

INTRODUCTION

Migration Theory

Talking across Disciplines

Caroline B. Brettell and James F. Hollifield

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 40 million, representing 12.9 percent of the total population. As the foreign-born share of the US population continues to increase, the number of second-generation Americans, the children of immigrants, also will rise. In 2013, first- and second-generation Americans accounted for 24.5 percent of the US population, and this figure is projected to rise to 36.9 percent of the population by 2025 (Pew 2013). Europe has experienced a similar influx of foreigners that began, in some countries, as early as the 1940s. In 2011 the foreign-born population of Europe stood at 48.9 million or 9.7 percent of the total (EU 27) population. The foreign-born constitute 12 percent of the German population, 11.2 percent of the French population, 12.4 percent of the Irish population, and 24.7 percent of the Swiss population, to take but a few examples (Vasileva 2012). 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 (Reitz 2014). With the abandonment in the 1960s of the White Australia Policy barring non-European settlers, Australia has become a multicultural nation (Castles et al. 2014), 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 (Hollifield 2010; Martin 2014). Even Japan and South Korea, countries with long histories of restricting immigration, began admitting foreign workers in

the 1980s and 1990s (Chung 2014). Finally, the movement of large populations throughout the southern hemisphere, such as refugees in Africa or “guest workers” in Asia and the Persian Gulf states, led one analyst to speak of a global migration crisis (Weiner 1995).

Whether and where there might be a migration crisis remain open questions. But clearly we are living in an age of migration (Castles and Miller 2009). Scholars in all of the social sciences have turned their attention to the study of this extraordinarily complex phenomenon.¹ Yet, despite the volume of research interest in a host of academic fields, only rarely are there conversations across the disciplines about shared theoretical perspectives and analytical concepts or about core assumptions that might differentiate one disciplinary approach from another.² Douglas Massey and his colleagues (1994: 700–701) formulated the problem in succinct terms over twenty years ago:

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.

One broad division 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. A second broad division, raised by Donna R. Gabaccia in her chapter in this volume, is among those whose approach is largely “presentist,” those who acknowledge the past within a “then *and* now” framework (Foner 2000), and those who look at change from a then *to* now framework. 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 foster dialogue across the disciplines social scientists will be doomed to their narrow fields of inquiry and the danger of constantly reinventing wheels will increase.

This book therefore represents an effort to talk about migration theory across disciplines and to this end we have brought together in a single volume essays by an historian, teams of sociologists, demographers, and political scientists, an economist, an anthropologist, a geographer, and a legal scholar who is also trained as a historian. 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. Most of the authors adopt a broad “survey of the literature” approach, honing in on the debates that characterize their respective fields and from time

to time comparing these to what other authors in the volume address. Rather than reaching for a unifying theory, as Massey et al. (1993, 1998) and Elizabeth Fussell (2012) attempt to do,³ in this introduction we examine the chapters in this volume as a whole, noting convergence and divergence in how questions are framed, how research is conducted and at what levels and with what units of analysis, how hypothesis-testing proceeds, and ultimately how theoretical models are constructed. Most of the contributors take an eclectic approach to “theory,” leaving ample room for positivist (hypothetico-deductive) and interpretivist (inductive and idiographic) approaches to the study of migration—the former being more characteristic of economics and political science and the latter more common in history and anthropology (see Weber 1949). In the concluding chapter, the sociologist and human geographer Adrian Favell gives an assessment of the book as a whole, seeking to determine whether we have successfully “re-booted” migration theory, and arguing for “interdisciplinarity, globality, and post-disciplinarity in migration studies.”

Our goal in this volume is to stimulate a cross-disciplinary conversation about migration drawing on theoretical and empirical insights from history, law, and the social sciences. If this book moves the conversation in the direction of “the study of migration as a social science in its own right . . . strongly multidisciplinary in its theory and methodology” (Castles 1993: 30), it will have achieved its objective.

FRAMING THE QUESTION

In the social sciences, students are taught that they must start any inquiry with a puzzle or a question, whatever the topic of study may be. Of course, the way in which that question is posed or framed is dependent upon the discipline; and the construction of hypotheses is almost always driven by disciplinary considerations. Intense disagreements and debates about the meaning and interpretation of the same body of data exist even within single disciplines. Sometimes there can be more agreement across the disciplines on the nature of the problem, or on the methodology, than within a single discipline—contrast, for example, a narrative to a social-scientific approach to history or a rational choice to a historical-institutional approach to the study of politics. However, agreement on a single explanation for or model of migration is less likely; it is even rarer to find hypotheses that are truly multidisciplinary, drawing upon concepts and insights from several disciplines simultaneously. Each discipline tends to have its preferred or acceptable list of questions, hypotheses, and variables.

In Table 1.1, we have constructed a matrix that summarizes principal research questions and methodologies, as well as dominant theories and hypotheses for each of the disciplines represented in this volume. The matrix is necessarily schematic and cannot include every question or theory; but it provides a framework for establishing a dialogue across disciplines.

TABLE 1.1: MIGRATION THEORIES ACROSS DISCIPLINES

Discipline	Research Question(s)	Levels/Units of Analysis	Dominant Theories	Sample Hypothesis
Anthropology	How does migration effect cultural change and affect cultural identity?	Micro/individuals, households, groups	Relational or structuralist and transnational	Social networks help maintain cultural difference.
Demography	To what extent do immigrant and native populations become more similar over time?	Individuals, immigrant groups, ethnoracial groups, national foreign-born populations	Theories of migration (cost/benefit and structural; theories in integration (assimilation and pluralist-based); theories of migration effects (economic, social structural, and cultural)	Immigrants will not become successfully integrated when they experience significant membership exclusion.
Economics	What explains the propensity to migrate and its effects?	Micro/individuals	Rationalist: cost-benefit and utility maximizing behavior	Incorporation varies with the level of human capital of immigrants.
Geography	What explains the socio-spatial patterns of migration?	Macro, meso and micro/individuals, households and groups	Relational, structural, and transnational	Incorporation depends on ethnic networks and residential patterns.
History	How has a phenomenon (e.g. causes, structures, processes, consequences of migration) or a relationship (e.g. gender and migration) changed or persisted over time?	Varies temporally (from short-to medium and long-term) as well as spatially	Periodization	Usually not applicable.
Law	How does the law influence migration?	Macro and micro/the political and legal system	Institutionalist and rationalist (borrows from all the social sciences)	Rights create incentive structures for migration and incorporation.
Political science	Why do states have difficulty controlling migration?	More macro/political and international systems	Institutionalist and rationalist	States are often captured by pro-immigrant interests.
Sociology	What explains incorporation and exclusion?	Macro/ethnic groups and social class	Structuralist or institutionalist	Incorporation varies with social and human capital.

