The distinctions between ethnographic and social survey methodologies are often falsely reduced to the difference between qualitative and quantitative research. As Schensel, Schensel, and LeCompte (1999) point out, this contrast distorts and conceals that which distinguishes ethnography from other research methods, a characteristic highlighted by the way in which ethnographers approach the study of transnational migration. In fact, many ethnographers conduct surveys and obtain and use a variety of quantitative data. Some survey researchers conduct ethnography before they conduct a survey. However, ethnographers and survey researchers differ in their understanding of the relationships between theory and data collection. The differences are so fundamental in the area of theory building that survey researchers often believe that ethnographers can merely suggest interesting lines of inquiry; they cannot produce verifiable data.

Most ethnographers and survey researchers would accept the definition of theory offered by Stephen Reyna, an anthropologist and the founder of the journal *Anthropological Theory*. Reyna sees theory as generalizations that are high in scope and abstraction and that state relationships between concepts so as to explain observed occurrences (Reyna 1994, 2002; see also Wallace 1971). Ethnographers rarely utilize grand theory, but they do deploy what Merton (1968) termed "middle-level theory," beginning their research with a formulation of relationships between variables, based on past research and reading. (However, high-level abstractions such as those about the nature of power and the power of culture are certainly within the domain of anthropology [Reyna 2002].) This use of theory, sometimes called "formative theory" or "grounded theory," was explicated by the Manchester school ethnographers, such as Jahn Van Velsen (1967), who developed the extended case-study method. More recently, Michael Burawoy (1991a and b, 1998), a sociologist, has championed this approach.

Formative theory connects "concepts that can explain what causes, predicts, or is associated with a central problem or topic under investigation" (Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte 1999:2). It "helps to organize observations and interviews into units, patterns and structures, attributing meaning to otherwise disconnected social facts" (Schensul, Schensul, and LeCompte 1992:2).

In their use of formative theory, ethnographers do not differ from other empirically oriented social scientists.[4] The differences arise in the ways and means of building and testing theory. In ethnography, systematic explanations of the relations between variables are constantly explored and reformulated in the course of research. The formative theory of ethnographers not only builds on previous observations and generates hypotheses from them but also produces new hypotheses from within ongoing observations. Those who deploy social surveys and test theory from a statistical sampling of a database generally operate with a model of science that proposes that deductively inferred hypotheses must be generated before a study begins. Data collection then verifies or fails to confirm the initial hypothesis. Ethnographers, too, generate hypotheses, but during the research, they continually question, explore, and reformulate their understanding of the relationship between variables and even the choice of variables. This process enables ethnographers to change research questions as new situations, not expected within the initial set of assumptions, present themselves. To social scientists who limit hypothesis testing to the statistical manipulation of variables, ethnography is not science, at least not good science.

For example, the initial research I used to describe Haitian transnational migration had been formulated to study the forces that

shape ethnogenesis among Haitian immigrants in New York and various migration histories and patterns of incorporation in the Caribbean. It was not a case study of the transnational migration, and the dependent variable was Haitian/United States–based ethnicity (Glick Schiller et al. 1987). However, in the course of this research, it became clear to me that a variety of migrants were building and maintaining transnational social fields and beginning to articulate identities that reflected this form of social location (Glick Schiller and Fouron 1990). When I was able to conceptualize transnational migration, I altered the direction of my subsequent research and analysis, which contributed to a new theoretical perspective. The new theoretical perspective on migration was then taken up by a range of scholars who further theorized the conditions that lead migrants to develop social, political, economic, and religious networks extending between nation-states (Goldring 1998; Mahler 1998; Smith and Guarnizo 1998). In short, a theory of transnational migration was developed and tested by ethnographers within the course of ethnographic research. Its utility stands apart from and does not require statistical verification. Portes, Haller, and Guarnizo (2002:278) have claimed that ethnography can provide only "a few descriptive examples and their possible determinants" but social surveys can validate the theoretical claim of the significance of transnational migration. Such a stance reduces all ethnographic research to the status of exploratory and denies its capability to develop and substantiate theory.

