Chapter 3
Transnationalism

Abstract This chapter reviews the origins of the concept of transnationalism and contemporary research on the relation between immigrant integration and transnational activities.

The first part of the chapter discusses different approaches to the concept of transnationalism and how the concept became popular in the social sciences in the last two decades, by drawing on the work of Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Christina Szanton Blanc, Thomas Faist, as well as Ludger Pries, and the work of Alejandro Portes and colleagues-to name but a few. It describes the sometimes heated debate on the nature and empirical relevance of the phenomenon in question and how, as the field matured, its meaning changed from the alleged discovery of a new phenomenon to a new perspective on social phenomena, among which migration is but one.

The second part of the chapter reviews the available quantitative studies on the scope of transnational involvement among contemporary immigrants and on the relation between immigrant integration and transnational involvement. Previous research indicates that cross-border activities and ties, in particular those that are not cost intensive, are rather common among immigrants, while deep transnational involvement and transnational modes of living are rare. It also appears that immigrant integration and transnational activities are not incompatible processes, at least for the first generation. However, these results may well be context-specific, as dependable data on transnational involvement of the general immigrant population have been available only for the United States.

The following chapter on transnational migration is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the origins of transnationalism as a scientific concept. The second part reviews empirical and theoretical work on transnational involvement among immigrants and how their transnational involvement relates to their integration into the receiving society. By now we have witnessed 20 years of research on transnational migration and the field has certainly matured. Many of the enthusiastic and sometimes perhaps unwillingly exaggerated accounts of transnationalism have been refined in a more reasoned way (see e.g. Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). At the same time, the

transnational perspective on migration has been firmly established within the social sciences. Still, important questions remain unanswered and this particularly holds for the relation of transnational involvement and immigrant integration.

Before discussing the concept of transnationalism and its origins in depth, it is necessary to develop an understanding of what transnationalism refers to. There has been considerable confusion regarding a precise definition, not least because there is a sizeable overlap between transnationalism and alternative existing conceptions and a certain ambiguity resulting from competing definitions (Portes 2003, p. 875; Kivisto 2001, p. 550). Some of the aspects that transnational migration studies focus on have already been studied from the perspective of globalization, international relations, and cultural diffusion (Sassen 1991; Meyer et al. 1997). Various different terms have been proposed in the literature. We find suggestions to study transnational migration, transnational migration circuits, transnational communities, transnational fields, transnational social spaces, transnational networks, transnational activities, transnational practices, and transmigrants, to name only the most prominent. For the moment, let us apply a straightforward definition of transnationalism that focuses on individual actions: transnational activities are border-crossing activities, not necessarily conducted by immigrants.

3.1 Approaches to Transnationalism

Despite its relatively young age, there are many different approaches to transnationalism. The maturation of the field of study has brought forth some excellent review articles as well as full volume books on this subject (see e.g. Kivisto 2001; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Portes 2003; Vertovec 2009; Khagram and Levitt 2008; Kivisto and Faist 2010). Obviously, these reviews are all guided by different rationales in their classifications of the approaches to the study of transnationalism. Many publications (see e.g. O'Flaherty et al. 2007; Kivisto 2001) draw a line between the research conducted by Alejandro Portes and colleagues (Portes 1996a, b, 1999, 2001, 2003; Portes et al. 1997, 1999, 2007, 2008; Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, 2005; Landolt 2001) and the research of Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Christina Szanton Blanc (Basch et al. 1994; Glick Schiller 1999; Glick Schiller et al. 1995; Szanton Blanc et al. 1995).[1] Besides the work of Portes and colleagues and the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues, Faist (Faist 1998, 2000a, b; Faist and Gerdes 1999; Kivisto and Faist 2010) and Pries (e.g. Goebel and Pries

---

[1] The use of the term Portes and collaborators or colleagues is not intended to downplay the work of Carlos Dore-Cabral, Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, José Itzigsohn, Silvia Giorguli-Saucedo, William Haller, Patricia Landolt, Cristina Escobar, Renelinda Arana, Alexandria Walton Radford, and all other contributors. Instead, it is only used to increase the readability of this chapter. The work of Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Christina Szanton Blanc will also be referred to as the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues. Similarly, this does not mean that Nina Glick Schiller's contributions outweigh in any sense those of Linda Basch or Christina Szanton Blanc. For a better readability of the text I will refer to their work as the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues.

