Interest in international migration in the social sciences has tended to ebb and flow with various waves of emigration and immigration. The United States is now well into the fourth great wave of immigration. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the immigrant population stands at a historic high of 36 million, representing 12.5 percent of the total population. As the foreign-born share of the U.S. population continues to rise, the number of second-generation Americans, the children of immigrants, also will increase. In 1995, first- and second-generation Americans accounted for 20 percent of the U.S. population, and this figure is projected to rise to one-third of the population by 2025. Europe has experienced a similar influx of foreigners that began, in some countries, as early as the 1940s. In 2005 the foreign-born population of Europe, including nationals of European Union (EU) member states and third-country nationals, stood at 8.8 percent of the population. The foreign-born constitute 12.3 percent of the German population, 10.7 percent of the French population, 14.1 percent of the Irish population, and 22.9 percent of the Swiss population, to take but a few examples. In Canada, the establishment in 1967 of a point system for entry based on skills and the reunion of families has not only increased the volume of immigrants but also diversified their places of origin. The same is true for Australia where 40 percent of population growth in the post–World War II period has been the result of immigration. With the abandonment in the 1960s of the White Australia Policy barring non-Euro-
pean settlers, Australia has become a multicultural nation (Castles and Vasta 2004), just as the United States became a more multicultural society in the wake of the 1965 Hart-Celler Act, which radically altered the composition of immigration, opening the door to Asians, Latin Americans, and immigrants from the four corners of the globe. Even Japan, a country that has long had a restrictionist immigration policy, began admitting foreign workers in the 1980s (Cornelius and Tsuda 2004). Finally, the movement of large populations throughout the developing world, such as refugees in Africa or “guest workers” in Asia and the Persian Gulf states, led some analysts to speak of a global migration crisis (Weiner 1995).

Whether and where there might be a migration crisis remains an open question. But clearly we are living in an age of migration (Castles and Miller 2003). Scholars in all of the social sciences have turned their attention to the study of this extraordinarily complex phenomenon. Yet, despite the volume of research interest in a host of academic fields, when members of the various disciplines meet, it is, as Silvia Pedraza (1990:44) cleverly remarked, in much the same fashion as when “one sometimes arrives at a party and is . . . surprised to find out who else is there.” It seems that only rarely do we talk across the disciplines. Douglas Massey and his colleagues (1994:700–1) state the problem in succinct terms: “Social scientists do not approach the study of immigration from a shared paradigm, but from a variety of competing theoretical viewpoints fragmented across disciplines, regions, and ideologies. As a result, research on the subject tends to be narrow, often inefficient, and characterized by duplication, miscommunication, reinvention, and bickering about fundamentals and terminology. Only when researchers accept common theories, concepts, tools, and standards will knowledge begin to accumulate.” Jan and Leo Lucassen (1997) argue that the deepest disciplinary canyon is between historians on the one hand, and social scientists on the other. A canyon almost as deep separates those social scientists who take a top-down “macro” approach, focusing on immigration policy or market forces, from those whose approach is bottom-up, emphasizing the experiences of the individual migrant or the immigrant family. It may be too much to hope for a unified theory of migration—one that encompasses all possible motives for moving or all possible results of that movement—but unless we begin the process of dialogue across the disciplines, social scientists will be doomed to their narrow fields of inquiry and the dangers of constantly reinventing wheels will increase.

This book therefore represents an effort to bridge these canyons, particularly with respect to theorizing about international migration. Here, we have brought together in a single volume essays by a historian, a demographer, an economist, two sociologists, an anthropologist, a geographer, a political scientist, and a legal scholar. Each was asked to assess and analyze the central concepts, questions, and theoretical perspectives pertaining to the study of migration in his or her respective discipline and in the intersection between disciplines.
ask who moves, when do they move? Why do some people stay put? How do those who move experience departure, migration, and settlement, rather than to a comparison across groups, an effort that would require, as Diner suggests, vast linguistic competence. In history, it is the narrative of various groups settled, shaped their communities, and constructed their identities that has taken precedence over the analysis of the migration process. Questions in the anthropological study of migration are framed by the assumption that outcomes for people who move are shaped by their social, cultural, and gendered locations and that migrants themselves are agents in their behavior, interpreting and constructing within the constraints of structure. Geographers are primarily interested in spatial relationships. In migration research their attention is therefore directed, as Hardwick (this volume) points out, to studying the relationship between employment patterns and residential patterns, the formation and development of ethnic enclaves, and the changing segregation patterns of various ethnic and racial groups. Geographers, like anthropologists, explore the transnational and diasporic dimensions of migration, as well as the role of social networks in connecting populations and individuals across space, but as Hardwick observes, geographers put space–time relationships at the center of their theorizing about transnationalism, diasporas, and networks. Space and place are also central to the geographical recasting of assimilation theory. Finally, even in the study of race and whiteness, geographers ask how time and place influence the way in which race is constructed.