The Influence of Methodological Nationalism

Ethnographers of transnational processes have questioned the fundamental assumption of mainstream social sciences and the humanities that the nation-state is the natural unit of analysis (Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994a; Kearney 1991; Rouse 1991). By calling for an "unbounding" of social science, we have challenged established theories of immigrant incorporation. Discarding prevailing theories of modernization and assimilation, we have linked changes in the world economy to changes in patterns of migrant incorporation and have called on researchers to envision social relations that stretch across national borders and boundaries. Andreas Wimmer and I (2002a and b) have proposed the term *methodological nationalism* to

critique the nation-state bias of mainstream academics and their tendency to identify with the interests of their own nation-state. We define *methodological nationalism* as "the assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world" (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2001a:301). We have argued that nation-state–building processes have fundamentally shaped the ways immigrations have been perceived and received. In turn, these perceptions have influenced (but not completely determined) social science theory and methodology and, more specifically, its discourse on immigration and integration.

Influenced by methodological nationalism, sociological theories of migration have generally sought to explain why various populations migrate and the subsequent degree and rate of assimilation into a new nation-state (Alba and Nee 1999; Morawska 2001a). Sociological theorists began with a classic push-pull theory, positing that certain factors within a sending society push individuals to migrate and another, discrete set of factors within a receiving society impel individuals to move and settle in a new home. Subsequent theorists critiqued this approach from a variety of perspectives. Reconciling competing explanations, D. S. Massey has recently spoken of the multiple determinants of migration, including various kinds of economic micro-level decision models, world systems theory, social capital theory, and the theory of cumulative causation (D. S. Massey 1999). Despite their apparent differences, both the initial theory and Massey's approach share the basic, generally unstated assumption that people normally and naturally stay in one place. They assume that stasis is both the ordinary and the desired human condition. In this perspective, the migrant exists outside the norm, in a liminal state, and assimilation into the new society is natural and desirable.

Rejecting the foundational notion of stasis that pervades much of sociological theory and leads down the path of methodological nationalism, many ethnographers of migration have generated a different set of questions, building on the work of several generations of anthropologists who have studied migration. Anthropologists have played a key role in these developments because, since the very beginning of the discipline, anthropologists have studied the physical and cultural implications of the movement of populations and the flow of ideas and

material objects (Boas 1940; Kroeber 1944; Lowie 1937; Schapera 1947). This anthropological acceptance of contact and diffusion as a norm through human history is perhaps linked to the disciplinary interest in the migration histories that mark the emergence of the human species and the development of systems of signification.

The twentieth-century diffusionist school of anthropology read the entire history of cultures as one of migration (Perry 1923; Smith 1933). The diffusionists are often used as a model of theory gone awry. If their writings are remembered at all, it is to provide a striking example of how European scholars tried every possible means of dismissing indigenous creativity all around the world. However, Boas, Lesser, Kroeber, and many other US anthropologists also worked with diffusionist theories. Within this early anthropology are useful insights on which the scholars who developed the transnational perspective in anthropology built. Deploying a global vantage point, the diffusionists did not naturalize the borders of the nation-state. They neither used a particular state as their unit of analysis nor equated the borders of the nation-state with the boundaries of society, economy, or culture. Their work reminds us that the sanctity of borders and boundaries is recent in human history and anthropological theory (Moch 1992).

With the demise of all forms of diffusionist theory by the 1950s, most social scientists retreated into a social science bounded not only by the territorial borders of a single nation-state but also by an identification with the nation-building project of that state. Modernization theory, developed during the Cold War, contrasted a premodern, unchanging, traditional world to modern industrial society, positing that the modern era was one in which all societies would shed their local cultural differences and archaic, authoritarian political systems as they became economically more developed and stepped into the modern world (Apter 1965; Rostow 1960). The modern world was made up of stable, discrete nation-states. In this framework, nation-states were increasingly normalized as the natural outcome of economic development within several variants of anthropology.