For historians, who nowadays straddle the divide between the humanities and the social sciences, principal research questions emerge from an emphasis on time, timing, and temporality (see Gabaccia, chapter 1 in this volume). Periodicity is a form of theorizing that focuses attention on both short- and long-term temporal scales and cycles. While historians may not engage directly in the development of theoretical models that predict behavior (as economists might do), they do engage in theory to frame their questions and to test or explore their arguments in ways that are familiar to social scientists. For example, they might ask what are the determinants and consequences of population movements? Who moves, when, why, and where, and how have patterns of movement changed over time? Why do most people stay put—at the beginning of the twenty-first century only a fraction (3 percent) of the world's population live outside of their country of birth? How do those who move experience departure, migration, and settlement? These questions can be applied to one or more groups (or even individuals) at a particular place and time, but they can also be applied over the long durations of time in the arena of migration history (Goldin et al. 2011; Lucassen and Lucassen 1997). In the latter case the result, Gabaccia observes, has been the re-theorization of human mobility by world historians. By framing questions in relation to time (then to now), historians like Gabaccia are able to confront the limitations of temporality in community studies that cannot explain enduring ethnic identities. They are equally able to extend the temporal scales for patterns that we might assume to be of more recent vintage.

Anthropologists tend to be context-specific in their ethnographic endeavors, and much of their theorizing is idiographic. But their ultimate goal is to engage in cross-cultural comparisons that make possible generalizations across space and time, and hence nomothetic theory building. Although Bjerer (1997) has 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. Brettell (chapter 5 in this volume) 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, always interpreting, constructing, and reconstructing social realities within the constraints of structure.

Geographers are primarily interested in spatial and areal relationships. In migration research their attention is therefore directed, as Susan W. Hardwick

(chapter 6 in 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 David Scott FitzGerald (chapter 4 in this volume) emphasizes, the central questions are: Why does migration occur and who migrates—that is, issues of selectivity? How is migration sustained over time (networks)? And what happens once these populations are settled in the host society and begin to take part in a multigenerational competition for resources and status, often defined in ethnic terms? Sociologists share a common theoretical framework with anthropologists and there is a good deal of cross-fertilization between these disciplines. 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 some notable exceptions (see the works of Douglas Massey and Fitzgerald himself on Mexico, for example), while anthropologists have often worked in the countries of origin, destination, or both. The difference is a result of the historical origins of these two disciplines—sociology is grounded in the study of Western institutions and society, whereas anthropology began with 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. Even though sociologists are interested in the causes of emigration (again, see Fitzgerald’s work on Mexico), the discipline places greater emphasis on the process of immigrant incorporation (see, for example, works by Portes and Rumbaut 1990; Perlman and Waldinger 1997; Kastoryano 1997; Favell 1998; Bloemraad 2006).

Sociological theory has moved from postulating a single outcome (classic assimilation) to manifold outcomes that depend on such factors as human capital, social capital, labor markets, and a range of institutional structures. FitzGerald outlines the major alternatives—segmented assimilation, transnationalism, and dissimilation. Assessment of these outcomes is often linked to an understanding of the political factors that undergird them, thereby bridging to questions that are of great interest to political scientists (see, for example, Jones-Correa 1998).

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 on). Within demography, a distinction is often drawn between formal demography, which is highly formal and mathematical, and social demography, which borrows freely from other social science disciplines and is more idiographic and applied. Formal demographers have paid more attention to fertility and mortality as mechanisms of population change than they have to the messier process of migration. However, social demographers like Frank D. Bean and Susan K. Brown (chapter 2 in this volume) have made migration a key interest of demography. 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 forecast the future or at least they try harder than other social sciences, especially in formal demography, which deals with hard numbers on births, deaths, age, and gender. But, as Frank D. Bean and Susan K. Brown remind us in their chapter, migration also has a powerful effect on societies and their populations. They focus on social demography, which, much like sociology (see chapter 4 by FitzGerald in this volume), tries to understand how and why people migrate, what happens to migrants, especially in the receiving society where they are likely to have a major impact on the population, and how difficult is it for migrants to be absorbed into the host society. Obviously demography plays a huge role in migration because of the imbalances between populations, leading to push factors in overpopulated societies and pull factors in underpopulated societies. Bean and Brown review theories of household behavior—a primary unit of analysis for demographers—and they delve into economic theory, looking at the structure and functioning of labor markets to understand how these affect the propensity for people to move. They also wrestle with many of the same concepts as sociologists and anthropologists, such as ethnicity and race, and, like political scientists, they strive to understand the nature of the international system and how it affects population dynamics. They theorize about intermarriage rates, social capital, and civil society and thereby help us to explain the effects of immigration on receiving societies. And they give us rich “research examples” to illustrate how and why some immigrant groups adapt and integrate better than others, echoing the findings of sociologists like Alejandro Portes, and challenging the findings of others like the political scientist Robert Putnam.

Economists also build predictive models, relying heavily on rationalist theories of human behavior, and they tend to frame their questions in terms of scarcity and choice (see Martin in chapter 3 in this volume). Economists, like other social scientists, are interested in why some people move while others do not; and like sociologists they pay close attention to selectivity,

to determine what it means for the sending (Kapur and McHale 2012) and receiving (Orrenius and Zavodny 2012) societies. This macroeconomic perspective explores what immigrants add to the economy of the receiving society (in terms of wealth, income, skills, etc.), what emigrants take away from the economy of the sending society (in terms of capital, human and otherwise), what they send back in remittances, and what is the net gain. From a microeconomic perspective, economists view migrants as utility maximizers who assess opportunity in cost-benefit terms and act accordingly. These two perspectives (macro and micro) have generated a range of questions and debates within economics about winners and losers in labor markets where migrants are present, about the impact of immigration on public finance, about entrepreneurship and innovation, and about the social mobility of immigrants—questions that economists share with sociologists and political scientists. Philip Martin observes that depending on the question and how it is framed economists can engage in a case study approach or in more longitudinal and econometric studies.

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 in favor of a more constructivist approach. Furthermore, anthropologists and historians are reluctant, if not averse, to framing questions in cost-benefit terms or in relation to evaluations of positive and negative inputs, outputs, 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 (Chiswick 1978, 1986; Borjas 1985; Duleep and Regets 1997a, 1997b; Huber and Espenshade 1997; Rothman and Espenshade 1992), not to mention broader debates about immigration policy (Borjas 1999; Card 2001; Orrenius and Zavodny 2012). Economists and demographers have also explored the educational, welfare, and social security costs of immigration (Passel 1994; Simon 1984; Borjas 1998), 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; Martin, chapter 3, this volume).

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; Bommers and Geddes 2000; Brochmann 2014). 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 (Orrenius and Zavodny 2012). It is

with attention to these questions that political scientists and legal scholars have entered the arena of migration research as relative newcomers.

As James F. Hollifield and Tom K. Wong emphasize in chapter 7 in this volume, the questions for scholars of the politics of international migration 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 behavioral, 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 (see Abraham in chapter 8 in this volume and Schuck 1998 and Motomura 2014). It is worth noting, however, that scholars in other disciplines—for example, history and anthropology—have been equally attentive to questions of citizenship in both its legal and participatory dimensions. For example, in her book *Law Harsh as Tigers*, historian Lucy Salyer shows how the Chinese “sojourners” who immigrated to the United States in the late nineteenth century exercised their rights to challenge discriminatory laws. A more recent historical example is Gardner’s (2005) fascinating analysis of the impact of US citizenship laws on immigrant women in particular.

Like sociologists, political scientists have worked 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; Sadiq 2009; Klotz 2013). 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, microeconomic (rational choice) approach to the study of migration (Freeman 1995, 1998), while others favor institutional, historical, and/or constructivist explanations for migration, immigrant incorporation, participation, and citizenship in the advanced industrial democracies (Hollifield 1992; Zolberg 1981, 2006; Koslowski 2011; Klotz 2013). All agree, however, that it is important to understand how the state and public policy affect migration, mobility, immigrant incorporation, identity, and citizenship, or, as Zolberg (2006) puts it, how nations are designed and shaped by policy.

