

Introduction

IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES

Nancy Foner, Rubén G. Rumbaut, and Steven J. Gold

FOUR decades into a new era of mass immigration, it has become commonplace to observe that the United States is undergoing its most profound demographic transformation in a century. Much less evident is the extent to which the social scientific study of immigration is itself being transformed in the process. This volume seeks to provide a glimpse of these dual transformations—indeed, it is itself a multidisciplinary product of the changes now under way. It reflects the work both of established scholars who have directed the Committee on International Migration of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) since its formation in 1994 and, especially, of younger scholars from a wide range of disciplines who were awarded postdoctoral and predoctoral research fellowships under the SSRC's International Migration Program. The latter were chosen from a highly competitive national field of 263 applicants in 1996 and 1997. The fellows whose papers are included in this book were among the two dozen who presented their research at a SSRC conference held at Columbia University in June 1998.

Surely, the sheer magnitude of the phenomenon of immigration, whether measured in terms of its size, composition, or spatial concentration, is impressive. The immigrant stock population of the United States today numbers 55 million people—27 million immigrants and 28 million U.S.-born children of immigrants. That figure is already one-fifth of the total national population. If today's immigrant stock were to form a country, it would rank in the top 10 percent in the world in the size of its population—about twice the size of Canada and roughly the size of the United Kingdom, France, or Italy (see Rumbaut 1998).

This newest immigration is not only, by definition, of recent vintage, but it is also overwhelmingly non-European in national origin. Of the 27 million foreign born in the United States today, fully 60 percent

arrived between 1980 and 1998, and an overwhelming 90 percent since 1960. Of those post-1960 immigrants, the majority (52 percent) have come from Latin America and the Caribbean, with Mexico alone accounting for 28 percent of the total. Another 29 percent have come from Asia and the Middle East. The Filipinos, Chinese, and Indochinese alone account for 15 percent of the total, or as much as all those born in Europe and Canada combined.

As in the past, today's newcomers are heavily concentrated in particular areas of settlement. Fully one-third of the immigrant stock population of the United States resides in California, and another third resides in Florida, Texas, and the New York–New Jersey region, with the concentrations denser still within metropolitan areas in these states. In Los Angeles County, for instance, a preponderant 62 percent of the area's 9.5 million people are of immigrant stock, as are 54 percent of New York City's and Orange County's, 43 percent of San Diego's, and 72 percent of Miami's population (Rumbaut 1998).

Unlike the last great wave of European immigration at the turn of the twentieth century, which was halted by the passage of restrictive legislation in the 1920s and by the back-to-back global cataclysms of the Great Depression and World War II, the current flows show no signs of abating. No draconian legislation that would drastically limit immigration is in sight. Moreover, inasmuch as immigration is a network-driven phenomenon and the United States remains the premier destination for a world on the move, the likelihood is that United States-bound immigration will continue for many years to come.

The rapid growth of this emerging population has led to a burgeoning research literature and an intensified public debate about the new immigration and its manifold impacts on American society. Virtually unnoticed by comparison has been the impact on American social science as it tries to grasp and grapple with the complexity of the subject. The papers in this volume, which address that interconnection, are organized into two parts. The focus of part I, "Studying Immigration," is not on the immigrants themselves but on research about them; these papers deal with various disciplinary perspectives that define the field, the social origins and intellectual orientations of immigration scholars themselves, and some critical reflections on future research needs. Part II, "Studies of Immigration," presents seventeen selected papers from a new generation of immigration researchers, the research fellows of the SSRC's International Migration Program.

Studying Immigration

Part I begins with a paper by Rubén Rumbaut that explores the social bases of the field of immigration studies itself. Rumbaut argues that the

field will be advanced by making immigration research the object of systematic scrutiny and by analyzing it from the vantage of the sociology of knowledge. Studying immigration in the United States has been, in essence, a century-long affair, beginning in the first decades of the twentieth century, during a time of heavy European immigration in which nativist and racist controversies were prevalent among commentators on "the immigration problem." In this early period, the emphasis was on the causes of immigration and on the full spectrum of the consequences of incorporating a mass migration of diverse strangers. The middle of the century saw a four-decade-long hiatus in mass immigration, during which the focus of immigration studies shifted to the processes of assimilation of a second and third generation and, after World War II, increasingly to issues of race and ethnic relations.

A third generation of scholarship can be said to span the newest era of mass immigration: paralleling the growth of immigration itself, this new era of research started out tentatively in the 1970s, expanded in the 1980s, and exploded in the 1990s into the growth industry it has become today. Because the study of immigration is socially and historically grounded, it is not surprising that today, as in earlier periods, the direction and emphasis of research are partly a reaction to, and have developed in conversation with, the dominant issues of the day. Thus, for example, the pressures of hegemonic Americanization at home and (for a time) isolationism abroad that stamped the early decades of the twentieth century contrast sharply with the era of hegemonic Americanization abroad and a domestic context of civil rights and ethnic reaffirmation in which today's researchers came of age intellectually.