2002; Pries 1996, 1997a, b, 1998, 2001a, 2005b) have both extensively contributed to the development of transnationalism as a scientific concept and its dissemination in the social sciences. They are therefore also included in the review.

The differentiation between these four approaches on transnationalism serves a heuristic purpose in tracing the origins of transnationalism as a scientific concept and the (ongoing) debate the field is involved in. While it is easy to find differences in approach and research programs, it is also easy to find similarities. Before proceeding, two comments on the following review are due. First, any review is bound to be selective in one way or the other. It concentrates more on some works than on others. There are certainly many other important contributions to the study of transnationalism beyond the four that are discussed here (e.g. Levitt 2001; Levitt et al. 2003; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Vertovec 1999, 2004, 2009). This work often draws on them, although they are not included in the review as independent approaches. More than anything else, this is due to limited space. Second, we have to consider that transnational migration studies have grown and changed rapidly in the last 20 years. This applies to the field as a whole but also to the work of specific scholars. In the face of new knowledge and new empirical evidence, scholars have changed their description of transnational migration and its aspects. Accordingly, the following review should be understood as a review on how transnationalism was established as a field of inquiry, concentrating mostly on early approaches.

In the following, the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues will be discussed first, followed, secondly, by a review of Portes and colleagues' perspective on transnationalism, and thirdly, by a discussion of Faist's and finally of Pries' work on this subject. These four approaches differ in a number of aspects, for example, with regard to their understanding of the causes and consequences of transnationalism, the nature of transnationalism, its compatibility with existing approaches to the study of migration and integration, and the relation of current international migration to international migration in history—all of which will be covered in the review.

3.1.1 Transmigrants and Transnational Social Fields: The Work of Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton Blanc

Transnationalism was made popular in the social sciences by a group of American-based anthropologists, Nina Glick Schiller and her colleagues Linda Basch and Christina Szanton Blanc (Basch et al. 1994; Glick Schiller 1999; Glick Schiller et al. 1995; Szanton Blanc et al. 1995). In their work, transnationalism refers to the increased interlinkage between people all around the world and the loosening of boundaries between nation-states. It denotes political, economic, social, or cultural processes that extend beyond the borders of a particular nation-state (Glick Schiller 1999, p. 96). In the specific context of migration, transnationalism describes "the process by which immigrants forge and sustain simultaneous multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement" (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 48). In this much cited definition transnationalism refers to a process

of individual actions that link the country of origin and the country of reception. Essential to the idea of transnationalism is its border-crossing or border-transcending nature: Immigrants are assumed to be simultaneously involved in two or more countries across borders. This multiple inclusion covers all aspects of life, be they familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, or political (Szanton Blanc et al. 1995, p. 684). Their theoretical work is grounded in ethnological observations of a new type of circular migration, focusing on immigrants who regularly oscillate between sending and receiving societies. Because the authors see this as a new phenomenon—at least in their early work—they propose to use the term 'transmigrant' to distinguish immigrants who are transnationally involved from those who are not (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 48).