For sociology, as Heisler (this volume, Chapter 4) emphasizes, the central questions are: Why does migration occur, and how is it sustained over time? Sociologists share a common theoretical framework with anthropologists. Both are grounded in the classic works of social theory (Marx, Durkheim, and Weber), and each tends to emphasize social relations as central to understanding the processes of migration and immigrant incorporation. However, sociologists have worked primarily in the receiving society with a few notable exceptions (see the works of Douglas Massey on Mexico, for example), while anthropologists have often worked at the sending, receiving, or at both ends. The difference is a result of the historical origins of these two disciplines—sociology in the study of Western institutions and society, anthropology in the study of “the other.” Anthropology “came lately” to the study of migration and immigration, but in sociology it has been a topic of long-standing interest. Sociological questions are generally also outcomes questions. Although many sociologists are interested in the causes of migration, the discipline places great emphasis on the process of immigrant incorporation.

### TABLE 1.1: MIGRATION THEORIES ACROSS DISCIPLINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Research Question(s)</th>
<th>Levels/Units of Analysis</th>
<th>Dominant Theories</th>
<th>Social Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>How does migration affect cultural change and affect ethnic identity?</td>
<td>Micro/individuals, households, groups</td>
<td>Relational or structuralist and transnational</td>
<td>Social networks help maintain cultural difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>How does migration affect population change?</td>
<td>Macro/populations</td>
<td>Rationalist (borrows heavily from economics)</td>
<td>Migration has a major impact on size, but a small impact on age structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>What explains the propensity to migrate and its effects?</td>
<td>Micro/individuals</td>
<td>Rationalist: cost–benefit and utility-maximizing behavior</td>
<td>Incorporation varies with the level of human capital of immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>What explains the spatial patterns of migration?</td>
<td>Macro, meso, and micro/individuals, households, and groups</td>
<td>Relational, structural, and transnational</td>
<td>Incorporation depends on ethnic networks and residential patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How do we understand the immigrant experience?</td>
<td>Micro/individuals and groups</td>
<td>Eschews theory and hypothesis testing</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>How does the law influence migration?</td>
<td>Macro and micro/ the political and legal system</td>
<td>Institutionalist and rationalist (borrows from all the social sciences)</td>
<td>Rights create incentive structures for migration and incorporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Why do states have difficulty controlling migration?</td>
<td>More macro/ political and international systems</td>
<td>Institutionalist and rationalist</td>
<td>States are often captured by pro-immigrant interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>What explains incorporation and exclusion?</td>
<td>Macro/ethnic groups and social class</td>
<td>Structuralist or institutionalist</td>
<td>Incorporation varies with social and human capital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

argued that anthropologists never formulate theories divorced from context, this is not necessarily the case. While context is generally very important to anthropologists, some theorizing moves away from it. Anthropologists who study migration are interested in more than the who, when, and why; they want to capture through their ethnography the experience of being an immigrant and the meaning, to the migrants themselves, of the social and cultural changes that result from leaving one context and entering another. BretteIl (in this volume, Chapter 5) notes that this has led anthropologists to explore the impact of emigration and immigration on the social relations between men and women, among kin, and among people from the same cultural or ethnic background. Questions in the anthropological study of migration are framed by the assumption that outcomes for people who move are shaped by their social, cultural, and gendered locations and that migrants themselves are agents in their behavior, interpreting and constructing within the constraints of structure.
Sociological theory has moved from postulating a single outcome (assimilation) to manifold outcomes that depend on such factors as social capital, labor markets, and a range of institutional structures. Heisler points to the significance of sociological research on the ethnic enclave economy and ethnic entrepreneurship. While anthropologists have emphasized the cultural construction and symbolic markers of ethnic identity, sociologists have emphasized the institutional manifestations of ethnic difference (Light 2006). Both are equally important, but they reflect a difference in disciplinary epistemologies, and hence in how questions are framed. However, there is also a good deal of interchange and cross-reading between these two disciplines. One area where scholars in both fields come together is in their study of the social relations of migration—specifically an assumption about the importance of social networks as both a causal and sustaining factor influencing the migration process.

The central question for demographers is the nature of population change. Births, deaths, and migration are the major components of population change. Drawing largely on aggregate data, they document the pattern and direction of migration flows and the characteristics of migrants (age, sex, occupation, education, and so forth). Teitelbaum in this volume (Chapter 2) makes a key distinction between formal demography, which is highly mathematical and theoretical, and social demography, which borrows freely from other social science disciplines and is more eclectic. Teitelbaum stresses that demographers do not shun theory and explanation; however, migration is only one factor in population change—fertility and mortality are the other two, and they have received far more attention from formal demographers than migration because migration, as Teitelbaum points out, is “rather messy.” It is difficult, he suggests, to capture in a parsimonious way the “realities and complexities inherent in the patterns of international migration.” Thus, demographers by necessity have bridged the canyons between the disciplines, and Teitelbaum, echoing Hollifield’s analysis of the politics of migration, draws our attention to the key role of the state in shaping migration flows. Demographers are as interested as historians, anthropologists, and sociologists in the questions of who moves and when, but to answer these questions, they engage in the construction of predictive models. Demographers can and do project the future. Historians, anthropologists, and sociologists, by contrast, focus on actual behavior of individuals and groups in the past or in the present.