Like political scientists legal scholars focus largely on institutions, process, and rights as key variables for explaining immigration outcomes, often with a heavy overlay of political philosophy (for example, Abraham, chapter 8, this volume; Legomsky 1987; Schuck 1998; Bosniak 2006). Most legal scholars are skeptical of the possibility for developing a “science of law” or as David Abraham (chapter 8) puts it “law is not a research discipline . . . [but it] is . . .

a tool of regulation; as such it constructs legality and illegality, the permissible and the impermissible.” In the Anglo-American common law tradition most legal scholars devote their efforts to the analysis and assessment of case law (Aleinikoff et al. 2003). But in his work, Abraham seeks to explain how the law has evolved over time and in different national contexts to shape international migration, and how immigration in particular affects American political development. Abraham shows how the construction of the American state following the Civil War resulted in the rise of a new jurisprudence revolving around issues of sovereignty, plenary power, immigration control (exclusion), citizenship, and membership, eventuating in the racist and discriminatory Chinese Exclusion Act (1882) and the National Origins Quota Law (1924). The arbitrary powers of the state to exclude undesirable aliens, even retroactively, continued apace during the Cold War and the “war on terror,” attenuated by the rise of what Hollifield (1992, 2012; Hollifield and Wilson 2011) has called rights-based politics, with the adoption and ratification (by most states) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Jacobson 1996) and the civil rights movement itself in the US. As Abraham shows in his review of US case law (e.g. *Plyler v. Doe*) a new jurisprudence was emerging in the 1970s and 1980s that would challenge the plenary power doctrine (see also Schuck 1998 and Law 2010) and expand the legal basis of citizenship. Abraham’s analysis is reminiscent of similar work in political science (Hollifield et al. 2014; Freeman 1995; Jones-Correa 1998; Zolberg 2006) and sociology (Soysal 1994; Jacobson 1996; Joppke 1998), which seeks to explain the difficulties of immigration control in liberal democracies. Abraham argues that law plays a crucial role in structuring international migration and shaping immigrant incorporation. 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 the liberal constitutions and human rights conventions. In the work of Abraham, 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.

Like many political scientists (see, for example, Hollifield 2005, 2012; Rudolph 2006; also Joppke 1998), Abraham stresses the importance of the institution of sovereignty in a largely Westphalian world where the plenary power of states to regulate and control entry to their territories is a fundamental principle of both municipal and international law, and this in his words “notwithstanding the growth . . . of universalism and humanitarianism in international law.” Also, like Hollifield (Hollifield and Wilson 2011), he struggles to understand the impact that law (qua rights) has on the ability of states to master immigration flows and on the capacity of states and societies to absorb, assimilate, and integrate foreign populations, illustrating his theoretical musings by

comparing citizenship and naturalization laws in the US and Germany. Following the logic of the Marshallian trilogy of rights—civil, political, and social (Marshall 1964 and FitzGerald, chapter 4, this volume)—he seeks to understand how the evolution of immigration law and policy in Europe and the US is tied to rights-based politics; that is, struggles over civil rights and the “criminalization” of immigration in the US, and struggles over social/welfare rights and the “social wage” in Europe. Finally, he extends his argument into the realm of political philosophy to understand how the rise of dual and multiple citizenships has undermined (or not) classical liberal conceptions of citizenship and the social contract, from the more cosmopolitan theory of Carens (2000, 2013) to the multicultural model of Kymlicka (1995).

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. World historians such as those described by Donna R. Gabaccia, as well as a range of social scientists, particularly sociologists and anthropologists, have been influenced by this approach (Portes 1997; Sassen 1996). However, as Hollifield and others (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004) point 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, 2004).

Despite the importance of world systems theory to both sociology and anthropology, FitzGerald and Brettell suggest that more theorizing in these fields takes place at the microlevel, or at what Thomas Faist (1997) labeled a “meso-level” that focuses on social ties.⁴ By contrast, political science and especially international relations, with its focus on the state, policy (process), and institutions, operates comfortably at the macro or systemic level, leaving them open to the criticism of “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002; Sassen 1996; and Favell, chapter 9, this volume). 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 necessarily of primary concern to demographers. However, as Bean and Brown (chapter 2, this volume) point out, households are often the critical decision-making units, as migrants make cost-benefit calculations about whether or not to move. In their words “risk-minimization” is a “significant force” that drives high employment rates among immigrants in the United States.

Some geographers also work at a meso-level, while others work at the macro-level to trace and map broad patterns of movement across space. Still others work at the micro-level 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 migration.

For sociologists, anthropologists, and some economists and political scientists it is the individual that is the primary unit of analysis, leaving them open to the criticism of “methodological individualism” (Sassen 1996; Favell, chapter 9, this volume). The sociologist Alejandro Portes (1997: 817), for example, has argued strongly in favor of something other than the individual as the unit of analysis. “Reducing everything to the individual plane,” according to Portes, “unduly constrains the enterprise by preventing the utilization of more complex units of analysis—families, households, and communities, as the basis for explanation and prediction.” By the same token, some political scientists (Hollifield 1997 and chapter 7, this volume; Zolberg 1981; Weil 1998), sociologists (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004 and Joppke 1998), and jurists (Schuck 1998 and Abraham, chapter 8, this volume) argue that migration scholars

ignore the nation-state at their peril. Brettell (chapter 5, this volume), on the other hand, traces a shift in anthropology from the individual to the household that accompanied the realization that migrants rarely make decisions in a vacuum about whether to leave and where to go, and that immigrant earnings and 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 work 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 (Martin, chapter 3, this volume) 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, about global cities, or about gateway cities of immigration and cities as contexts for immigrant incorporation (Brettell 2003; Foner 2005; Hanley et al. 2008; Price and Benton-Short 2008; Sassen 1991; Singer et al. 2008). 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 policy and regulation of population movements, whether domestic (as in the system of internal passports in the old Soviet Union or China today) or international (see Torpey 2000). 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 et al. 1986; Passel and Cohn 2011; Passel et al. 2013; Hollifield and Wong, chapter 7, this volume; Abraham, chapter 8, this volume). Rules of entry and exit formulated by the state regulate migration flows. State sovereignty, control, and rule of law 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 (Hollifield 2004), 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 (Brettell and Reed-Danahay 2012) than are their colleagues in political science, who may be focused on the international systemic or national security implications of population movements, as well as the mechanisms of naturalization and formal political participation (Hollifield 2004; Rudolph 2006; DeSipio 1996, 2012). 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; Kivisto and Faist 2007; FitzGerald 2008; Waldinger and FitzGerald 2004). 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 constitute one 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 largely by the data (Hill 1997). Demographers are perhaps most preoccupied with the accuracy of the data and with matters of method.⁵ 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 and to be ever vigilant in

questioning the concepts and categories of analysis (see, for example, Skerry 2000; Simon 2005).