Transmigrants and Transnational Social Fields Transmigrants are thus defined as persons who migrate and yet establish and maintain stable relations that link the country of origin and the country of reception. What is more, transmigrant's "daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders [. . .]" (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 48). Some similarities to previous concepts, in particular sojourners and diaspora migrants, may come into mind. However, according to Glick Schiller (1999, p. 96), the concept of transmigrants differs from previous ones. Diasporas are understood best as "dispersed populations who attribute their common identity, cultural beliefs and practices, language, or religion to myths of a common ancestry but whose common heritage is not linked to a contemporary state." Accordingly, migrants belonging to diasporas differ from transmigrants in two important aspects. First, the collective identity that members of a diaspora share is not necessarily based on an existing nation-state. Second, members of a diaspora do not necessarily live lives which span across national borders. While transmigrants are pluri-local, members of a diaspora can be quite uni-local. Transmigrants also differ from sojourners, because besides being engaged in the country of origin, they are also integrated into the economy, political institutions, localities, and daily life in the receiving country (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 48). According to this understanding, sojourners are not as much integrated into the receiving society, as their stay is of a more temporary nature.[2]

By virtue of the transmigrants' simultaneous involvement in two or more countries across borders, they create a multiplicity of networks that connect the sending with the receiving society. Glick Schiller and colleagues propose the concept of transnational social fields to describe these stable interconnections. While transnational social fields are occasionally mentioned in the earlier work (see e.g. Basch et al. 1994, p. 29), the concept becomes prominent especially in later works (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, p. 1009). The clearest outline of this concept can probably be found in Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004). Accordingly, transnational social fields are to be understood as a set of multiple interlocking networks across national borders through

---

[2] This differentiation between transmigrants and the other types of (im)migrants seems to disappear in later works (see e.g Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006, p. 8).

which ideas, practices, and resources are exchanged, organized, and transformed (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, p. 1009).[3]

Causes of Transnationalism Transmigrants and transnational social spaces are, according to Glick Schiller and her colleagues, products of the current structuring of the global economy. They offer a structural, and in part Neo-Marxist, explanation which attributes the emergence of transnational migration to the restructuring of global capital (see e.g. Szanton Blanc et al. 1995, p. 684; Basch et al. 1994, pp. 30–34, 228–233). In particular, the authors identify three core mechanisms which together have given rise to transnational migration. First, the global restructuring of capital has caused conditions in sending and receiving countries to deteriorate, thus stripping migrants of a "secure terrain of settlement" (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50). Second, adverse reception conditions nowadays await immigrants in the receiving societies (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50, 228). And third, current nation-state building politics of sending and receiving countries simultaneously create loyalties toward both countries (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50). What does this mean? With respect to the first point, Glick Schiller et al. (1995, p. 50) argue that today all parts of the world have been integrated into a single system of production, investment, communication, coordination, staffing, and distribution. All regions in the world are interconnected by this mode of production. At the same time, capital is channeled into key regions, especially cities, leaving peripheral regions of the world stripped of the infrastructure, education and health services (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50). The large-scale indebtedness and economic retrenchment of the sending countries and the associated deterioration of living standards cause persons to leave the periphery and seek paid labor in the core regions and cities. In short, the division of the world into core and periphery (see also: Wallerstein 2005) induces persons living in the periphery to sell the labor on a global market.

However, the receiving context is in many instances not favorable, which brings us to the second point. Much of the labor migration of previous decades was spurred by economic growth and accompanied by the possibility of a relatively quick economic assimilation in the receiving country. Currently, as the authors argue (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50), immigrants are more and more faced with limited economic possibilities in the countries of reception, and even if they become economically integrated they still find themselves racialized and discriminated (compare also the account of immigrant integration in pluralist frameworks as discussed in Chap. 2). At the same time, and this refers to the third point, many sending countries start to reclaim their expatriate populations, by constructing themselves as "deterritorilized nation-states" (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 50, 52), which encompasses, for instance, granting dual citizenship and voting rights. To sum up, the global capitalistic economy creates labor migration, with immigrants following the streams of capital. Once in the receiving society, however, immigrants face adverse economic and

---

[3] Although the social field concept was originally coined by Kurt Lewin (see e.g. Lewin 1951), Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004, p. 1009) relate their concept to that of social fields proposed by Pierre Bourdieu (see e.g. 1987, 1989).

social conditions, making full integration into these new societies either not possible or not desirable. At the same time, they are provided with new opportunities to remain members of their sending country. Taken together, these conditions create (structural) opportunities and motives for transnational migration.