Unlike the nascent scholarship on immigration at the turn of the past century, the present era has seen many immigrants themselves become leading scholars of immigration in certain disciplines, and the children and especially grandchildren of immigrants are prominent immigration scholars in others. In his opening contribution to this volume, Rumbaut reports some revealing empirical findings from the first National Survey of Immigration Scholars (NASIS), which provide valuable clues about their social origins and research orientations. The survey is based on a large sample of scholars, at various stages in their careers, who are immigration specialists in a wide variety of disciplines, principally sociology, history, anthropology, political science, and economics. The sample also includes substantial numbers of other immigration researchers whose doctoral training was in psychology, education, public health, urban planning, public policy, area studies, ethnic studies, religious studies, languages, literature, and other disciplines. In effect, the NASIS study paints a comparative cross-disciplinary portrait of those scholars who are most responsible for producing our scholarly knowledge base. It analyzes the extent to which that knowledge is produced

by ethnic insiders or outsiders, and—by examining changes by gender, generation, ethnicity, and research focus over time—the extent of the transformation of the field in the present era.

The special commentaries that then follow, in chapter 2—on sociology, anthropology, history, and political science—offer a view of the perspectives of the different disciplines. They are supplemented by Josh DeWind's overview of the Social Science Research Council's activities in the immigration area. This is not the first time a SSRC committee has looked at immigration—an earlier committee, in the 1920s, was created to study immigration in the aftermath of the enormous turn-of-the-century influx. The earlier committee was also multidisciplinary in makeup; it drew its members from the fields of anthropology, psychology, economics, political science, and statistics. Yet there are important differences from the past. The Social Science Research Council itself had only just been created in 1923, and the committee on immigration—called the Committee on Scientific Aspects of Human Migration—was, as Josh DeWind and his colleagues have observed elsewhere, part of the effort by these disciplines to establish their scientific credentials, independent of efforts at social reform. The fledgling SSRC must have seen in the study of immigration and the integration of immigrants into American society a promising opportunity to demonstrate the importance of social science research as something more than fields of knowledge derived from the natural sciences (Hirschman, DeWind, and Kasinitz 1999, 5). Today, of course, the social sciences are firmly established as legitimate fields of study, and within each discipline there is a body of research and theory addressing immigration. In this context, one of the major goals of the present-day SSRC migration committee, as DeWind notes, has been to integrate this diverse body of scholarship and to promote the “theoretical coherence of immigration studies as an interdisciplinary subfield within the social sciences.”

As a step in this direction, four members of the SSRC International Migration Committee offer their reflections on immigration research in their particular disciplines: sociology, anthropology, history, and political science. Each of the social science disciplines, of course, has distinct methods, emphases, and orientations that influence the interpretation, analysis, and conduct of immigration research. Sociologists studying immigration maintain a continuing interest in assimilation, residential segregation, occupational specialization, marginality, and ethnic and racial relations. Anthropologists, drawing on their research in cultures outside the United States, have emphasized migrants' links with their home societies. Political scientists have been concerned with explaining immigration policy, the political incorporation of migrants, citizenship, and the meaning of the nation-state, and historians, looking back to

America's past, have explored assimilation processes, the transplantation of immigrant cultures to America, and, increasingly, the role of race in newcomers' adaptation. Whereas once immigration history focused almost exclusively on the study of European immigrants, a growing number of historians are now studying Latin American and Asian immigrants.

There are differences, too, in the degree to which immigration to the United States is central to the concerns of the various social science disciplines. Immigration, as Mary Waters observes, is at the very core of American sociology—a legacy from the days of the Chicago School of sociology, with its studies of early-twentieth-century immigrants and their effects on American cities. It is not surprising that immigration has been a major topic in American history for many years, given its critical role in the making of the United States. It is noteworthy, however, that the first paper by a leading historian to propose a research agenda for establishing “the significance of immigration in American history,” written by Arthur Schlesinger Sr., was published in 1921 in the *American Journal of Sociology*, the official organ of the Chicago School of sociology (Schlesinger 1921). Immigration actually became a field of specialization in American history in the period from 1926 to 1940, according to Philip Gleason's (1998) account; the field, in his words, “erupted” in the late 1960s to such an extent that by the 1970s, 1,813 doctoral dissertations in history focused on immigration or ethnicity. In anthropology, immigration to the United States is only beginning to develop as a legitimate topic of study, now that, as Nancy Foner notes, the people studied on their home turf end up living next door. In political science, according to Aristide Zolberg, immigration has, until recently, evoked little or no interest.