Sociologists and some economists also generate their own individual- or household-level data, using surveys with samples that can range from 200 to 2,000 or more (Massey and Durand 2004). 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.⁶ 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; Tichenor 2002; Wong forthcoming), 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; Motomura 20014; Abraham, chapter 8, this volume). 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. Historians and historical anthropologists have also turned increasingly to quantitative methods of data analysis, which have 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 1988; 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. Bjerén (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. Some historians 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. On the other hand, there are any number of historians comparing immigrants from the same place of origin in different destinations (e.g. Baily 1999; Gabaccia and Ottanelli 2001), or engaged, as Gabaccia (chapter 1, this volume) suggests, in migration on the world stage to understand comparative processes of mobility.

The concept of “my group”—the Irish, the Italians, the Germans (e.g. Diner 2008; Fuchs 1990)—that characterizes the approach of some historians 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 (Brettell 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 metropolises 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 metropolises. The former form of comparison can have the effect of privileging the perspective of the metropolises . . . 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." Revealing in this regard is the comparison that Nancy Foner and Richard Alba (2008) undertake of the role of religion in processes of immigrant settlement in Europe and the United States.

Some social scientists use historical analysis to frame their comparisons (Foner 2000; Freeman 1979; Hollifield 1992; Perlman and Waldinger 1997; King 2000, 2005). 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 foster 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 1990. Historian Nancy Green (1997: 59ff.) has argued 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.” Indeed, sociologist Barbara Heisler (2008) has called strongly for the development of cross-national comparative research. For her, the ocean that divides 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.⁷ 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). Of equal interest are a recent book comparing Amsterdam and New York as cities of immigration (Foner et al. 2014), the comparative work of Richard Alba and various co-authors on immigrant youth (Alba and Waters 2011; Alba and Holdaway 2013), and a volume that explores transatlantic perspectives on immigrant political incorporation (Hochschild and Mollenkopf 2009).

While the case study is commonly used in all of the social sciences, much of the most important and pathbreaking work on migration has taken the form of systematic comparison, often with very sophisticated research designs using 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; Bauböck 2012; Brubaker 1992; Hollifield 1992; Horowitz and Noiriel 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 (Wong forthcoming). 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.

IMMIGRATION, INTEGRATION, AND CITIZENSHIP

For history, economics, sociology, anthropology, geography, and increasingly in political science one of the dominant paradigms in migration theory is the assimilation model, associated with Robert Park (1930) and the “Chicago School” (see also Park and Burgess 1921; Gordon 1964). This model, which predicts a single outcome, has given way to new models that predict a range of outcomes. This was best encapsulated early on 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) US 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 non-existent, working class, or entrepreneurial/professional. Also of interest to social scientists are issues of human and social capital. Sociologists have emphasized the role of social capital (the social networks and social relationships of immigrants) in facilitating incorporation while economists place greater emphasis on human capital criteria (schooling, professional qualifications, language proficiency, and the like) in facilitating incorporation.

Chiswick (2008), in contrast to George Borjas (1987, 1991), argues 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 (see Martin, chapter 3, this volume for a summary of these debates). 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 1.1).

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, 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 and India, dual nationality to maintain a presence abroad as well as attachment to home (FitzGerald 2008; Sadiq 2009). There is equally 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; Hoerder 2002). 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 “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 that 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; Zhou 2012). Essentially, given post-industrial 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 US immigrants that cries out for cross-national comparison (see Thomson and Crul 2007; Alba and Waters 2011; Ziolek-Skrzypczak 2013) and interdisciplinary perspectives

that accurately assess the past as well as the present. Perlman and Waldinger (1997: 894), for example, argue that “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.

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; see also FitzGerald, chapter 4, this volume), for example, suggest that assimilation theory should be resurrected without the prescriptive baggage formulated by the dominant majority that 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 disciplines with the transnational model, reflected in several chapters in this volume, 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 observation brings reflexivity, powerfully formulated within anthropology, to bear on sociological theory.⁸

BRIDGE BUILDING AMONG THE DISCIPLINES

Our discussion reveals that despite some strong statements to the contrary, there is already a good deal of interchange among the disciplines. Historians draw on many of the theories formulated by sociologists; demographers are

attentive to both sociological and economic theory and, increasingly, to those emerging from political science; law has close affinity with all the social sciences and with history, while political science borrows heavily from economics and history as well as from sociology and law—one could argue that political science is a theoretical vagabond when it comes to the study of migration; and anthropology shares much with history, sociology, and geography. Although economists also borrow and work with other disciplines—demography, sociology, and history, for example—they maintain a focus on their own (quantitative) methodology and (often highly formal) models, especially the rational choice model. Proponents of rational choice argue that this is an indication of how much more advanced economic modeling is, as a science, when compared with other social science disciplines. Detractors would say that economists are so wedded to the rationalist paradigm, they cannot admit that any other theoretical approach might be as powerful as a straightforward, interest-based, microeconomic model. An economist might respond with the metaphor of Occam's Razor—simple and parsimonious models are more powerful than the complex models offered by other social science disciplines, and that economics is a more advanced “science,” because there is agreement on a unified (rationalist) theory and a common methodology. On the other hand, it is easy to slit one's throat with Occam's Razor!

Our discussion demonstrates clear divergences in which questions are asked and how they are framed, in units of analysis, and in research methods. Bridge building, in our view, might best proceed through the development of interdisciplinary research projects on a series of common questions to which scholars in different disciplines and with different regional interests could bring distinct insights drawn from their particular epistemological frameworks. How, for example, might anthropologists and legal scholars collaborate in the study of so-called cultural defenses (Coleman 1996; Magnarella 1991; Volpp 1994; Shweder 2003) that often involve new immigrants, and how might the results of this work lead to refinements in theories about migration and change? How might scholars from across a range of disciplines collaborate on a project focused on the financial and health status of undocumented immigrants in several receiving societies with or without government benefits.

Bridge building also entails identifying a common set of dependent and independent variables, so that it is clear what we are trying to explain and what factors we stress in building models to explain some segment of migrant behavior or the reaction of states and societies to migration. In this vein, we propose the following (suggestive) list of dependent and independent variables, broken down by discipline (see Table 1.2). It is important to recognize not only that this is very simplified but also that scholars in some disciplines (history, for example) rarely consider that they are examining single dependent or independent variables.

Clearly, we endorse the call for more cross-national interdisciplinary research projects (Castles 1993; Massey et al. 1998; Favell, chapter 9, this volume), whether at a micro- or a macro-level of analysis. How, for example, are first-generation immigrants differentially incorporated (economically, politically, 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 Japan or Korea? Similarly, how and to what extent are immigrants, their children, and subsequent generations differentially incorporated in a cross-national context? Or how do different policies shape the experiences of forced migrants or asylum seekers in Ireland by contrast with Germany or the United States?

A second topic crying out for interdisciplinary and cross-national examination is the impact (political, economic, social, 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 origin, but the questions asked must be expanded through the participation of those in other disciplines, particularly political science (see Sadiq 2009) and economics. For example, some scholars have already noted how crucial migrants have become for national economies (Guarnizo 1997; Kapur and McHale 2012; Newland and Patrick 2004; Martin, chapter 3, this volume) and processes of development (Hollifield et al. 2006; Castles and Wise 2008; Wise and Covarrubias 2010).