Then and Now   Since transnationalism is seen as a natural byproduct of the present structuring of the global economy, it is clearly conceived of as a qualitatively new phenomenon—at least in the early work of Glick Schiller and colleagues (Basch et al. 1994; Glick Schiller 1999; Glick Schiller et al. 1995; Szanton Blanc et al. 1995). A new phenomenon, of course, requires new theoretical tools to be adequately described and understood. Conventional theories on migration and immigrant integration conceive of migration as a unidirectional process, in which immigrants uproot themselves, leave their home country behind, and face the difficult and painful process of becoming integrated (or assimilated) into the new society (Glick Schiller et al. 1995, p. 48). In the face of transnational migration, such a bipolar conception of the migration process can no longer satisfactorily capture contemporary migration. Because conventional theories concentrate on the integration of immigrants in the receiving society, they miss an important part of the picture, namely frequent cross border movements and connections. Consequently, conventional theoretical frameworks are not adequately endowed to explain transnational migration. The concentration on national societies and in particular on the receiving society stems from what Glick Schiller and Levitt (Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006) call "methodological nationalism." Methodological nationalism assumes that the nation-state (and national society) is the natural social and political form in the contemporary world (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a, p. 302). This perspective naturalizes the nation-state and presupposes a container model of society, which "does not capture, adequately or automatically, the complex interconnectedness of contemporary reality" (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, p. 1006). As a consequence, frameworks which are located within methodological nationalism are based on an implicit meta-theoretical assumption that prevents these frameworks from grasping processes outside the national containers.

3.1.2   Transnational Activities: The Work of Portes and Colleagues

Many assumptions and implications of the work of Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc were empirically untested. This applies foremost to the scope of transnational involvement among contemporary immigrants. In the above depicted work, we are inclined to believe that being transnationally active is a widespread and even dominant aspect of contemporary migration. A very important first step to assess the scope of transnational involvement among contemporary immigrants was the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP), conducted by Portes and colleagues (Portes 1996a, b, 1999, 2001, 2003; Portes et al. 1997, 1999, 2002, 2007, 2008; Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, 2005; Landolt 2001).

Table 3.1 Examples of transnational activities

Field of action	Activities
Economic	Border-crossing entrepreneurial activities
	Conducting trade with country of origin
	Transfer of money or goods to country of origin (remittances)
	Investment in real-estate in country of origin
Political	Member of (political) organization in country of origin
	Member in (political) organization related to country of origin
	Participating in politics related to country of origin
	Contributing (financially) to organizations in country of origin
Socio-cultural	Frequent visits of friends or family in country of origin
	Frequent contacts with friends or family in country of origin
	Member of social organization in country of origin

Up to today it remains the only large-scale empirical study which was explicitly conducted to study transnationalism. Its results are still highly cited when it comes to providing estimates of the scope of transnational activities of immigrants and the relation of transnational activities and immigrant integration (Vertovec 2009; see e.g. Kivisto and Faist 2010).

Transnational Activities   Portes and colleagues focus on individual immigrants' border-crossing activities. Among the first contributions of the CIEP is its classification of transnational activities. In particular, transnational activities are classified into three categories: socio-cultural activities, political activities, and economic activities. Table 3.1 gives an overview and specific examples of these forms of transnational activities. Socio-cultural transnational activities are defined as activities "[. . .] that involve the recreation of a sense of community that encompasses migrants and people in the place of origin. Socio-cultural transnationalism concerns the emergence of practices of sociability, mutual help, and public rituals rooted in the cultural understandings that pertain to the sense of belonging and social obligations of immigrants" (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, p. 768). Political transnational activities encompass electoral and non-electoral activities that are aimed at influencing conditions in the sending country (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1223). In particular, "[t]ransnational electoral participation includes membership in a political party in the country of origin, monetary contributions to these parties, and active involvement in political campaigns in the polity of origin. Transnational non-electoral politics includes membership in a hometown civic association, monetary contributions to civic projects in the community of origin, and regular membership in charity organizations sponsoring projects in the home country" (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1223). Finally, transnational economic activities encompass all economic activities that cross borders, such as sending remittances or transnational entrepreneurship. The latter, which refers to self-employed immigrants whose business (success) depends on regular travels and contacts with the sending country (Portes et al. 2002, p. 284), takes a prominent position within the research of Portes et al. (Portes et al. 2002).