There is also variation in the degree to which scholars in the different disciplines are self-consciously reflecting on the role that their fields can, and will, play in understanding and studying the recent immigration. Whereas sociologists accept, as a matter of course, that immigration will be a central topic—indeed, as Waters notes, sometimes they even wonder why other disciplines are stepping on sociological turf—many anthropologists are concerned with carving out a distinctive anthropological approach to the new immigration now that a growing number are turning their attention to populations in the United States. In history, several contributors to a recent forum on immigration history, published in the *Journal of American Ethnic History*, speak of a field in crisis, torn between historians who have analyzed nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century European immigration and those studying immigration from Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean in the past and present, and also between historians who define themselves as im-

migration historians and others who count themselves as ethnic studies scholars (see Gjerde 1999a; Sánchez 1999).

Although immigration researchers are, inevitably, influenced by their particular disciplines, they are increasingly crossing disciplinary boundaries and drawing on theoretical insights—and empirical data—from fields other than their own as they tackle particular problems, from the causes of international migration to what happens to the children of immigrants in the schools and the economy. At the same time, an interdisciplinary field of immigration studies is very much in the making. Sociological approaches to assimilation, for example, including the more nuanced concept of segmented assimilation, are influencing scholars studying immigrant incorporation, whatever their discipline. The same can be said of work on ethnic entrepreneurship; researchers in a variety of disciplines who study immigrant businesses cite and use models elaborated by sociologists to understand why particular groups go into business and why some are more successful than others. Transnationalism, a concept first elaborated by anthropologists to understand how—and why—present-day immigrants maintain ties with their homelands, has been taken up by sociologists, historians, and political scientists and is being examined and further developed from their own disciplinary perspectives. Historical studies of “whiteness” that bring out the contingent nature of race and analyze the “whitening” process among earlier European immigrants are helping to shape work on race and ethnicity among today’s newcomers. Finally, researchers exploring immigration policy and the role of the state are gaining insights from the emerging political science literature on immigration, membership, and citizenship. Indeed, a recent call for the historiography of immigration law draws heavily on work by legal scholars and political scientists (Lee 1999).

The mix of disciplines in immigration studies, as Mary Waters notes, is creative and empowering, leading scholars to ask new questions and see old problems in new ways and to go beyond what are sometimes the limited concerns of their own fields. The anthropologist’s emphasis on sending communities, the historian’s on the contingencies of historical development, and the political scientist’s on the way states shape the choices available to individuals are all, she says, correctives to the sometimes narrow focus of sociological thinking on immigration. In history, to give another example, George Sánchez has recently written that the future of immigration history depends on the field’s ability to incorporate insights on race, nation, and culture that have primarily developed outside its own disciplinary boundaries (Sánchez 1999, 68). If, as Alejandro Portes notes, theoretical advances arise

out of the ability to reconstitute a perceptual field and to identify connections not previously seen, then the interdisciplinary thrust of so much immigration research may be particularly productive as it brings new perspectives to bear on familiar issues, incorporates insights from different fields, and promotes the kind of “distance from reality” that Portes argues is important “in order to identify patterns lost at close range” (1997, 802, 803).

At the same time, efforts to create and sustain an interdisciplinary field of immigration studies raise some difficult questions and issues. On an intellectual level, there is the risk that scholars trained to study present-day immigration from a multidisciplinary perspective will lose the benefits that come from being steeped in the traditions and founding works of a particular discipline. This is something that worries some historians of immigration. The turn among recent graduate students to theory developed outside of history has led to concerns, among some historians, that classic works in immigration history are being neglected to the detriment of the field (Gjerde 1999b). There are also the hard realities of the hierarchy of disciplines and career concerns. As Waters points out, some methods and disciplines are privileged over others; and managing a career in a discipline—publishing and getting tenure, most importantly—when a scholar’s work strays outside of disciplinary boundaries is a professional challenge in its own right.

Waters also alerts us to the importance of creating more linkages between immigration and the study of race, a theme that emerges in Sánchez’s paper as well. Moreover, as Sánchez reminds us, immigration studies, past and present, need to consider the full range of groups arriving in every period. Just as historians need to remember that Asian and Latin American and Caribbean migration was occurring in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, so, too, social scientists studying the present need to concern themselves with European immigration to the United States in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Finally, the establishment of new academic fields and departments—ethnic studies, women’s studies, urban studies, American studies, city and regional planning, and the like (with which several of this volume’s authors are affiliated)—have already begun to integrate existing approaches to create new disciplinary identities.