In the destination countries, 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 (e.g. King 2000), and the anthropologists, who frame the questions in relation to ethnicity, the construction of identity, and a sense of belonging (Brettell and Reed-Danahay 2012). One precise example of cross-disciplinary fertilization in this arena is a book edited by Ramakrishnan and Bloemraad (2008) on the civic participation of immigrants that brings together work by political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists, and historians. One of the central debates, emerging largely from within the field of economics but with resonance in law and political science, is between those who see a positive impact of immigration and hence propose an admissionist policy, and those who highlight the negative impact and advocate more restrictionist policy.⁹ Economic models alone do not offer a complete explanation. Getting to the roots of anti-immigrant sentiments and their connection to the way nationals of the receiving society construct their own identities in relation to immigrants should be a prime research agenda for scholars of international migration. Indeed political scientists and sociologists already have an extensive body of work on these topics (see for example Money 1999; Givens 2005; Norris 2005). But they need more input from geographers and anthropologists. Again

TABLE 1.2: MODELING MIGRANT BEHAVIOR AND ITS EFFECTS

Discipline	Dependent Variables	Independent Variables
Anthropology	Migrant behavior and migrant identities, gender relations (emigration, integration)	Social and cultural context, transnational networks
Demography	Sizes of migration flows, degree of integration for individuals and groups, societal cohesion	Kinds of migration policies, contexts of reception, ethnoracial diversity
Economics	Migrant flows and adjustment and macroeconomic impact	Wage/income differentials, demand-pull/supply-push, human capital, factor proportions, structure of the economy and transfer systems
Geography	Migrant decision making	Spatial, environmental, political, cultural, and socioeconomic contexts
History	Migrant experience	Social/historical context
Law	Legal, political, social, and economic treatment of migrants	Law or policy
Political science	Policy outputs (admissionist or restrictionist); policy outcomes (control); political incorporation and civic engagement	Institutions, rights, Interests
Sociology	Migrant behavior (immigration and incorporation)	Networks, enclaves, social capital

it is a question that would be better served by cross-national and comparative research on immigrant reception.

The broader implications of multidisciplinary and comparative approaches for theory are exciting to contemplate, particularly if bridges can be built between deductive and interpretive approaches, between statistical regularities and unique occurrences, and between the economic and structural forces that shape migrant behavior, and the individual agency that operates both harmoniously and disharmoniously in relation to those forces. In his concluding essay, Adrian Favell (chapter 9) challenges migration scholars to think globally and to avoid the tendency to focus narrowly on a single country-case. He laments the dominance of the US case and of American social scientists in the study of migration. He also explains how the organization of migration research in university departments is a constraining factor on truly interdisciplinary work. He strives mightily to square some very difficult social scientific circles, between what he calls naïve positivism and constructivism, arguing instead for what he calls “constructive realism” that “might enable a re-thinking of migration theory . . . and help us re-build a more politically autonomous and scientific form of studying [migration].” He wants to move away from an approach to the study of migration that is wedded to “time and place specific narratives.” In this he is closer to many anthropologists (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002) who reject a “nation-state” centered approach and takes issue with Hollifield and Wong (this volume) who want to give primacy to the state and policy in explaining

international migration. He takes the counterintuitive view that mobility is natural and normal in human history (a point also made by Gabaccia for the *longue-durée*), and that “what is abnormal . . . is the idea that human societies need to construct political borders . . . that constrain . . . spatial mobility.” Not surprisingly, he points to the European Union with its open borders as the way of the future.

NOTES

1. A conceptual distinction is drawn between internal and international migration, the former referring to movement that occurs within national borders (internal migration) and the latter to movement across national borders (emigration or immigration and forced migration). We use the term *migration* somewhat loosely here to refer to international migration, generally the emphasis of all the chapters in this volume. However, from a theoretical perspective it is worth noting that economic theories of migration often apply to internal and international flows (Stark 1991; Martin et al. 2006); and some sociologists, political scientists, demographers, and human geographers prefer the more general term “mobility” to migration (Koslowski 2011; Smith and Favell 2006).
2. Hammar and Tamas (1997: 13) observe that research is “frequently undertaken without consideration or consultation of related work in other disciplines,” and call for more multidisciplinary research endeavors. Similarly, in an edited volume on Mexican immigration to the United States, Suárez-Orozco (1998) calls for more “interdisciplinary dialogue.” An early effort at interdisciplinary dialogue is Kritz et al. (1981).
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. 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 micro-models as causal, while meso-models are processual. Hoerder (1997) offers a slightly different tri-level 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.
5. Caldwell and Hill (1988) have noted a similar “obsession” in other areas of demographic research and have consequently called for more micro approaches. Massey and Durrand (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 on migration.
6. Some examples are Brettell (1995), Hart (1997), Kibria (1993), Gmelch (1992), Olwig (1998), Stack (1996), and several of the chapters in Benmayor and Skotnes (1994a). Yans-McLaughlin (1990) writes about the use of subjective documents in history for similar purposes. See also Brettell (2003).
7. 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.
8. For a contrary view, see Rumbaut (1997).

9. There are those policy analysts 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.

REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard and Jennifer Holdaway. 2013. *The Children of Immigrants at School: A Comparative Look at Integration in the United States and Western Europe*. New York: New York University Press.
- Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Alba, Richard and Mary Waters, eds. 2011. *The Next Generation: Immigrant Youth in Comparative Perspective*. New York: New York University Press.
- Aleinikoff, Alexander, David A. Martin, and Hiroshi Motomura. 2003. *Immigration and Citizenship: Process and Policy*. St. Paul, MN: Thomson/West.
- Bade, Klaus and Myron Weiner. 1997. *Migration Past, Migration Future: Germany and the United States*. Providence/New York: Berghahn Books.
- Baganha, Maria Ioannis. 1990. *Portuguese Emigration to the United States, 1820–1930*. New York: Garland.
- Baily, Samuel L. 1990. “Cross-Cultural Comparison and the Writing of Migration History: Some Thoughts on How to Study Italians in the New World,” in Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, ed., *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, pp. 241–53. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1999. *Immigrants in the Land of Promise. Italians in Buenos Aires and New York City, 1870–1914*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Baily, Samuel L. and Franco Ramella, eds. 1990. *One Family, Two Worlds: An Italian Family’s Correspondence across the Atlantic, 1901–1922*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Bauböck, Rainer. 2012. “Migration and Citizenship: Normative Debates,” in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 594–613. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benmayor, Rina and Andor Skotnes. 1994a. *Migration and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1994b. “On Migration and Identity,” in Rina Benmayor and Andor Skotnes, eds., *Migration and Identity*, pp. 1–18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bjeren, Gunilla. 1997. “Gender and Reproduction,” in Tomas Hammar, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas, and Thomas Faist, eds., *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, pp. 219–46. New York: Berg Publishers.
- Bloemraad, Irene. 2006. *Becoming a Citizen: Incorporating Immigrants and Refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bommes, Michael and Andrew Geddes. 2000. *Immigration and Welfare: Challenging the Borders of the Welfare State*. London: Routledge.
- Borjas, George J. 1985. “Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality and the Earnings of Immigrants,” *Journal of Labor Economics* 3: 463–89.
- . 1987. “Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants,” *American Economic Review* 77: 531–53.
- . 1991. “Immigration and Self-Selection,” in John Abowd and Richard Freeman, eds., *Immigration, Trade and the Labor Market*, pp. 29–76. Cambridge, MA: NBER.