Economists also build predictive models. Chiswick’s chapter in this volume offers an excellent example of the methodology of economics. Using the utility maximizing framework of microeconomics, he addresses the question of “who migrates.” He focuses specifically on a central debate within economics: under what conditions will the most favorable (in human capital terms and for labor market success) individuals migrate? Chiswick develops models that predict more or less positive selectivity under various conditions. This is a supply-side theory, rather than an outcomes theory, and it reflects the broader assumption that frames much of the research on migration within the discipline of economics—that individuals act rationally to maximize their utility (Sjaastad 1962; Straubhaar 1988). Economists call this the microeconomic model of individual choice.

Anthropologists and historians argue that economic factors cannot and do not fully predict population movement when they are divorced from social and cultural context. Anthropologists in particular reject a universal rationality. Furthermore, anthropologists and historians are reluctant, if not averse, to framing questions in relation to evaluations of positive and negative inputs or outcomes. But economists (and economic demographers) are often called upon (by those who formulate policy) to assess the fiscal and human capital costs and benefits of immigration in precisely these evaluative terms. It therefore shapes many of the theoretical debates in their discipline (Borjas 1999; Huber and Espenshade 1997; Rothman and Espenshade 1992), not to mention broader debates about immigration policy. For example, in earlier work using data from the 1970 census, Chiswick (1978) addressed the economic assimilation rate of immigrants. He demonstrated that although immigrants start with earnings that are approximately 17 percent below those of natives, after 10 to 15 years of employment in the United States, they tend to surpass the average wage level and subsequently rise above it. This conclusion was challenged on the basis of 1980 census data by George Borjas (1985), but Borjas’s work in turn has been challenged by Chiswick (1986) and others (Duleep and Regets 1997a, 1997b) using data from multiple censuses. Economists and demographers have also explored the educational, welfare, and social security costs of immigrants (Passel 1994; Simon 1984), thereby responding to national debates that erupt periodically in the political arena. Americans in particular are concerned about the costs and benefits of immigration and want to harness the social sciences, especially economics, to shape and inform policy debates (National Research Council 1997; Hanson 2005). Europeans are also concerned about the macroeconomic impact of immigration, but most European states and governments are preoccupied with perceived crises of integration and with the effects of immigration on the welfare state (Favell 1998; Bommes and Geddes 2000).

Chiswick’s chapter in this volume ends with a discussion of the way that immigration laws and regulations (the demand side for immigrants) shape selectivity factors. A country that emphasizes skills as the primary criterion upon which to issue visas will experience a different pattern in the growth and composition of its immigrant population from that of a country that constructs a policy based on family reunification or refugee status. It is with attention to these questions that political scientists and legal scholars have entered as relative newcomers the arena of migration research.
As Hollifield emphasizes in his chapter, the questions for scholars of immigration within political science follow three themes. One is the role of the nation-state in controlling migration flows and hence its borders; a second is the impact of migration on the institutions of sovereignty and citizenship, and the relationship between migration on the one hand, and foreign policy and national security on the other; a third is the question of incorporation, which raises a host of ethical, normative, and legal issues. Political science has paid attention to what sociologists and economists have written about social and economic incorporation and added to it the dimension of political incorporation—specifically questions of citizenship and rights, familiar themes for legal scholars as well (Schuck in this volume, Chapter 8). It is worth noting, however, that Diner discusses a particular historical monograph, Salyer’s Law Harsh as Tigers, which addresses similar issues for the Chinese who immigrated to the United States in the late nineteenth century. Salyer shows how these Chinese “sojourners” exercised their rights to challenge discriminatory laws. A more recent historical example is Gardner’s (2005) fascinating analysis of the impact of U.S. citizenship laws on immigrant women in particular.

Like sociologists, political scientists work largely at the receiving end, although one can find a few examples of those whose research has addressed emigration policy (rules of exit), rather than immigration policy (rules of entry), according to similar themes of control, but with a greater focus on development issues (Leeds 1984; Russell 1986; Weiner 1987, 1995). Whether they are looking at the sending or receiving societies, political scientists tend to be split theoretically. Some lean heavily toward a more interest-based, micro-economic (rational choice) approach to the study of migration (Freeman 1995, 1998; Kessler 1998), while others favor institutional, cultural, and ideational explanations for increases in immigration in the advanced industrial democracies (Hollifield 1992; Zolberg 1981). All agree, however, that it is important to understand how the state and public policy affect migration flows, or as Zolberg (2006) puts it, how nations are designed and shaped by immigration policy.