Although the huge influx of immigrants to the United States in the last four decades has stimulated an outpouring of research in all the social science disciplines, much remains to be done. Chapter 3, by Herbert Gans, concludes this first section by identifying six main “holes” or areas of needed immigration research. Three of these concern processes of immigrant incorporation: the persistent question of selectivity in em-

igration and immigration, which should be addressed much more systematically; intergenerational differences in adaptation, particularly between the first, 1.5, and second generations; and macro-level economic, political, and societal factors shaping those patterns of adaptation. Three other areas involve the field of immigration scholarship itself: insider versus outsider roles among immigration researchers, the need for more empirical research on the choices (and omissions) of topics and groups that draw the attention of immigration scholars, and the role of funding agencies in shaping the field of study—including the SSRC's International Migration Program itself.

As Gans admits, his research holes are mainly sociological holes. Clearly, there are additional anthropological, historical, economic, and political science holes that will need to be filled by future immigration researchers. A host of policy questions await further study in political science, as does the increasingly important role that immigrants are playing—and will continue to play—in U.S. politics: as immigrants become citizens (and voters) with the potential to determine the outcome of local, state, and even national elections; as foreign-born elected officials and political activists grow in number; and as immigrants become members of important political blocs and interest groups. Among the areas that await further careful study in anthropology are the dynamics of culture creation and invention among immigrants, cultural conflicts between immigrant and mainstream values, and the consequences of transnational connections for sending, as well as receiving, communities. In history, there are gaps to be filled in our understanding of the histories of Asian and Latin American immigrants in the United States; moreover, models and theories developed by social scientists to study America's latest arrivals may shed new light on the experiences of European immigrants in the past. Within disciplines—and across them—immigration research will also benefit from a range of comparisons that can offer new insights into the immigrant experience, among them comparisons of immigrants in the United States past and present and of immigration to the United States and other major receiving countries.

Finally, as to Gans' call for studies of immigration scholarship itself, this is largely unexplored territory. The massive immigration of the past few decades is, as we have emphasized, not only transforming American society and the immigrants themselves but is also transforming the way immigration is studied—that is, how researchers are trying to make sense of the very transformations immigration has created. To do this full justice, we need studies of the way knowledge is developed about immigration's causes and consequences, within and across disciplines, in concrete sociohistorical and intellectual contexts.

The Shifting Contexts of Migration Research

In examining the ways immigration research has been recently transformed, it is worthwhile to reflect upon some of the shifting contexts that have brought about these changes. The unprecedented immigration that the United States has witnessed since the 1960s—in both numbers and diversity of origin—is obviously a major factor. The Cold War was associated with the arrival in the United States of more than two million refugees from Cuba, Southeast Asia, Central America, Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, and other countries as well as the expansion of military and political links with several source countries of migration. A related event, the collapse of the Soviet bloc, reduced the prominence of Marxist thought among both activists and academics while expanding the reach of global capitalism into regions in which its influence had previously been restricted (Antonio 1990).

Within the United States, the civil rights and feminist movements reframed American notions of social membership, economic opportunity, equality, and assimilation. Today's migrants thus enter a society transformed by the expansion of opportunities for minority group members and women and also by patterns of industrial restructuring that have drastically altered the economic environment. The huge influx of Third World immigrants itself has begun to change, in very basic ways, our notions about race and the structure of America's racial hierarchies. Migration scholarship has also been influenced by social movements that have championed a wide array of policy agendas from multiculturalism and affirmative action, through selective inclusion, to exclusionary nativism and restrictive welfare reform.

If these developments in the larger society have shaped migration scholars' perspectives on immigration and ethnic relations, so too have changes in their home turf—the academy, which has been perhaps the focal venue for debates about the meaning of immigration and ethnicity in American society. Many of society's most articulate and vehement spokespersons on topics of ethnic change and immigrant incorporation have been academics, and much campus activism has been directed at increasing resources for and representation of migrant and ethnic minority constituencies. Recent immigrants from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia, as well as Africa, the Middle East and Europe, are now among our nation's leading scholars (as well as athletes, artists, physicians, scientists, and entrepreneurs). Women of all ethnic groups are increasingly visible as authors of migration research in the social sciences and as part of higher education generally. A number of the most contro-

versarial policy efforts directed toward ethnic and gender inequalities have occurred on campuses—ranging from culturally sensitive speech codes to the outright banning of affirmative action programs in some of the nation's largest and most ethnically diverse state university systems. Immigrant and ethnic faculty and students have been major actors in these debates.