In the United States, some anthropologists championed community studies that approached communities as if each stood as a fixed social order within a folk-urban continuum (Redfield 1955, 1967). The community study method failed to examine the ways in which the community studied was shaped by colonialism and by a larger political structure that enforced intensive exploitation and imposed and maintained unequal political and social relationships. British social anthropologists developed structural-functional approaches to what they called "tribes," thereby positing stasis within discrete and unrelated societies.

To a certain extent, the ethnographies of transnational migration were written in opposition to the stasis theorists in sociology and anthropology. Even before the beginning of transnational migration studies, many ethnographers began their study of migration with a different set of questions. We were influenced not only by the strengths of diffusionist theory but also by Max Gluckman, the Rhodes-Livingston studies, and the Manchester school. These earlier researchers documented persisting ties of kinship within African urban life and the networks of connection that migrants maintained with their tribal identities and rural areas of origin. They asked not what causes migration but rather why people maintain or construct home ties when they migrate. What motivates people to live their lives so that they can be simultaneously rural and urban, townsmen and tribesmen, or "traditional" and "modern" (Mayer 1961)? Using ethnographic studies and social anthropology, these scholars developed network studies, situational analysis, the extended case-study method, and other process approaches to complex societies and colonial relationships (Barnes 1954, 1969; Epstein 1958, 1967, 1969; Gluckman 1958, 1967; Mitchell 1956, 1969; Turner 1957). Studies of Puerto Rican migration and rural-urban migration in Latin America were also important in initiating an ethnography of migration. They, too, had a history and trajectory situated outside the assimilationist and modernization framework (Lewis 1966; Padilla 1958; Roberts 1978).

Beginning in the 1970s, scholars of migration—primarily, but not exclusively, anthropologists who built on concepts of networks and kinship—began to document continuing transnational connections (Eades 1987; Gonzalez 1988; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Kearney 1986). However, until the 1990s, no widely accepted terminology was available to foreground and theorize transnational ties. When an anthropological theory of transnational migration did emerge, it developed directly from the ethnographic evidence.[5]

Ethnography versus Social Survey—The Nature of Data

Many researchers who rely on survey methods define ethnographic observations as anecdote. It is true that anthropologists sometimes begin an academic article with a vignette from their personal observations. Such portraits of social relations are not equivalent to journalistic observation. They represent examples of patterned, frequently observed behaviors and are selected because of their typicality. Anthropologists ascertain typicality of behavior not on the basis of a delimited set of self-reported frequencies of particular behavior but from their ongoing observations, over time and within a range of contexts, of what people do, differentiated from what they say that they do. Anyone who has responded to a survey questionnaire immediately realizes how the predefined choices shape and distort one's responses and how, after the fact, one remembers other aspects of one's behavior. There is also behavior one prefers not to report or that one does not consider relevant.

Like all social scientists, ethnographers impose categories as they observe and record data. However, these categories are constantly tested in the field, and, increasingly, field data are also contextualized by the writer, who identifies her or his own social positioning so that the reader can take these particular biases into account. Evidence provided on the basis of a survey done without corroborating participant observation is emic data. It is a respondent's self-presentation and cannot be equated with observed behavior. As Marvin Harris pointed out, it is methodologically important to distinguish between emic and etic observations and, for good ethnography, to include both forms of data. "Emic operations have as their hallmark the elevation of the native informant to the status of the ultimate judge of the adequacy of the observer's descriptions and analyses. Etic operations have as their hallmark the elevation of the observer to the status of ultimate judge" (Harris 1979:33). The ethnographer must have a sense of daily activities based on observation, as well as self-reported descriptions.

Consistent and sometimes very important differences exist between observed behavior and verbal reports. This is why participant observation is an essential part of ethnography, although ethnography cannot rely only on participant observation and must include ethnographic interviews and surveys. Observation is also part of an ethnographic interview, and the ethnographer records in field notes not only what the respondent says but also all the interactions observed in the course of the interview.