Both traditions of inquiry can be found in the study of law as well, with one group of scholars taking a more rationalist, microeconomic approach to understanding migration, and another group (for example, Schuck in this volume, Chapter 8; Legomsky 1987) focusing on institutions, process, and rights as the key variables for explaining outcomes. As Schuck points out, most legal scholars are skeptical of the possibility for developing a “science of law”; and they devote most of their efforts to the analysis and assessment of case law. But in his work, Schuck breaks with this atheoretical tradition as he attempts to explain how the law shapes the phenomenon of international migration, and how immigration in particular affects American political development. Schuck points to the difficulties of establishing a coherent regulatory regime for immigration and attempts to explain why there are such large gaps between immigration policy (the law on the books) and the implementation of policy (the law in action or in people’s minds). His analysis is reminiscent of similar work in political science (Cornelius, Martin, and Hollifield 1994; Freeman 1995; Hollifield 1986; Zolberg 2006), which seeks to explain the difficulties of immigration control in liberal democracies. The emphasis that Schuck places on the institution of rights as a key determinant of policy outcomes echoes work by political scientists and sociologists (Hollifield 1992; Jacobson 1996; Soysal 1994). Following the ideas of the sociologist Robert Merton, Schuck suggests that the failure of immigration law may actually serve some latent social function: it helps to finesse or cover up the profoundly ambiguous attitudes of the American public toward illegal immigration, which Schuck describes provocatively as a “victimless crime,” drawing on the work of lawyer-sociologist Robert Kagan (2001). In effect, Schuck argues that the law is extremely limited in what it can do to regulate international migration, and particularly illegal immigration, even though law plays a crucial role in constructing the “complex array of incentives that individuals and groups take into account in deciding whether, when, and where to migrate.” On the one hand, legal admissions largely determine the types of naturalized citizens; on the other, the enforcement of immigration law is often constrained by cost or by liberal and human rights ideologies. In the work of Schuck, we can see how the jurist’s approach to the study of migration differs from that of many social scientists and historians. Legal scholars are less concerned with theory building and hypothesis testing, and more inclined to use the eclectic techniques of analysis in social science to argue for specific types of policy reform. Equally, they draw on detailed understandings of institutional and practical realities (mostly costs) to debunk general theories.

LEVELS AND UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Objects of inquiry and theory building are closely related to the levels and units of analysis. In migration research, these vary both within and between disciplines. An initial contrast is between those who approach the problem at a macrolevel, examining the structural conditions (largely political, legal, and economic) that shape migration flows, and those who engage in microlevel research, examining how these larger forces shape the decisions and actions of individuals and families, or how they effect changes in communities. World systems theory is one manifestation of the macro approach. Historians, Diner notes, know about world systems theory, but have tended to avoid it. By contrast, in a range of social sciences, particularly sociology and anthropology, it has been influential (Portes 1997; Sassen 1996). However, as Hollifield points out, political scientists have tended to be critical of world systems theory and the types of globalization arguments that often flow from it. The logic of world systems theory is heavily sociological and structural, and it discounts the role
of politics and the state in social and economic change. Mainstream scholars of international relations continue to place the state, as a unitary and rational actor, at the center of their analyses of any type of transnational phenomenon, whether it is trade, foreign direct investment, or international migration (Hollifield 1998).

Despite the importance of world systems theory to both sociology and anthropology, Heisler and Brettell suggest that more theorizing in these fields takes place at the microlevel, or at what Thomas Faist (1997) has labeled a "meso-level," which focuses on social ties. By contrast, political science, with its central concern with the role of the state, operates more comfortably at the macrolevel. This is also true of the law, especially when law intersects with politics and economics. However, legal scholars equally focus on individual cases and on patterns of case law and hence operate at a microlevel of analysis as well. Economics also operates at both levels, depending on the research questions. Economists have not only theorized about how wage or employment opportunity differentials between sending and receiving societies affect general flows of populations, but also about how such differentials influence individual or household cost-benefit and utilitarian decision making about migration. Demography is perhaps a special case because the primary unit of analysis for the demographer is the population. Hill (1997:244) has argued that the "easy definition of a population has blinded [demographers] to more complex thoughts about what holds people together and what divides them." In other words, the meso-level at which sociologists and anthropologists frequently operate to theorize about the maintenance or construction of kinship, ethnic, or community ties among immigrants is not of primary concern to demographers.

Some geographers also work at a meso-level, while others work at the macrolevel to trace and map broad patterns of movement across space. Still others work at the microlevel of communities, households, and individuals. Geographers are attentive to varied units of analysis because the concept of scale is at the core of their research. Scale, in geography, refers primarily to space, but temporal scale, which addresses the size of time units, and thematic scale, which addresses "the groupings of entities or attributes such as people or weather variables" (Montello 2001:13501), are also important. Montello (2001:13502) also describes analysis scale, "the size of the units in which phenomena are measured and the size of the units into which measurements are aggregated for data analysis and mapping." Clearly all these elements of scale have framed the ways in which geographers have theorized about migration.

For sociologists, anthropologists, and some economists it is the individual or household that is the primary unit of analysis. The sociologist Alejandro Portes (1997:817) has argued strongly in favor of something other than the individual as the unit of analysis. "Reducing everything to the individual plane would unduly constrain the enterprise by preventing the utilization of more complex units of analysis—families, households, and communities, as the basis for explanation and prediction." Brettell in fact traces a shift in anthropology from the individual to the household that accompanied the realization that individual migrants rarely make decisions in a vacuum about whether to leave and where to go, and that immigrant earnings or emigrant remittances are often pooled into a household economy. Similarly it is in the distinction between individual decision making, on the one hand, and household or family decision making, on the other, that Massey et al. (1993) locate the difference between neoclassical microeconomic migration theory and the new economics of migration. New economics theorists argue that households send workers abroad "not only to improve income in absolute terms, but also to increase income relative to other households, and, hence, to reduce their relative deprivation compared with some reference group" (Massey et al. 1993:438; see also earlier works by Mincer 1978; Stark 1991). This is an economic theory that, with a different unit of analysis, must take sociological and anthropological questions into consideration.