Finally, the writings of scholars have contributed significantly to deliberations about the meaning of immigration in a nation of immigrants. In addition to the myriad reports that have attempted to assess the impact of immigrants upon American culture and economy, scholars have begun to alter our basic understandings of the relations between immigrant communities and both the larger receiving society and their sending countries.

For example, before new understandings of ethnic community emerged, fostered by the ethnic revivals of the 1970s, both scholars and the wider public generally accepted as an article of faith that "American" culture was superior to that of migrant groups. Hence, the faster migrants abandoned their traditional customs and behavioral patterns in favor of those of the Anglo-American middle class, the better. Since that time, a wide range of studies has shown that immigrant and ethnic communities have the ability to provide their members with a variety of social, psychological, and economic benefits—ranging from business ownership and increased earnings to success in schools, protection from discrimination, moral support, and even superior physical and mental health.

These many changes in the field of migration studies have generally redirected its outlook and orientation, but certain contemporary conditions have also fostered the resuscitation of several approaches closely associated with the Chicago School's studies in the thirty years preceding World War II. These include the growing emphasis on community-based, qualitative studies in sociology and history, a revival of concern with the concept of assimilation in several fields, and an increased awareness of the importance of enduring ties to the country of origin (often in discussions of transnationalism). Fields such as sociology and history reveal a renewed interest in culture and identity, often explored through qualitative methods at the community level. Assimilation, a taboo word as recently as the late 1980s, is now a major topic in sociology, political science, education, and other fields. The concern with assimilation is visible in the work of senior scholars like Gans and Waters as well as that of the younger generation of social scientists represented here, including Jane Junn, Greta Gilbertson, and Audrey Singer. Just as sociologists and political scientists have devoted additional attention to issues of culture, community, and identity, anthropologists,

who have always regarded these topics as central to their discipline, have become increasingly attuned to international and national political and economic contexts that frame their research settings. They are now as likely to discuss global capitalism or the world system as scholars in fields with a longer tradition of research on political economy.

Accordingly, a degree of convergence has occurred as topics and methods once associated with a single field are now shared by several disciplines. Chapters in this volume by Jennifer Lee, Jennifer Hirsch, Peggy Levitt, and Gaspar Rivera-Salgado each offer multidimensional analyses that emphasize contextual factors as well as immigrants' cultural patterns in trying to explain new social arrangements and organizations that arise within and beyond the United States.

New understandings of context and solidarity are being developed in a large body of work on the viability of ethnic self-help, the importance of ethnic niches, and an awareness of migrants' ties with the country of origin. Informed by theoretical understandings of ethnicity, race, and nationality as socially constructed rather than primordially determined, contemporary scholars are much more aware of the subtle, complex, and shifting array of social identities and sources of solidarity and conflict within ethnic and migrant populations than were earlier generations. For example, in their chapters in this book, Rafael Alarcón, Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, and Fred Krissman all report on Mexican migrants in the United States. Yet because of the distinct occupational, class, and ethnic characteristics of the three groups studied—Silicon Valley scientists, indigenous migrants, and migrant farmworkers—their subjects have little else in common. Nationality *per se* recedes into the background as a focal topic, and a more subtle analysis of class, ethnicity, and economic context takes its place. In general, as a consequence of the immense diversity found in contemporary immigrant experiences, scholars tend to specialize in certain types of immigration or locations of origin and settlement.

The younger generation of scholars, who are themselves often of immigrant origin, have brought a new level of concern with issues of belonging, identity, and social access. Having grown up after the modern civil rights and feminist movements, they are especially sensitive to issues of discrimination and marginalization among the immigrants they study, whatever their social class or educational level. For example, Jane Junn, Rafael Alarcón, and Catherine Ceniza Choy all ask to what extent skilled newcomers are stereotyped, blocked by "glass ceilings," or incorporated into forms of political participation that may be biased against them.

New perspectives on discrimination are reflected in recent studies of "whiteness," noted by Sánchez to be an issue of special interest to

historians. By demonstrating that “white” ethnics were at one time considered to be “nonwhite,” scholars such as Nancy Carnevale, Howard Markel, and Alexandra Minna Stern apply today’s more critical models of racial and ethnic exclusion to an earlier period, demonstrating the extent to which racial discrimination once affected groups that are now accepted as members of the majority. At the same time, by exploring the selective incorporation of formerly racialized groups, these scholars reveal that racial classification continues to be a powerful basis of inequality in American society, even as our society increasingly accepts the social and ultimately political, rather than purely biological, basis of racial classification.

In sum, biographical, sociohistorical, and academic factors contribute to the evolution of immigration studies. Although some disciplinary differences and concerns have been retained, movement toward disciplinary convergence can be seen. Perhaps the most immediate evidence of this is the fact that a far greater number of disciplines than ever before—including several new fields—now regard the study of international migration among their integral concerns.