These points are particularly important in the study of transnational migration. There are many reasons for the discrepancies between self-reported responses and the actual behavior of migrants who maintain various forms of transnational connections. Some are political. For example, persons who seek or are granted political asylum on the grounds that they can no longer safely reside in their homeland may report that they have little or no contact with those left behind. Acknowledgment of an ongoing homeland connection could undercut their political claim or persona. In these situations, even family ties may not be discussed, and questions about transnational kinship become political questions. Such connections become apparent to an ethnographer who observes and sometimes helps facilitate telephone calls, the purchase of calling cards for the home country, and the sending of various kinds of remittances.

People engaged in political activities organized to change the political situation in a homeland may not report their activities if these are defined as subversive either at home or abroad. Transnational economic activities may not be acknowledged because people involved in the informal economy or even with formal businesses may use kinship networks to restock their business, avoiding taxes and bureaucracies. Transnational religious activities may not be acknowledged when the religion in question has become politically suspect, as in the case of Islam since the United States and the European Union declared a global war on terrorism. Haitian practitioners of Haitian and other Afro-Caribbean or Afro-Brazilian religions, which differ from mainstream belief systems, may not readily disclose their transnational religious networks and practices to a survey interviewer who is a stranger. All these types of connections become apparent to the ethnographer.

In understanding and assessing the significance of transnational migration, it is important to remember that at particular times, migrants may speak of their expectation of returning home or emphasize their desire to settle in the new land. Their emphasis at any one time reflects an array of factors, including the current immigrant or refugee policies of the country of settlement, the current political

situation in the homeland, and a host of personal and economic motivations. The self-ascription of migrants as immigrants or temporary sojourners is important data, influencing what respondents choose to disclose about themselves in response to a questionnaire. However, these emic statements must be accompanied by data about the actual development and range of the respondents' transnational connections: familial, economic, religious, social, and political. Ethnography, because of its daily, long-term engagement within the social networks of immigrants, is well suited to discover whether and how specific individuals within a study population maintain multiple transnational connections over time.

The loss or misrepresentation of information is only one of the difficulties in studying transnational migration through survey research. Another is the inability of synchronic surveys to document social process. Providing a single snapshot of a response cannot tell us how an individual will respond over time and in a variety of situations. Multiple surveys over time allow for the possibility of ascertaining a pattern of response; at best, they turn a snapshot into a slide show. The representations never become a moving picture.

What is at stake in these methodological discussions becomes clearer when looking at how the various methods lead to different assessments of the significance of transnational migration. Using probability surveys of Colombian, Dominican, and Salvadoran immigrants in the United States that reduce the study of transnational migration to frequent economic transactions or direct participation in homeland political parties or hometown associations, Portes (2001:183) argues that "participation in transnational economic and political activities is exceptional." On the basis of this type of data, he concludes that there is "limited numerical involvement of immigrant groups in transnational activities" (Portes 2001:182). Transnational family connections are excluded from any measure of transnational connection as nothing new and therefore useless in accessing the importance of the contemporary phenomena of transnationalism. Itzigsohn et al. (1999) provide a broader definition by including occasional interactions reported in surveys and differentiating between broad and narrow transnationalism. Using this approach, Itzigsohn (2002) finds that 63 percent of Dominicans in New York and in Providence, Rhode Island, have

transnational connections. In general, however, those who seek to study transnational migration on the basis of survey data have found themselves arguing that transnational migration is significant despite its rarity.

Ethnographers see different things. We are able to watch as transnational family connections become the foundation for many other kinds of interconnection. By studying not only the actors who maintain transnational organized or economic activity but also the social field that includes persons who have networks to transmigrants but may not, themselves, maintain social relations across borders, ethnographers judge that the transnational connections of migrants and their descendants are widespread and significant.

When researchers accept the concept of a transnational field of social relations, they enter into a research domain that is best explored by ethnography. There are two interrelated reasons for this. First, economic, political, religious, familial, and personal transnational relationships may involve an array of interconnected actors. Second, when we acknowledge that the study of transnational migration includes examination of a specific kind of social field that we must trace within the same research frame, five sets of actors emerge: (1) circulating migrants within a transnational network who travel between their new land and homeland, (2) transmigrants who maintain multiple connections across borders and who may or may not travel, (3) immigrants and their descendants who may maintain only one or two types of transnational connections, such as family and friendship, (4) immigrants and their descendants who do not maintain their transnational connections but participate in networks with people who do maintain such ties, and (5) circulating migrants, transmigrants, and immigrants and their descendants who utilize various forms of media, including the Internet, to obtain information about the homeland and utilize this information in their day-to-day interactions and decision making.