Economists asking a different set of research questions that are shared with sociologists often focus on other units of analysis—the labor market in the receiving society or the economy of a sending society. These generate different bodies of theory about dual and segmented labor markets, about aggregate income and income distribution, about the impact of capitalist development, about the political implications of emigrant remittances, or about global cities (Sassen 1991). In all cases, the needs and interests of entities other than the individual are of interest here.

Political scientists and legal scholars have generally entered into the debate at this point, taking as their primary unit of analysis the state. Bringing the state in as the unit of analysis focuses attention on regulation of population movements, whether domestic (as in the old Soviet Union or China today) or international. As Zolberg (1981) has noted, micro-analytic theories often do not distinguish between domestic and international flows, nor do meso-level theories. The politics of the state (or states) are often behind refugee and illegal flows (Hollifield 1998; Zolberg, Suhreke, and Aguayo 1986). Rules of entry and exit formulated by the state regulate migration flows. State sovereignty and control are at issue in debates about citizenship, and since citizenship and sovereignty are cornerstones of the international legal system, migration always has the potential to affect international relations. In this case, the level of analysis may move (from the individual or the state) to the international system itself, and normative issues of morality and justice come into play (Carens 2000).

Contrasts between the perspectives of political science and those of anthropology are stark on the issue of the relationship between immigration and citizenship. Anthropologists are more concerned with the meaning of citizenship for the individual migrant—whether and how it is incorporated into a new identity—than are their colleagues in political science, who may be focused
on the international systemic or national security implications of population movements (Hollifield 2004; Rudolph 2006). Sociologists, with their interest in institutions, have, it appears, aligned themselves more with political scientists and lawyers than with anthropologists on this particular question (Brubaker 1992). As Heisler points out, the theoretical focus in the citizenship literature, particularly in the European context, is primarily on the transformation of host societies and only secondarily on the immigrants. It is here that some intriguing interdisciplinary interchange could occur by combining different units of analysis (the state and the individual) and different questions (sovereignty and identity) (Kastoryano 1997). The utilitarian aspects of citizenship might also be a dimension of such interdisciplinary exploration. In their work on citizenship, for example, Peter Schuck (Schuck and Smith 1985; Schuck 1998) and Rogers Smith (1997) explore the way in which naturalization law and policy (a state-level variable) affect the rate of political incorporation of newcomers.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The units of analysis in migration research are closely linked to matters of data and methodology. When the unit of analysis is the population, research is conducted at an aggregate level, using primarily census data, but sometimes also data from large surveys. Demographic data are abundant, discrete, and accessible, and theorizing is driven by the data (Hill 1997). Demographers are perhaps most preoccupied with the accuracy of the data and with esoteric matters of method. Because they use secondary data, they must be concerned with how migration and immigration were defined by those who collected the data. Sociologists and economists of migration, particularly if they are also trained as demographers, often use the same secondary data and engage in similar kinds of statistical methods of analysis. Yet when they do this, it is with an awareness of the limitations of census data. “They undernumerate undocumented migrants, they provide no information on legal status, and they are ill-suited to the study of immigration as a process rather than an event,” write Massey and colleagues (1994:700). They realize that data sets vary in their suitability for addressing various questions and the task of social scientists is to identify the most appropriate data for a given problem or question.

Sociologists and some economists also generate their own individual- or household-level data, generally using surveys of samples that can range from two hundred to two thousand. This is equally true of much geographical and anthropological research on migration, but anthropologists also generate primary individual- and household-level data through extended and sometimes arduous periods of ethnographic fieldwork and participant observation. While it may not be the basis for extensive theory construction, the life history method has been employed to some effect by anthropologists to access the rich texture of the lived experience of being a migrant and the cultural context of decision making. Benmayor and Skotnes (1994b:15) are most articulate in outlining the way personal testimony “speaks . . . to how im/migrant subjects constantly build, reinvent, synthesize, or even collage identities from multiple sources and resources, often lacing them with deep ambivalence. Knowing something of the utter uniqueness of particular individual migrant experiences certainly enhances our generalizations about the group experience, but it also elicits humility about the adequacy of these generalizations and a realization that few actual individual lives fully conform to the master narratives.”

In political science and the law, common methods often involve interviews with key politicians and lawmakers. They also involve a careful reading of texts, as well as statistical analysis of aggregate or individual-level data, depending on the types of questions that are asked. Policy analysis and political economy are often focused on aggregate data (Hollifield 1992), whereas studies of political and voting behavior, as well as public opinion, involve the use of individual-level survey data (DeSipio 1996). Legal scholars are less likely than economists or political scientists to use formal models or statistical analysis, relying instead on interpretation of case law, institutional analysis, and political history (Schuck 1998). But, with the theoretical and methodological borrowing that goes on between law and economics or political science, legal scholars have come increasingly to draw on more formal methods of data analysis.

Clearly, historical methods, which rely on archival sources, are quite distinct and well developed within that discipline. In recent years, of course, historians and historical anthropologists have turned increasingly to quantitative methods of data analysis, which has in turn expanded and enriched the range of sources drawn upon to study migration and immigration. These include manuscript census data and ownership and housing records (Gabaccia 1984), population registers (Kertzer and Hogan 1989), official statistics containing aggregate data on emigration and immigration (Hochstadt 1981), passport registers (Baganha 1990), ships’ manifests (Swierenga 1981), and even local parish records (Brettell 1986; Moch and Tilly 1985). However, historians also use the kinds of documents to study migration that they have used for other historical projects—letters, autobiographies, newspapers and magazines, urban citizenship registers, sacred and secular court documents, tax and land records, settlement house and hospital admission records, organization booklets, and oral histories (Baily and Ramella 1990; Diner 1983; Gjerde 1985; Mageean 1991; Miller 1985; Yans-McLaughlin 1990).