The topics and issues identified in this book will surely continue to take new forms because migrant populations, academic affairs, social history, political economy, legal developments—and the social and cultural origins of the scholars who track them—are not static phenomena. Yet it is our hope that this volume will contribute to our understanding of important transformations in migration research and help to identify important directions in its future development.

Studies of Immigration

The second part of this volume seeks to exemplify the diversity of a field in process of transformation by turning to a selection of quite distinct papers written by SSRC postdoctoral and dissertation research fellows. The papers illustrate a number of important new developments taking place in immigration research. The young researchers have been intensely influenced by recent changes in society, international migration, and intellectual life. They tend to be less immersed than senior scholars in the academic approaches of earlier periods, and, as Rubén Rumbaut’s contribution makes clear, compared with the recent past, they include an unprecedented number of foreign-born and women scholars.

New Groups

Many of the populations, both large and small, that concern the new generation of immigration scholars were barely present in the United

States before the 1970s. These include groups that are the focus of papers in this book, from large populations like Dominicans, South Asians, Koreans, and Filipinos to small ones about whom little is known, like Nuer refugees and Japanese Peruvians. Others, such as Mixtec Mexicans, may have been in the United States in the past but were invisible to the classification schemes of an earlier era.

In addition, the social characteristics and legal status of contemporary migrants are unlike those prevalent earlier in the century. In recent decades, large numbers of highly skilled and educated migrants have entered the country, including the Indian and Mexican computer specialists, Korean entrepreneurs, and Filipino nurses described in the papers by Rafael Alarcón, Jennifer Lee, and Catherine Ceniza Choy, respectively. Furthermore, two of the largest and most controversial categories of recent entrants—refugees and the undocumented—were of far less prominence and interest before 1970.

Research Themes

The concern that animates the largest number of chapters in part II is social membership. As Gans and Waters both remark in their papers, despite its enduring relevance in some fields, the theory of straight-line assimilation has been deservedly challenged. As a consequence, contemporary migration scholars have generated a new and more complex awareness of the nature of group identity, national membership, racial divisions, and multiculturalism.

Several papers address these topics by examining the web of links that immigrants maintain between countries of origin and settlement. Conventionally, social scientists have assumed that authorized presence in a country, especially when legitimated through naturalization, resolves major questions about national membership. More recent scholarship challenges this conclusion, suggesting that identity, citizenship, and presence within a nation-state can and often do vary independently. In fact, whereas scholars once assumed that becoming naturalized proved a migrant's loyalty to the United States, today's researchers understand that naturalization may be motivated precisely by the desire to facilitate easy travel to another country.

Addressing the question of national membership and the role of the nation-state, Peggy Levitt, Gaspar Rivera-Salgado, and Fred Krissman variously illustrate the permeability of national borders and the benefits that individuals, corporations, social movements, and organizations often receive by accessing extranational resources. Elaborating on this process, Ayumi Takenaka, Greta Gilbertson and Audrey Singer, Steven Zahniser, and Gallya Lahav conclude that social, legal, and economic factors continue to make transnational existence a convoluted and diffi-

cult one. Furthermore, although ties to multiple nations offer new options, they also serve to further complicate matters of national membership for migrants and nation-states alike.

Another dimension of group membership around which recent studies of migration converge involves racial classification and the social construction of whiteness. For an earlier generation of scholars, full assimilation into the white, middle-class, English-speaking majority was seen as inevitable for the descendants of immigrants, although not for the immigrants themselves. Today's immigration scholars are questioning the inevitability of this process, seeing inclusion as selective, relational, and competitive and dependent on a wide range of factors, including the social, political, and economic concerns of the time and place. Focusing on the fit between the social characteristics of migrant groups and their contexts of reception—including race, health, language, location of entry and residence, gender, culture, social class, government policies, patterns of nativism, and discrimination—they show that migrants are first classified and then selectively offered or denied access to opportunities and membership in the larger society according to prevailing classification schemes.

For some groups, classification is the outcome of direct investigation by American authorities. Describing the medical practices used by immigration officials at several ports of entry early this century, Howard Markel and Alexandra Minna Stern argue in their chapter that the way immigrants were treated was a consequence of regional labor needs and eugenics-based beliefs about immigrants' origins. These factors, in turn, contributed to the medical treatments immigrants received and the rates of rejection they encountered. Similarly, Nancy Carnevale delineates the role literacy and English competence played in the racial classification of Italian and other European immigrants during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Other chapters deal with more subtle processes of classification and incorporation. These center on migrants' ability to merge with existing American social institutions. Jane Junn explores the extent to which various minority groups have been incorporated into the American majority-rule political system. Ingrid Gould Ellen examines the ways immigrants of Asian and Latin American origins fit into racially segregated neighborhoods.