- . 1998 “Immigration and Welfare Magnets,” *NBER Working Paper Series*, no. 6813, pp. 1–32. Cambridge, MA: NBER.
- . 1999. *Heaven’s Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bosniak, Linda. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brettell, Caroline B. 1981. “Is the Ethnic Community Inevitable? A Comparison of the Settlement Patterns of Portuguese Immigrants in Toronto and Paris,” *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 9: 1–17.
- . 1986. *Men Who Migrate, Women Who Wait: Population and History in a Portuguese Parish*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1995. *We Have Already Cried Many Tears: The Stories of Three Portuguese Migrant Women*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- . 2003. “Migration Stories: Agency and the Individual in the Study of Migration,” in Caroline B. Brettell, *Anthropology and Migration: Essays on Transnationalism, Ethnicity, and Identity*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Brettell, Caroline B. and Deborah Reed-Danahay. 2012. *Civic Engagements: The Citizenship Practices of Indian and Vietnamese Immigrants*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brochmann, Grete. 2014. “Scandinavia: Governing Immigration in Advanced Welfare States,” in James F. Hollifield et al., eds., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caldwell, John C. and Allan G. Hill. 1988. “Recent Developments Using Micro-Approaches to Demographic Research,” in John Caldwell, Allan Hill, and Valerie Hull, eds., *Micro-Approaches to Demographic Research*, pp. 1–9. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Campbell, M. 1995. “The Other Immigrants: Comparing the Irish in Australia and the United States,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 14: 3–22.
- Card, David. 2001. “Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and the Local Labor Market Impacts of Higher Immigration,” *Journal of Labor Economics* 19: 22–64.
- Carens, Joseph. 2000. *Culture, Citizenship, and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2013. *The Ethics of Immigration*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, Stephen. 1993. “Migrations and Minorities in Europe. Perspectives for the 1990s: Eleven Hypotheses,” in John Wrench and John Solomos, eds., *Racism and Migration in Western Europe*, pp. 17–34. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Castles, Stephen and G. Kosack. 1973. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, Stephen and Mark Miller. 2009. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castles, Stephen, Ellie Vasta, and Derya Ozkul. 2014. “Australia: A Classical Immigration Country in Transition,” in James F. Hollifield et al., eds., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Castles, Stephen and Raúl Delgado Wise, eds. 2008. *Migration and Development: Perspectives from the South*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Chiswick, Barry. 1978. “The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men,” *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 897–921.
- . 1986. “Is the New Immigration Less Skilled than the Old?” *Journal of Labor Economics* 4: 168–92.

- . 2008. "Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?" in Caroline B. Brettell and James F. Hollifield, eds., *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, 2nd Edition, pp. 63–82. New York: Routledge.
- Chung, Erin A. 2014. "Japan and South Korea: Immigration Control and Immigrant Incorporation," in James F. Hollifield et al., eds., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Coleman, Doriane Lambelet. 1996. "Individualizing Justice through Multiculturalism: The Liberals' Dilemma," *Columbia Law Review* 96: 1093–1167.
- DeSipio, Louis. 1996. *Counting on the Latino Vote: Latinos as a New Electorate*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- . 2012. "Immigrant Participation," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 171–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diner, Hasia. 1983. *Erin's Daughters in America: Irish Immigrant Women in the Nineteenth Century*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 2008. "History and the Study of Immigration: Narratives of the Particular?" in Caroline B. Brettell and James F. Hollifield, eds., *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, 2nd Edition, pp. 31–50. New York: Routledge
- Duleep, Harriet O. and Mark C. Regets. 1997a. "Measuring Immigrant Wage Growth Using Matched CPS Files," *Demography* 34: 239–49.
- . 1997b. "The Decline in Immigrant Entry Earnings: Less Transferable Skills or Lower Ability?" *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 37 (Special Issue on Immigration): 89–208.
- Faist, Thomas. 1997. "The Crucial Meso-Level," in Tomas Hammar, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas, and Thomas Faist, eds., *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, pp. 187–217. New York: Berg Publishers.
- Favell, Adrian. 1998. *Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- FitzGerald, David. 2008. *A Nation of Emigrants: How Mexico Manages Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Foner, Nancy. 1985. "Race and Color: Jamaican Migrants in London and New York City," *International Migration Review* 19: 706–27.
- . 1998. "Towards a Comparative Perspective on Caribbean Migration," in Mary Chamberlain, ed., *Caribbean Migration: Globalised Identities*, pp. 47–60. New York: Routledge.
- . 2000. *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration*. New Haven, CT and New York: Yale University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 2005. *In a New Land: A Comparative View of Immigration*. New York: New York University Press.
- Foner, Nancy and Richard Alba, R. 2008. "Immigrant Religion in the U.S. and Western Europe: Bridge or Barrier to Inclusion?" *International Migration Review* 42 (2): 360–92.
- Foner, Nancy, Jan Rath, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Rogier van Reekum. 2014. *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape*. New York: New York University Press.
- Freeman, Gary P. 1979. *Immigrant Labor and Racial Conflict in Industrial Societies: The French and British Experiences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1995. "Modes of Immigration Politics in Liberal Democratic States," *International Migration Review* 19: 881–902.

- . 1998. *Toward a Theory of the Domestic Politics of International Migration in Western Nations*. South Bend, Ind.: Nanovic Institute, University of Notre Dame.
- Fuchs, Lawrence. 1990. *The American Kaleidoscope: Race, Ethnicity and Civic Culture*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Fussell, Elizabeth. 2012. "Space, Time, and Volition; Dimensions of Migration Theory," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 25–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gabaccia, Donna. 1984. *From Sicily to Elizabeth Street: Housing and Social Change among Italian Immigrants, 1880–1930*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- . 1994. *From the Other Side: Women, Gender and Immigrant Life in the U.S. 1820–1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gabaccia, Donna and Fraser M. Ottanelli. 2001. *Italian Workers in the World: Labor Migration and the Formation of Multiethnic States*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1997. "Toward a Reconciliation of 'Assimilation' and 'Pluralism': The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention," *International Migration Review* 31: 875–92.
- Gardner, Martha. 2005. *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration and Citizenship, 1870–1965*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Givens, Terri E. 2005. *Voting Radical Right in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gjerde, Jon. 1985. *From Peasants to Farmers: The Migration from Balestrand, Norway, to the Upper Middle West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1996. *The Minds of the West: Ethnocultural Evolution in the Rural Middle West, 1830–1917*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Gmelch, George. 1992. *Double Passage: The Lives of Caribbean Migrants Abroad and Back Home*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goldin, Ian, Geoffrey Cameron, and Meera Balarajan. 2011. *Exceptional People: How Migration Shaped Our World and Will Define Our Future*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Green, Nancy. 1997. "The Comparative Method and Poststructural Structuralism: New Perspectives for Migration Studies," in Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen, eds., *Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives*, pp. 57–72. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Guarnizo, Luis Eduardo. 1997. "The Emergence of a Transnational Social Formation and The Mirage of Return Migration among Dominican Transmigrants," *Identities* 4: 281–322.
- Gutiérrez, David G. 1998. "Ethnic Mexicans and the Transformation of 'American' Social Space: Reflections on Recent History," in Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, ed., *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, pp. 309–40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hammar, Tomas, ed. 1985. *European Immigration Policy: A Comparative Study*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammar, Tomas and Kristof Tamas. 1997. "Why Do People Go or Stay?" in Tomas Hammar, Grete Brochmann, Kristof Tamas, and Thomas Faist, eds., *International Migration, Immobility and Development: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, pp. 1–19. New York: Berg Publishers.