The diverse methods of history and the social sciences, and the various bodies of data that are used, yield different knowledge about migration. They access different voices and leave others out. They provide for different types of generalizations and hence different levels of theorizing. Bjeren (1997:222) outlines the implications of different methods for migration research. She writes:
Large-scale social surveys are certainly necessary in migration research since it is only through such studies that the relative (quantitative) importance of different phenomena, the distribution of characteristics and their relationship between variables can be ascertained. However, the limitations imposed by the method of investigation must be respected for the results to be valid. The same holds true for detailed studies of social contexts, where the fascination of the complexity of life may make it difficult for the researcher to step back and free herself from the idiosyncrasies of an individual setting or situation.

If survey data miss some of the intersubjective meanings characteristic of social situations revealed in participant observation (Kertzer and Fricke 1997:18), research based on an intense examination of a limited number of cases (such as occurs in history and anthropology) can in turn limit generalization.

While method also involves comparison, in the study of migration, there are differences of approach within each discipline. As mentioned above, historians have tended to avoid comparisons mostly because they pose methodological challenges in terms of time and the skills necessary to command archival sources in different countries and distinct languages. The concept of "my group"—the Irish, the Italians, the Germans—described by Diner is also characteristic of anthropology, although the roots of anthropology as a discipline are in the comparative method. The anthropologist feels equally compelled to have command of the language of the immigrant population among whom he or she is conducting ethnographic fieldwork (participant observation), be it the Portuguese in Paris, the Hmong in Minneapolis, or the Koreans in New York. When an anthropologist engages in comparison, it is often based on data gathered by another ethnographer and tends to be more impressionistic than systematic. There are, however, some examples of anthropologists who have studied the same national immigrant population in two different receiving societies, and hence engaged in a process of controlled comparative analysis of quite specific questions that provide the foundation for the construction of middle-range theories of processes of migration and settlement (BretteIl 1981; Foner 1985, 1998, 2005). Olwig (1998:63) notes, with reference to Caribbean migration, that comparative studies can generate quite distinct conclusions depending on the framework of analysis adopted.

A framework which singles out for comparison the disparate experiences of migrating from a variety of Caribbean places of origin to their different respective (neo-) colonial metropoles leads to quite different conclusions than one which takes its point of departure in the multifaceted experiences of people who move from a single island society to a multiplicity of metropoles. The former form of comparison can have the effect of privileging the perspective of the metropoles... however, if one takes as one's point of departure a particular island society, or even a particular family, one will see that there is a long heritage of moving to different migration destinations.

Foner (1998:48) suggests that the comparative approach to migration reveals "a number of factors that determine the outcome of the migration experience. ... Cross-national comparisons allow us to begin to assess the relative weight of cultural baggage, on the one hand, and social and economic factors, on the other."

Some social scientists use historical analysis to frame their comparisons (Foner 2000; Freeman 1979; Hollifield 1992; Perlman and Waldinger 1997). An excellent example is Robert Smith's (1997) comparison of the transnational practices of Italians who came to New York in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with Mexican and other immigrants who have entered that city more recently. In particular, he notes differences in the longevity of community/ethnic organizations of the present by contrast with those of the past, the greater extent of participation in the development of sending communities, and an international political context and weaker anti-immigrant tenor that fosters continued ties with the homeland. But the comparison also allows him to argue that the "global nation is not a new idea" (Smith 1997:123).

When historians of migration have themselves engaged in comparison, it is largely based on secondary sources used to complement primary research (Campbell 1995). Thus, Gjerde (1996) has drawn on a range of works to write his masterful and ambitious analysis of the Midwestern immigrant experience in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Similarly, Gabaccia (1994) uses a wealth of both primary and secondary sources to explore similarities and differences in the experiences of migratory women who came to the United States between 1820 and 1900. Historian Nancy Green (1997:59ff) rightly argues that only through comparison can we understand what is specific and what is general in migration, and that "by changing the unit of analysis to compare immigrant groups to each other in their cities of settlement, we can focus on the intermediary—"mezzo"—level of analysis more pertinent to understanding the social construction of ethnic identities" (61). Historical comparisons that are "explicit, systematic, and methodologically rigorous" would, as Samuel Baily (1990:243) observes, "provide a corrective to the misleading assumption of U.S. exceptionalism," a problem raised in this volume by both Diner and Heisler. Indeed, Heisler calls most strongly for the development of cross-national comparative research. For her, the ocean that for centuries divided the study of immigration in Europe from that in the United States is perhaps as wide as the canyon that separates scholarship of the different disciplines—she calls for a bridge between Americanists and comparatists/globalists. Only through such comparison can the "national models" of migration be tested for cross-cultural validity. Portes (1997:819) has made a similar plea by suggesting that there are many questions that have flourished in the North American immigration
literature that lack a comparative dimension.\textsuperscript{9} The research of some European scholars of immigrant communities on ethnic enclaves and ethnic entrepreneurs in cities such as Amsterdam, Paris, and Berlin begins to address this problem (Rath 2002).