Research into a transnational field extends into all the domains we understand to be social: reproduction, gender, socialization, economics, politics, religion, and identity. If we judge the significance of the phenomena of transnational migration on the basis of numerical assessments taken from surveys of the number of people who report one or even several specific, frequent kinds of transnational activity—

whether business transactions or formal membership in transnational political organizations—we miss the significance for public policy and for the development of a new way to theorize society, one not restricted by the boundaries of a nation-state.

THE SECOND WAVE

Within the past few years, a second wave of research on transnational migration has moved beyond the efforts to prove that a specific migrant experience we can call "transnational migration" exists, to ask a new series of questions. The second wave has also revisited the question of this form of migration's novelty. Because of ethnography's strengths in studies of transnational migration, anthropologists have much to offer. The second wave has begun to ask the following questions, which constitute a significant and exciting agenda for further research.

In what specific ways is the current period of transnational migration similar to and different from previous periods in which migrants constructed transnational social fields? As increasing numbers of scholars have turned their attention to the transnational connections of previous waves of migrants, it has become clear that a wealth of data are available about transnational migration between various regions of the world at the end of the nineteenth century and that many areas of similarity exist between past and present (Chan 1990; Ginel 1982; Lamphere 1987; Lesser 1999; Morawska 1987, 1989).[6] These data indicate that transnational migration becomes important in periods of intensive globalization. However, most analysts stress the novel aspects of the current transmigrant experience, despite the evidence of previous periods of transnational connection. They attribute this novelty to the new period of global capitalism, the effect of new technologies, or the interrelationship between a restructured global capitalism and the new technology (Foner 2002; Portes, Guarnizo, and Landholt 1999; Smith 1998). More detailed investigation is needed here, including investigation of the changing role of various states in the midst of globalization. Ethnography provides insights into the processes of everyday forms of state formation, which involve both simultaneous incorporation into the daily activities of a new society and continuing multiple connections with the incorporative practices of other states.

What are the relationships between transnational migration and poverty? We know that persons who migrate are rarely among the poorest or least educated of a society; a long-distance move requires certain economic, social, and cultural capital. However, we know much less about the effects of the burden of remittances on class formation in the old land and the new and on the life possibilities of migrants (Sider 1992). Remittances are widely acknowledged as a source of foreign exchange for many poor states, but systematic study of the role of migrants in sustaining the political and economic viability of the sending nation-states has just begun. We need to explore the role of remittances in sustaining families, localities, and whole nation-states as various forms of state services are withdrawn. Poverty studies, development studies, and transnational studies must be brought together to explore the effect of remittances on transmigrants and those they left behind (Conway, Bailey, and Ellis 2001; Fouron and Glick Schiller 2001a and b). Moreover, we must explore the relationship between deepening poverty in certain countries and localities and the inability of specific sets of actors to access transnational social fields. It is important to document that as communication technologies have grown, so have disparities of access to these technologies. Different regions of an emigrant-sending country, various classes, and men and women may have differential possibilities of establishing and maintaining transnational connections (Mahler 2001). By investigating the tensions and unities within networks over time and across space, we can explore the class tensions that develop within family networks and between actors within a single transnational social field.

What is the role of transmigrants in sustaining nationalist ideologies and nation-state–building projects within contemporary global capitalism? To what degree are transmigrants implicated in the contemporary resurrection of ideologies of blood, race, and nation as they participate in forms of long-distance nationalism? How is it possible for migrants to live as "flexible citizens" or to navigate a world still divided into nation-states of very different degrees of power (Ong 1999)? In *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Post Colonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*, my colleagues and I argued that "by living their lives across borders, transmigrants find themselves confronted with and engaged in the nation-building processes of two or more nation-states"

(Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994a:22). Second wave scholars of transnational migration have increasingly returned to this theme. They have provided further evidence that nation-states remain significant units of analysis in the study of transnational migration; migrants from certain states avoid contact with sending states, and migrants from other states participate in various kinds of home country politics (Tölölyan 2001). With this understanding, a scholarship of long-distance nationalism has begun.