- Hanley, Lisa M., Blair A. Ruble and Allison M. Garland. 2008. *Immigration and Integration in Urban Communities: Renegotiating the City*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hanson, Gordon H. 2005. *Why Does Immigration Divide America? Public Finance and Political Opposition to Open Borders*. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Hart, Dianne Walta. 1997. *Undocumented in L.A.: An Immigrant's Story*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc.
- Heisler, Barbara Schmitter. 2008. "The Sociology of Immigration: From Assimilation to Segmented Assimilation, from the American Experience to the Global Arena," in Caroline B. Brettell and James F. Hollifield, eds., *Migration Theory: Talking Across Disciplines*, 2nd Edition, pp. 83–112. New York: Routledge.
- Hill, Allan G. 1997. "'Truth Lies in the Eye of the Beholder': The Nature of Evidence in Demography and Anthropology," in David I. Kertzer and Tom Fricke, eds., *Anthropological Demography: Toward a New Synthesis*, pp. 223–47. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hochschild, Jennifer L. and John H. Mollenkopf. 2009. *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hochstadt, Steve. 1981. "Migration and Industrialization in Germany, 1815–1977," *Social Science History* 5: 445–68.
- Hoerder, Dirk. 1997. "Segmented Macrosystems and Networking Individuals: The Balancing Function of Migration Processes," in Jan Lucassen and Leo Lucassen, eds., *Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives*, pp. 73–84. Bern: Peter Lang.
- . 2002. *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hollifield, James F. 1986. "Immigration Policy in France and Germany: Outputs versus Outcomes," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 485(1): 113–28.
- . 1992. *Immigrants, Markets, and States: The Political Economy of Postwar Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1997. *L'immigration et l'état-nation à la recherche d'un modèle national*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- . 1998. "Migration, Trade, and the Nation-State: The Myth of Globalization," *UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs* 3(2): 595–636.
- . 2004. "The Emerging Migration State," *International Migration Review* 38: 885–912.
- . 2005. "Sovereignty and Migration," in Matthew J. Gibney and Randall Hansen, eds., *Immigration and Asylum from 1900 to the Present, Volume Two*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- . 2010. "American Immigration Policy and Politics: An Enduring Controversy," in Gillian Peele et al., eds., *Developments in American Politics* 6. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2012. "Migration and International Relations," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 345–79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hollifield, James F., Philip L. Martin, and Pia Orrenius, eds., 2014. *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Hollifield, James F., Pia M. Orrenius, and Thomas Osang. 2006. *Migration, Trade and Development*. Dallas, TX: Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.
- Hollifield, James F. and Carole J. Wilson. 2011. "Rights-Based Politics, Immigration, and the Business Cycle: 1890–2008," in Barry R. Chiswick, ed., *High-Skilled Immigration in a Global Labor Market*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.
- Horowitz, Donald and Gérard Noiriel. 1992. *Immigrants in Two Democracies: French and American Experience*. New York: New York University Press.
- Huber, Gregory A. and Thomas J. Espenshade. 1997. "Neo-Isolationism, Balanced-Budget Conservatism, and the Fiscal Impacts of Immigrants," *International Migration Review* 31: 1031–54.
- Ireland, Patrick. 1994. *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jacobson, David. 1996. *Rights across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 1998. *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Joppke, Christian, ed. 1998. *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1999. *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kapur, Devesh and John McHale. 2012. "Economic Effects of Emigration on Sending Countries," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 131–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kastoryano, Riva. 1997. *La France, l'Allemagne et leurs immigrés: négocier l'identité*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Kertzer, David I. and Tom Fricke. 1997. "Toward an Anthropological Demography," in David I. Kertzer and Tom Fricke, eds., *Anthropological Demography: Toward a New Synthesis*, pp. 1–35. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kertzer, David and Dennis Hogan. 1989. *Family, Political Economy, and Demographic Change: The Transformation of Life in Casalecchio, Italy, 1861–1921*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kibria, Nazli. 1993. *Family Tightrope: The Changing Lives of Vietnamese Americans*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- King, Desmond. 2000. *Making Americans: Immigration, Race and the Diverse Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *The Liberty of Strangers: Making the American Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kivisto, Peter and Thomas Faist. 2007. *Citizenship: Discourse, Theory, and Transnational Prospects*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Klotz, Audie. 2013. *Migration and National Identity in South Africa*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koslowski, Rey, ed. 2011. *Global Mobility Regimes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kritz, Mary M., Charles B. Keely, and Silvano M. Tomasi, eds. 1981. *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research in International Population Movements*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Law, Anna O. 2010. *The Immigration Battle in American Courts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Leeds, Elizabeth. 1984. "Salazar's 'Modelo Económico': The Consequences of Planned Constraint," in Thomas C. Bruneau, Victor M. P. da Rosa, and Alex Macleod, eds., *Portugal in Development: Emigration, Industrialization, the European Community*, pp. 13–51. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Legomsky, Stephen. 1987. *Immigration and the Judiciary: Law and Politics in Britain and America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lucassen, Jan, and Leo Lucassen, eds. 1997. *Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Mageean, Deirdre M. 1991. "From Irish Countryside to American City; The Settlement and Mobility of Ulster Migrations in Philadelphia," in Colin G. Pooley and Ian D. Whyte, eds., *Migrants, Emigrants and Immigrants: A Social History of Migration*, pp. 42–61. London: Routledge.
- Magnarella, Paul J. 1991. "Justice in a Culturally Pluralistic Society: The Cultural Defense on Trial," *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 19: 65–84.
- Marshall, T. H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Martin, Philip L. 2014. "The United States: The Continuing Immigration Debate," in James F. Hollifield et al., eds., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Martin, Philip, Manolo Abella, and Christianne Kuptsch. 2006. *Managing Labor Migration in the Twenty-First Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1999. "International Migration at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century: The Role of the State," *Population and Development Review* 25: 303–22.
- Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kovaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal," *Population and Development Review* 19: 431–66.
- . 1994. "An Evaluation of International Migration Theory; The North American Case," *Population and Development Review* 20: 699–751.
- . 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. and Jorge Durand, eds. 2004. *Crossing the Border: Research from the Mexican Migration Project*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Miller, Kerby. 1985. *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, Mark J. 1981. *Foreign Workers in Western Europe: An Emerging Political Force*. New York: Praeger.
- Mincer, Jacob. 1978. "Family Migration Decisions," *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 749–73.
- Moch, Leslie Page and Louise A. Tilly. 1985. "Joining the Urban World: Occupation, Family and Migration in Three French Cities," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 25: 33–56.
- Money, Jeannette. 1999. *Fences and Neighbors: The Geography of Immigration Control*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Montello, D. R. 2001. "Scale in Geography," in N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes, eds., *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, pp. 13501–504. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Motomura, Hiroshi. 2014. *Immigration Outside the Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- National Research Council. 1997. *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, DC: Commission on Immigration Reform and National Academy of Sciences.