One of the burgeoning areas of social science research since the 1970s has concerned women, gender, and families. Before that time, social scientists focused on male wage earners and neglected immigrant women. If discussed at all, immigrant women were generally depicted as limited to the domestic sphere. Similarly, little attention was devoted to immigrant families and gender relations. Recent scholars, however, have

devoted considerable attention to gender and family issues among migrants. As Rubén Rumbaut notes, the concern with women, gender, and families mirrors the increasing representation of women among migration scholars. Although women made up only 8 percent of migration researchers who received doctorates before 1965, they account for more than 60 percent of migration scholars who have received their doctorates since 1995.

Among the chapters concerned with gender issues, those by Catherine Ceniza Choy and Kathy Kaufman explore the experience and societal impact of migrant women in view of the demand for gendered workers like nurses and domestics. Taking a different approach, Jon Holtzman and Jennifer Hirsch describe the way in which the social, economic, and legal influence of American gender norms transforms the interactions of immigrant men and women in the country of settlement and, as Hirsch notes, extends to the country of origin as well.

A final topic that animates many of these projects is interest in economic incorporation. Before the 1970s, much of the research on immigrants' economic lives was rooted either in the individualistic assumptions of neoclassical economics or in cultural determinism. Since that time, scholars have developed more complex and contextualized understandings of economic incorporation, noting the importance of collective resources, labor markets shaped by class, ethnicity, gender, and legal status, and the influence of the United States on countries of emigration.

The chapters by Catherine Ceniza Choy, Fred Krissman, Peggy Levitt, Rafael Alarcón, and Steven Zahniser all describe the ways that U.S. political and economic interests contribute to the arrival of migrant workers, and several chapters show the dynamic processes involved in the establishment of niches for foreign-born engineers and scientists (Alarcón), nurses (Choy), private-household workers (Kaufman), farmworkers (Krissman), and small shopkeepers (Lee). Jennifer Lee considers the ways that immigrant and ethnic groups compete over the market for goods and services in urban ghettos, and Kathy Kaufman seeks to explain why immigrants become heavily enmeshed in private household work in some cities but not others.

New Research

A closer look at the particular themes developed in the papers by the SSRC postdoctoral and dissertation research fellows that comprise part II of this volume brings out the sorts of problems, processes, and concerns that are the focus of a new generation of immigration scholars. Their papers have been organized in the following thematic triptych.

The first set of chapters examines issues of political economy, membership, and the state. In chapter 4, historians Stern and Markel (the latter is also a physician) draw upon historical data about the health screening and treatment of immigrants in four points of entry into the United States: the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and the Mexican and Canadian borders. Their study reveals the ways in which labor needs and racial stereotypes intersected with medical knowledge to shape the nature of migrants' incorporation into the United States. Historian Choy (chapter 5) studies a skilled migrant group, Filipino nurses, tracing the presence of this gendered labor force to colonial education policies developed early this century and the U.S. Exchange Visitor program of the 1950s and 1960s. Focusing, in chapter 6, on the impressive level of political mobilization and cooperation displayed by Oaxacan Mixtec farmworkers in Mexico and California, sociologist Rivera-Salgado works to refine models of transnational community to incorporate the importance of networks and identities that existed before migration. Sociologists Gilbertson and Singer examine the complex patterns of connection that an extended, multigenerational family of Dominicans maintain between the United States and their country of origin as they explore decisions about naturalization, in chapter 7. In so doing, they reveal the various factors that frame migrants' views of citizenship and the reasons that dual citizenship, when available, appeals to many. Political scientist Junn utilizes several Texas voting surveys to assess the entrenched models of political participation across ethnic and nationality lines in chapter 8. Given the growing diversity of the American population, she asks if alternative means of political involvement will enhance newcomers' engagement in the democratic process. Comparing the United States and Europe, political scientist Lahav, in chapter 9, examines the current role of the nation-state, as well as that of nonstate actors, in regulating migration. In contrast to recent scholarship that sees a decline in the power of the nation-state, her research indicates that states continue to exert significant influence, sometimes through nonstate actors.

The second series of chapters concerns migration, economic incorporation, and the market. Economist Zahniser (chapter 10) applies a logit model to quantitative survey data to test a range of hypotheses about patterns of migration between Mexico and the United States. In explaining migration behavior and its determinants, he finds several intriguing differences for subgroups defined in terms of gender, legal status, and family composition. Anthropologist Krissman, in chapter 11, uses data culled during ethnographic fieldwork in California and Washington state to demonstrate the process by which U.S. employers access ethnic networks to recruit Mexican villagers to labor in agribusiness.