The concept of long-distance nationalism, popularized by Anderson (1993, 1994) and increasingly employed by scholars of transnational migration, provides an analytical lens that brings into focus the ways in which transmigrants relate to their homeland and to different sectors of the homeland population. Skrbis (1999), describing the ideology and practices of Croatians in Australia, Fuglerud (1999), studying the connections of Tamils to the struggle in Sri Lanka, and Georges Fouron and I (2001), in our study of the Haitian ideology of blood and nation, have found this term useful and have documented the global significance of long-distance nationalism as a political ideology and set of practices. Long-distance nationalism links together people living in various geographic locations and motivates or justifies their taking action in relationship to an ancestral territory and its government. Through such linkages, a territory, its people, and its government can constitute a transnational nation-state.

We are seeing the flourishing of a politics in which ancestral identities are made central by diverse sets of actors, including emigrants of different classes, political refugees, leaders of homeland governments, and intellectuals (Ali-Ali, Black, and Koser 2001; England 1999; Klimt 2000). In past periods of extensive transnational migration, disparate actors also contributed to ideologies and practices of long-distance nationalism (Bodnar 1985; Glick Schiller 1999c; Wyman 1993). However, important new questions are raised by the current revitalization of long-distance nationalism during a period in which financial institutions, multinational corporations, and various forms of regional and global trade agreements transcend borders and state-specific regulations to a greater degree than ever before.

Citizenship and civil society became two hot topics among scholars at the turn of the twenty-first century, and some observers began to talk

about "postnational citizenship" (Soysal 1994) as if the allocation of citizenship was no longer linked to state power. In contrast, researchers of transnational migration began to explore the ways various sectors of transmigrants navigate issues of legal rights and identity as they live in more than one nation-state (Grahm 2001; Nyiri 1999). Approaching the topic from a very different angle, Karen Olwig (1997) has stressed that although people may leave home and live across borders, notions of home continue to be linked to the land left behind. Space and place can be locations of connection instead of representations of identity. Bill Maurer (1995) has looked at the ways, through concepts of blood and descent, even small, weak states may restrict access to citizenship among migrants from other countries while extending it to nationals living abroad.

How is gender constituted within transnational social fields, and how is it linked to the reconstitution of notions of family, race, and nation? In a special issue of *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, Patricia Pessar and Sarah Mahler address questions of the reconstitution of gender categories and the challenges to and reinforcement of gender hierarchies within transnational contexts, including transnational migration (Mahler and Pessar 2001; see also Kelherer 2000; Matsuoka and Sorenson 2000). Over the years, feminist scholarship has linked the personal to the political and explored the connections between the domestic domain and the public arena. The different and gendered strategies of men and women in migration are increasingly being explored (Grillo, Riccio, and Salih 2000; Hondagenu-Sotelo 1998, 1999). Recently, scholars have begun to examine the emotional toll paid by transmigrants when states, such as the Philippines, rely on the export of labor to the extent that, to support their children, women must leave home, construct transnational households, and raise their children from afar (Salazar-Parreñas 2001). Feminist analysis is also now examining the mutual constitution of nation and gender in transnational spaces as gender is lived by transmigrants embedded in two or more nation-states (Fouron and Glick Schiller 2001b). In Chapter 3 of this volume, Pessar takes the discussion further by linking gender to recent scholarship on the embodiment of race and nation.

Do forms of transnational connection continue across generations, extending our concepts of transnational migration and family? A concept of

transnational social fields leads to a re-evaluation of the concepts of the second generation and of family in migration. When transnational social fields are established, kin relations and children who live within such fields are reshaped by that experience. Children in such social fields become a transnational second generation. Much research is yet to be done about the children socialized within transnational social fields. A growing body of research on the second generation in the United States reveals that youths may choose between several identity options: rejection of the identity embraced by their parents, a hyphenated identity, and identification only with their homeland (Waters 1999; see also Levitt and Waters 2002). In Europe, social surveys of the children of migrants in England, France, and Germany indicate that the majority of youths in the sample identify with their parent's home country but most have multiple identities (Heckman 2001).