While the case study is commonly used in all of the social sciences, much of the most important and path-breaking work on migration has taken the form of systematic comparison, often with very sophisticated research designs using the comparative method as a way of testing hypotheses and building theories. Some of the earliest work on immigration in political science and sociology involved systematic comparisons of politics and policy (Castles and Kosack 1973; Freeman 1979; Hammar 1985; Miller 1981; Schmitter 1979). These studies, which followed a most-similar-systems design, gave rise to a new literature in the comparative politics and sociology of immigration and citizenship (Bade and Weiner 1997; Brubaker 1992; Hollifield 1992; Horowitz and Noireil 1992; Ireland 1994; Sowell 1996; Soysal 1994; Weiner and Hanami 1998; Joppke 1999; Rudolph 2006). Such systematic, cross-national research has helped to illuminate similarities and differences in immigration and citizenship policy and to explain different outcomes. It is safe to say that the comparative method has been a mainstay of migration research across the social science disciplines, and it has resulted in some of the most innovative scholarship in the field.

\section*{Immigration, Integration, and Citizenship}

For history, economics, sociology, anthropology, and geography one of the dominant paradigms in migration theory is the assimilation model. As mentioned above, Heisler argues that this model, which predicts a single outcome, has given way to new models that predict a range of outcomes. This is best encapsulated in Portes and Rumbaut’s (1990) complex model of incorporation. This model, formulated in relation to the United States, postulates outcomes for different groups according to contexts of reception that vary with reference to (1) U.S. government policy that passively accepts or actively supports; (2) labor market reception that is neutral, positive, or discriminatory; and (3) an ethnic community that is nonexistent, working class, or entrepreneurial/professional. Heisler reviews the literature in sociology that deals quite specifically with the ethnic enclave economy and its role in either facilitating or delaying the process of incorporation. Sociologists who emphasize social capital (the social networks and social relationships of immigrants) tend to argue the for-

Chiswick argues, in contrast to George Borjas, that higher levels of inequality in the country of origin do not necessarily lead to negative selectivity of immigrants, but rather to less favorable positive selectivity. In effect, according to Chiswick, even though immigrants may come from very poor countries, they are still favorably selected compared to those who stay behind, and are likely to add to the human capital stock of the receiving country and to assimilate fairly quickly. In this framework, immigrants’ earnings are still likely to increase at a higher rate than the earnings of natives. Hence, economists and sociologists are focused on many of the same questions concerning the incorporation or assimilation of immigrants, even though their theories and methods are quite different (see Table I.1).

A range of outcomes is equally manifested in the model of transnationalism that was first formulated by anthropologists, but which has had an impact on migration research in several other disciplines including sociology, geography, and political science. The roots of transnationalism within anthropology can be found in earlier work on return migration that emphasized links with the homeland and the notion that emigration did not necessarily mean definitive departure in the minds of migrants themselves. But equally transnationalism implies that return is not definitive return. Furthermore, and as Heisler observes, for political sociologists the maintenance of home ties among European immigrants (a transnational perspective) was hardly surprising given policy that did not encourage permanent settlement. Even sending countries have developed transnational policies, encouraging, as in the case of Portugal and more recently Mexico, dual nationality to maintain a presence abroad as well as attachment to home. Although Diner does not address it in her chapter, there is also a body of historical work that has documented return movement in an era prior to global communication and cheap and easy mass transportation (Wyman 1993). Social scientists have yet to take advantage of this historical dimension to refine their understanding of contemporary flows. What precisely is different? Is transnationalism simply a characteristic of the first generation of contemporary migrants, or will it endure and hence mean something different in the twenty-first century from the return migration flows of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? Are scholars of immigration talking about something totally new when they use the term \textit{transnational space} (Faist 1997; Gutiérrez 1998)? Robert Smith (1997:111) argues that although the practices are not new, they are “quantitatively and qualitatively different . . . because, in part, of differences in technology as well as in the domestic and international politics of both sending and receiving countries.” He also suggests that simultaneous membership in two societies does not mean coequal membership and that “local and national American identity [for the second generation] are most likely to be primary and the diasporic identity, secondary” (Smith 1997:112). Others would argue that there is something qualitatively different about the new culture that exists across borders and that powerfully shapes migrant decisions. Massey et al. (1994:737–38) link this new culture to the spread of consumerism and immigrant success that itself generates more emigration. Migration becomes an expectation and a normal
part of the life course, particularly for young men and increasingly for young women. What emerges in today's world of rapid, inexpensive communication and transportation is a culture of migration and ethnic enclaves, which allow one to migrate but remain within one's culture.