Unlike most scholars of migration who focus on unskilled laborers, urban planner Alarcón's research concerns highly skilled Indian and Mexican migrants working in Silicon Valley. His comparative case study, in chapter 12, presents the life histories and job trajectories of workers in one of the world's most technologically advanced and globally integrated industries. In so doing, he contributes to our understanding of an economically vital but understudied facet of human migration. Drawing on a growing body of research and theory on ethnic economies, sociologist Lee compares the small businesses owned by three ethnic groups—Jews, Koreans, and African Americans—in inner-city New York and Philadelphia (chapter 13). Her interviews and fieldwork reveal that the three groups specialize in distinct economic activities and, hence, limit competition. However, because their groups have higher rates of entrepreneurship, Jews and Koreans have access to greater levels of coethnic economic cooperation than is available to African Americans. Comparing two cities with small and large foreign-born populations but similar demand for domestic help, sociologist Kathy Kaufman determines that the presence of many immigrant women depresses wages for workers in this sector and permits employers to select household help according to their own ethnic stereotypes (chapter 14).

The third, and final, set of chapters examines issues of ethnicity, race, gender, and community. Anthropologist Hirsch did fieldwork with Mexican immigrant women in Atlanta and then traveled to their villages of origin, where she interviewed their mothers, sisters, and sisters-in-law. In this way, she was able to contemplate the ways in which generation and location shape women's opportunities and their relations with men. Based on her research, she argues in chapter 15 that social scientists should stop trying to determine only the effects of migration on women and instead consider how migration, generation, and other factors fashion what couples seek from their relationships. Anthropologist Holtzman conducted fieldwork among Sudanese refugees in Minnesota. In chapter 16, he analyzes the ways that American gender norms and views of marriage, and the U.S. criminal justice system, reorder power relations among Nuer men and women. Historian Carnevale discusses the importance of literacy and competence in the English language in views about the social acceptability of Italian and other European immigrants to the United States in the early twentieth century (chapter 17). Ellen, whose doctorate is in public policy, compares patterns of residential segregation between native whites and blacks and between Asian and Latino immigrants, in chapter 18. She finds that whites are leaving locations of migrant settlement faster than they are neighborhoods with a black presence and concludes that although issues of racial avoidance may play a part in this process, demographic and

economic patterns also have an important impact. Sociologist Takenaka reports in chapter 19 on fieldwork she conducted on three continents (in North America, South America, and Asia) to examine the experience of Peruvians of Japanese ancestry. Upon returning to Japan from Latin America, they find themselves regarded as foreigners rather than countrymen. Accordingly, whether in Japan, Peru, or the United States, they learn to emphasize and deploy a hybrid identity reflecting their unique communal and cultural heritage. Finally, in chapter 20, sociologist Peggy Levitt investigates three Boston migrant populations—Dominicans, Brazilians, and Asian Indians—who maintain links with their countries of origin. She examines their distinct array of home-country links and United States–based resources to consider the effect of home-country affiliation on migrants’ relationship to the host society.

Conclusion

These chapters, with their widely different disciplinary styles, theoretical concerns, and research methods, stand in marked contrast to what an earlier era of immigration studies produced. The work collected in this book serves at once the functions of describing and analyzing substantive social, cultural, economic, and political aspects of the complex transformations wrought by today’s immigration while offering an augur of what a new generation of immigration researchers, now coming of intellectual age, is helping to create.

References

- Antonio, Robert J. 1990. “The Decline of the Grand Narrative of Emancipatory Modernity: Crisis or Renewal in Neo-Marxian Theory?” In *Frontiers of Social Theory: The New Synthesis*, edited by George Ritzer. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gjerde, Jon. 1999a. “New Growth on Old Vines—the State of the Field: The Social History of Immigration to and Ethnicity in the United States.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18(4): 40–65.
- . 1999b. “Response.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18(4): 151–57.
- Gleason, Philip. 1998. “Crevecoeur’s Question: Historical Writing on Immigration, Ethnicity, and National Identity.” In *Imagined Histories*, edited by Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hirschman, Charles, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind. 1999. Introduction to *Handbook of International Migration*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Lee, Erika. 1999. "Immigrants and Immigration Law: A State of the Field Assessment." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18(4): 85–114.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1997. "Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities." *International Migration Review* 31(4): 799–825.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. 1998. "Coming of Age in Immigrant America." *Research Perspectives on Migration* 1(6): 1–14.
- Sánchez, George. 1999. "Race, Nation, and Culture in Recent Immigration Studies." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18(4): 66–84.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. 1921. "The Significance of Immigration in American History." *American Journal of Sociology* 27(1): 71–85