Ethnography is essential to explore the degrees to which these choices of members of the second generation reflect their experiences within the transnational social fields of their family and to explore the links between identity and transnational social relationships. We need to know whether the identities of members of this generation change as they age, marry, raise families, and move into a range of social and occupational settings, including transnational social fields established by their own generation. Georges Fouron and I (2001a) have hypothesized that young people who grow up within a transnational terrain develop a sense of self that has been shaped by personal, family, and organizational connections to people "back home." Participation in transnational social fields can link children of immigrants to broader processes that define them as a political constituency that can act on behalf of its "home country."

The question of transnational connections extending across generations and the topic of transnational family are just beginning to come together in an important new area of scholarship (Chamberlain 2002). Researchers working on data about transnational migration to Europe have begun to theorize aspects of transnational migration through the lens of family dynamics. They speak of "frontiering" to emphasize "the crisscross and clash of cultural values that is ongoing within transnational families" (Bryceson and Vuorela 2002:13). Theirs is not a unilineal model of assimilation through generations but a dynamic view of a

complex cultural process of differentiation and belonging that takes place within the terrain of more than one nation-state.

What is the relationship between the transnational social field built by migrants and various forms of transnational religious networks, organizations, ideologies, and activities? Evidence of the transnational networks of migrants can be found in studies of Islam in Europe, the building of churches or temples in the homeland with funds from transmigrants abroad, and the support of Hindu nationalism by non-resident Indians in the United States (Carter 1997; Chan 1990; Lessinger 2003; Levitt 2001b; Yalçin-Heckmann 1997). Most studies of migration and religion have focused on the role of organizations. Recent work by Peggy Levitt explores the way migrants use religious organizations to maintain transnational connections in complex relationships with various states and their nation-state–building projects. Much work is to be done to link the descriptions of religious networks to the growing body of research on other aspects of transnational social fields and to explore the belief systems and religious practices that develop within transnational social fields (van Dijk 2002).

RE-ENVISIONING OUR CONCEPT OF SOCIETY

Morawska (2001a) proposes a conceptualization of migration as "structuration" to posit the continuing dynamic between structure and agency that extends into a transnational domain. Faist (2000a and b), reasoning along similar lines, strives to conceptualize a domain of cross-border social relations that he glosses as "transnational social spaces" instead of societies. Both Guarnizo (1997b) and Landolt (2001) refer to a "transnational social formation." Much work remains to put aside the blinders of methodological nationalism and develop a concept of systematic and structured transnational social processes and relationships. The concept of social field enables us to envision how people can simultaneously be incorporated into two or more nation-states yet live within ongoing social relations that are not coterminous with any polity. Ethnographies of simultaneous migrant incorporation can provide the building blocks for a reformulation of our concept of society. In this reformulation, states remain significant as repositories of varying degrees of power but are not coterminous with the domain of social relations, which extends transnationally. The study of

transnational migration opens a pathway to differentiate between polity and society in ways that can advance social theory.

THE FUTURE—REINTEGRATING TRANSNATIONAL MIGRATION INTO TRANSNATIONAL STUDIES

Analytically, it is necessary to study transmigrants as a specific set of transnational actors and explore the nature and significance of the transnational fields they establish. However, too much research on transnational migration has stood apart from the work being done on other forms of transnational processes. Contemporary transnational migration exists in a context in which many people around the world watch the same televisions shows, are besieged by the same advertisements, long for the same commodities, and find their states penetrated and their dreams of a brighter future constrained, altered, and defaced by the same set of global corporations, financial institutions, and regulatory transnational agreements.