Finally, one could argue that the growth of work on the second generation, particularly within the discipline of sociology, is a result of the rejection of the assumptions of assimilation theory (Perlman and Waldinger 1997; Portes and Zhou 1993; Portes 1996). Essentially, given postindustrial economies and the diversity of places of origin of today's immigrant populations, the path to upward mobility (and hence incorporation) will be much less favorable for the contemporary second generation than it was for the second generation of the past. Clearly, this is a topic of intense debate and another area of research and theory building dominated by research on U.S. immigrants that cries out for cross-national comparison and interdisciplinary perspectives that accurately assess the past as well as the present. Perlman and Waldinger (1997:894), for example, argue, “the interpretive stance toward the past, and toward certain features of the present situation as well, puts the contemporary situation in an especially unfavorable light.” Later they point to the problem and implications of the absence of conversation across the disciplines on this topic: “Economists read Borjas, sociologists read their colleagues, and historians do not regularly read the literature produced by either discipline. Since Borjas's writings are also widely read and cited by policy analysts in connection with immigration restriction issues, this divergence of emphasis regarding the ‘common knowledge’ about long-term character of immigrant absorption should not be ignored” (Perlman and Waldinger 1997:898–99). In fact, their close analysis of the historical evidence to illuminate contemporary trends is exemplary. They reveal continuities between the difficulties experienced by earlier immigrant groups and those of today that suggest “that the time frame for immigrant accommodation was extended and that we should not expect different today” (915).

Perhaps the controversial nature of the debate about the contemporary second generation, and the power of the transnational model, have placed the assimilation model back on the table. Alba and Nee (2003), for example, suggest that assimilation theory should be resurrected without the prescriptive baggage formulated by the dominant majority, which calls for immigrants to become like everyone else. They argue that assimilation still exists as a spontaneous process in intergroup interactions. Certainly the current preoccupation in several fields with the transnational model may be a reflection of research that is largely focused on the first generation and that lacks a historical perspective. Herbert Gans (1997) has suggested that rejection of straight-line assimilation may be premature, given not only the different generations of immigrants studied by those who originally formulated the theory and by those carrying out contemporary research, but also differences in the background (outsiders versus insiders) of researchers themselves. This latter
macrolevel of analysis. How, for example, are first-generation immigrants differentially incorporated (economically, politically, and socially) in Germany as opposed to the United States, in Britain by comparison with France, in Australia by contrast with Canada, or in Singapore by comparison with Riyadh? Similarly, how and to what extent are immigrants, their children, and subsequent generations differentially incorporated in a cross-national context?

A second topic crying out for interdisciplinary and cross-national examination is the impact (political, economic, social, and cultural) of emigration and transnationalism on sending societies (Massey 1999). As noted above, primarily anthropologists and to a lesser extent historians have conducted the most work in the countries of emigration, but the questions asked must be expanded through the participation of those in other disciplines, particularly political science and economics. For example, some scholars have already noted how crucial migrants have become for national economies. Writing about the Dominican Republic, Guarnizo (1997:282–83) observes that “migrant’s monetary transfers (excluding their business investments) now constitute the second, and according to some the first, most important source of foreign exchange for the national economy, and they are a sine qua non for Dominican macroeconomic stability, including monetary exchange rates, balance of trade, international monetary reserves, and the national balance of payments.”

In countries of immigration, we foresee exciting collaboration on the question of citizenship between the political scientists and political sociologists who frame the question in relation to the nation-state and the rights of a democratic society, and the anthropologists who frame the questions in relation to


1. Normally, a conceptual distinction is drawn between migration and immigration, the former referring to movement that occurs within national borders (internal migration) and the latter to movement across national borders.
(emigration or immigration). We use the term migration somewhat loosely here to refer to international migration, generally the emphasis of all the essays in this volume. However, from a theoretical perspective it is worth noting that economic theories of migration can often apply to either internal flows or international flows (Stark 1991; Martin, Abella, and Kuptsch 2006), and some sociologist and human geographers may prefer the more general term “mobility” to migration (Smith and Favell 2006).


3. Portes (1997:10) argues that any attempt at an all-encompassing theory would be futile and that even the macro and the micro are not easily united into a single approach. Cf. also Portes and DeWind (2004).

4. However, historians such as Donna Gabaccia (1992, 1999, 2004) have for some time been calling on migration historians to engage in more comparative, cross-national, global, and interdisciplinary work.

5. One example of a monograph in the historical literature that invokes both world systems theory and transnationalism is Friedman-Kasaba (1996). Her conclusion includes an analysis of theoretical debates. See also Gabaccia 2004.

6. Faist (1997:188) has usefully reformulated these three levels of analysis as the structural (the political-economic and cultural factors in the sending and receiving countries), the relational (the social ties of movers and stayers), and the individual (the degrees of freedom of potential movers). He also views macro- and micromodels as causal, while meso-models are process related. Hoerder (1997) offers a slightly different trilevel model: analysis of world systems, analysis of behavior among individual migrants from the bottom up, and analysis of segmentation and individual actions in terms of networks and family economies.

7. Caldwell and Hill (1988) have noted a similar “obsession” in other areas of demographic research and have consequently called for more micro approaches. Massey et al. (1994:700) see the focus on methodological and measurement issues in the literature on North American immigration as limiting to the advancement of theoretical understanding of what shapes and controls flows of migration.


9. Massey et al. (1998) make such an attempt in a volume that compares the migration systems in North America, Western Europe, the Gulf region, Asia and the Pacific, and the Southern Cone region of South America.

For a contrary view, see Rumbaut (1997).

11. There are those policy analysts, like Chiswick in this volume, who see the impact of immigration varying with the characteristics of the migrants and the nature of the host economy; hence visas should be rationed according to the “national interest” and a strict cost–benefit logic.
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