- Newland, Kathleen and Erin Patrick. 2004. *Beyond Remittances: The Role of the Diaspora in Poverty Reduction in their Countries of Origin*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Norris, Pippa. 2005. *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olwig, Karen Fog. 1998. "Constructing Lives: Migration Narratives and Life Stories among Nevisians," in Mary Chamberlain, ed., *Caribbean Migration: Globalised Identities*, pp. 63–80. New York: Routledge.
- Orrenius, Pia M. and Madeline Zavodny. 2012. "Economic Effects of Migration: Receiving States," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 105–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Park, Robert Ezra. 1930. "Assimilation, Social," in Edwin Seligman and Alvin Johnson, eds., *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, p. 281. New York: Macmillan.
- Park, Robert Ezra and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 1994. *Immigrants and Taxes: A Reappraisal of Huddle's "The Costs of Immigration"*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and D'Vera Cohn. 2011. *Unauthorized Immigrant Populations: National and State Trends*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., D'Vera Cohn and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. 2013. "Population Decline of Unauthorized Immigrants Stalls, May Have Reversed," Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends Project, Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Perlmann, Joel and Roger Waldinger. 1997. "Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present—A Reconsideration," *International Migration Review* 31: 893–922.
- Pew Research Center. 2013. *Second-Generation Americans: A Portrait of the Adult Children of Immigrants*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Portes, Alejandro, ed. 1996. *The New Second Generation*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 1997. "Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities," *International Migration Review* 31: 799–825.
- Portes, Alejandro and Josh DeWind, eds. 2004. "Conceptual and Methodological Developments in the Study of International Migration," *International Migration Review* 38: special issue.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 1990. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530: 74–96.
- Price, Marie and Lisa Benton-Short, eds. 2008. *Migrants to the Metropolis: The Rise of Immigrant Gateway Cities*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Ramakrishnan, S. Karthick and Irene Bloemraad, eds. 2008. *Civic Hopes and Political Realities; Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rath, Jan, ed. 2002. *Unravelling the Rag Trade: Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Seven World Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reitz, Jeffrey. 2014. "Canada: New Initiatives and Approaches to Immigration and Nation-Building," in James F. Hollifield et al., eds., *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Rothman, E. S. and Thomas J. Espenshade. 1992. "Fiscal Impacts of Immigration to the United States," *Population Index* 58: 381–415.
- Rudolph, Christopher. 2006. *National Security and Immigration: Policy Development in the United States and Western Europe since 1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. 1997. "Assimilation and Its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality," *International Migration Review* 31: 923–60.
- Russell, Sharon Stanton. 1986. "Remittances from International Migration: A Review in Perspective," *World Development* 41: 677–96.
- Sadiq, Kamal. 2009. *Paper Citizens: How Illegal Immigrants Acquire Citizenship in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. *The Global City*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1996. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sayler, Lucy E. 1995. *Law Harsh as Tigers: Chinese Immigrants and the Shaping of Modern Immigration Law*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Schmitter, Barbara E. 1979. *Immigration and Citizenship in West Germany and Switzerland*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Schuck, Peter H. 1998. *Citizens, Strangers, and In-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Schuck, Peter H. and Rogers Smith. 1985. *Citizenship without Consent*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shweder, Richard. 2003. "The Moral Challenge in Cultural Migration," in Nancy Foner, ed., *American Arrivals: Anthropology Engages the New Immigration*, pp. 259–94. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Simon, Julian. 1984. "Immigrants, Taxes and Welfare in the United States," *Population and Development Review* 10(1): 55–69.
- Simon, Patrick. 2005. "The Measurement of Racial Discrimination: The Policy Use of Statistics," *International Journal of Social Science* 183: 9–25.
- Singer, Audrey, Susan W. Hardwick, and Caroline B. Brettell, eds. 2008. *Twenty-First Century Gateways: Immigrant Incorporation in Suburban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Skerry, Peter. 2000. *Counting on the Census: Race, Group Identity, and the Evasion of Politics*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Smith, Michael Peter and Adrian Favell. 2006. *The Human Face of Global Mobility: International Highly Skilled Migration in Europe, North America and the Asia-Pacific*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Smith, Robert. 1997. "Transnational Migration, Assimilation, and Political Community," in Margaret E. Crahan and Alberto Vourvoulias-Bush, eds., *The City and the World: New York's Global Future*, pp. 110–32. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Smith, Rogers. 1997. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sowell, Thomas. 1996. *Migration and Cultures: A World View*. New York: Basic Books.
- Soysal, Yasemin N. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stack, Carol. 1996. *Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stark, Oded. 1991. *The Migration of Labor*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

- Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M. 1998. *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Swierenga, Robert. 1981. "Dutch International Migration Statistics, 1820–1880: An Analysis of Linked Multinational Nominal Files," *International Migration Review* 15: 445–70.
- Thomson, Mark and Maurice Crul. 2007. "The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7): 1025–1041.
- Tichenor, Daniel J. 2002. *The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Torpey, John. 2000. *The Invention of the Passport*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasileva, Katya. 2012. "Nearly Two-Thirds of the Foreigners Living in EU Member States are Citizens of Countries outside the EU-27." *Eurostat: Statistics in Focus* 31/2012.
- Volpp, Leti. 1994. "(Mis)Identifying Culture: Asian Women and the 'Cultural Defense,'" *Harvard Women's Law Journal* 17: 57–101.
- Waldinger, Roger and David FitzGerald. 2004. "Transnationalism in Question," *American Journal of Sociology* 109(5): 1177–95.
- Weber, Max. 1949. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Free Press.
- Weil, Patrick. 1998. "The State Matters: Immigration Control in Developed Countries," New York: United Nations, Department of Social and Economic Affairs, Population Division.
- Weiner, Myron. 1987. "International Emigration and the Third World," in William Alonso, ed., *Population in an Interacting World*, pp. 173–200. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1995. *The Global Migration Crisis*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Weiner, Myron and Tadashi Hanami. 1998. *Temporary Workers or Future Citizens? Japanese and U.S. Migrations Policies*. New York: New York University Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration, and the Social Sciences," *Global Networks* 2(4): 301–34.
- Wise, Raúl Delgado and Humberto Márquez Covarrubias. 2010. "Understanding the Relationship between Migration and Development: Toward a New Theoretical Approach," in Nina Glick Schiller and Thomas Faist, eds., *Migration, Development and Transnationalization: A Critical Stance*, pp. 142–75. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Wong, Tom K. Forthcoming. *Rights, Deportation, and Detention in the Age of Immigration Control*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Wyman, M. 1993. *Round Trip to America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia. 1990. "Metaphors of Self in History: Subjectivity, Oral Narrative, and Immigration Studies," in Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, ed., *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, pp. 254–90. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zhou, Min. 2012. "Segmented Assimilation and the American Experience of Asian Immigrant Children," in Marc R. Rosenblum and Daniel J. Tichenor, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration*, pp. 383–409. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ziolek-Skrzypczak, Magdalena. 2013. "Integrating Immigrant Youth: Transatlantic Perspectives," Migration Information Source, September.
- Zolberg, Aristide R. 1981. "International Migration in Political Perspective," in Mary M. Kritz, Charles B. Keely, and Silvano M. Tomasi, eds., *Global Trends in Migration: Theory and Research in International Population Movements*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Zolberg, Aristide R. 2006. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., A. Suhrke, and S. Aguayo. 1986. "International Factors in the Formation of Refugee Movements," *International Migration Review* 20: 151–69.