Transmigrants also participate in or confront a series of other transnational actors, including the personnel of corporations, nongovernment organizations, religious organizations, and social movements for global change. Since the 1970s, anthropologists and other social scientists have been writing about the global assembly line, the international division of labor turning an ethnographic eye to deindustrialized US cities, the entrance of women into the *maquedora* export processing industries of Mexico, the emerging free-trade zones in the Caribbean and Asia, and the effects of structural adjustment policies (Harrison 1997; Nash and Fernández Kelly 1983; Ong 1987; Rothstein and Blim 1992).

The world systems framework, which became so influential among anthropologists in the 1970s, served as a critique of modernization discourses but did not encourage analysts to examine global cultural processes, transnational connections, and migration. The time has come for scholars of transnational migration to document the intersection of a multiplicity of transnational processes.

In developing the study of transnational migration, ethnographers must continue to build on the methodological and theoretical strengths of past generations of anthropological studies of migration and homeland connections and learn from and contribute to transnational studies. We must not only develop the study of transnational migration but also place our research more centrally in the field of transnational studies and globalization, understanding that transnational migration is but one aspect of past and current moments of globalization. Studies of the continuing role of states and nationalism must be an important part of this scholarship, but we must move beyond methodological nationalism and neither naturalize the nation-state nor conflate its interests and projects with our own. Only then can the ethnographies of transnational migration enable us to reconceptualize society and think beyond the conceptual and political constraints of the current world order.

Notes

1. Note that in Europe, at about the same time, anthropologists such as Mirjana Morokvasic (1996) also began to speak of transnational migration, although without calling attention to a new paradigm.

2. The word *international* is generally used to refer to state-to-state relations. Another term that has recently received attention is *cosmopolitan*, which usually refers to persons who are global in their perspective, rejecting loyalty to any particular nation-state or region. They differ from internationalists. Although cosmopolitans may identify with global capitalists, internationalists historically have rejected their own nation-states to identify with a worldwide struggle of workers for economic and social justice.

3. I should note that I do live in a transnational social field that includes such networks. My father's mother's brother's children and their descendents settled in Israel and exchange email and visits with my father's sister and her children in the United States, who strongly identify with Israel. This definitely influences my identity and actions, although it has led me to repudiate Zionism (Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001).

4. This same point is imbedded in the challenge to mainstream historiography made by Thistlewaite (1964), who began a revisionist history of Atlantic migration (Gerstles 1999).

5. I should note that writing about transnational migration does not necessarily free analysts from identifying with the interests of a nation-state in their politics and social science. It is certainly possible to study transnational migration and continue to accept as normal and identify with the nation-state as the unit of

analysis, legitimating and reinforcing methodological nationalism (for example, see Kovisto 2001).

6. Immigrants in the previous stage of globalization, at the turn of the twentieth century, entered into politics in the United States motivated, at least in part, by the desire to support and strengthen the struggles or national welfare of their home country (Bodnar 1985; Kwong 1987:101). In Latin America, also an important area of migration settlement in the nineteenth- to early twentieth-century movement from Europe, there is a history of transnational connection that is only now beginning to be re-evaluated (for example, see Lesser 1999; Gonzalez 1992).

5

Becoming American

Immigration, Identity, Intergenerational Relations, and Academic Orientation

Alex Stepick and Carol Dutton Stepick

Henri was born in Haiti and migrated to the United States with his family before he started school. He is a 1.5 generation immigrant; that is, he immigrated at a young enough age to be enculturated primarily in his adopted country. A star student throughout high school, he graduated from Harvard University in 2000 and spent the following year working for Americorps, "to help his community." In 2002, Henri entered medical school. He has a brother now at Harvard and a brother who graduated from Northwestern University. His father is a janitor and his mother a domestic. The brothers attribute their success to their parents, who unfailingly pushed them to pursue academic excellence. Henri and his brothers personify the archetypal immigrant student, high achieving with a positive orientation toward education.

Marie, also a 1.5 generation Haitian immigrant, was a high school English Honors student and an excellent gospel singer. Marie appeared to embody the ideal immigrant adolescent profile, an outstanding student, close to her parents, and deeply involved in church activities. Then she showed signs of assimilation—she acquired an African American boyfriend. In her parents' eyes, a boyfriend, especially an