Such a classification is helpful when it comes to specifying and potentially delimiting the object of inquiry. Nevertheless, it is ideal-typical and thus should rather

serve heuristic purposes. Empirically, the different types of border-crossing activities are likely to overlap. For instance, it seems rather difficult to maintain a strict differentiation between socio-cultural and political activities in the country of origin, as participating in politics of the country of origin may go hand in hand or even be identical with socio-cultural activities there. Guarnizo et al. (2003, p. 1223) conceptualize political transnational involvement as encompassing non-electoral activities, such as membership in hometown civic associations and monetary contributions to these associations. In contrast, Itzigsohn and Giorguli Saucedo (2002, p. 767) include these activities in the realm of socio-cultural transnational involvement. It is apparent that both realms are overlapping and that being a member of charity organizations in the country of origin can be motivated both by political interests as well as by the intention to recreate a sense of community which spans across borders. In this sense, the distinction between these two forms of transnational activities is rather analytical, while their empirical correspondences are likely to be overlapping.

Causes of Transnationalism Compared to the work of Glick Schiller and her colleagues, Portes and his colleagues call for more caution in theorizing and assessing the causes, the scope, and the consequences of immigrants' transnational involvement. While Glick Schiller and colleagues, based on their ethnographic observations, do not hesitate to infer that transnational involvement is omnipresent among contemporary immigrants, Portes et al. (1999, p. 223) scrutinize this by drawing on Merton's (1987) necessary conditions for establishing new phenomena for scientific inquiry: (a) the process in question involves a significant portion of the relevant persons, (b) the process in question possesses a certain stability over time and is not exceptional and fleeting, and (c) the content of this process is not captured by some pre-existing concept. Thus, Portes et al. (1999) leave open the possibility that transnationalism is an academic construct which does not find an empirical counterpart.

Portes and collaborators (Portes 1999, p. 467; Portes et al. 1999, pp. 223–224) see changes and innovations in technologies of mass transportation and communication as the crucial condition for transnationalism to emerge. These "space- and time-compressing" technologies enable immigrants to readily cross borders, easily follow the events in the country of origin, and maintain close relations across borders. Moreover, the establishment and maintenance of networks across borders is a necessary condition for transnationalism (Portes et al. 1999, p. 224).[4] Yet, these are but a set of conditions that only specify antecedent conditions for transnational involvement. Consequently, "[a] first step in answering these questions [why immigrants are transnationally active] is to note that transnational activities must be in the interest of those that engage in them since, otherwise, they would not invest the considerable time and effort required" (Portes 1999, p. 469). As Portes (1999, p. 464; 2003, pp. 879–880) observes, while most immigrants have access to these means of communication and transportation, there is considerable variance in the extent to which they are transnationally active. In order to understand why some immigrants

---

[4] The second point seems problematic, as one can argue that border-crossing networks are not a prerequisite but a consequence of transnational activities.

are transnationally active and others are not, we have to examine the conditions in the context of reception as well as the context of origin. First, in line with the work on segmented assimilation theory, Portes (1999, p. 464; 2003, p. 880) stresses that the ethnic group in which an immigrant is embedded plays a crucial role in providing opportunities for transnational involvement. The form and scope of transnational involvement depends strongly on the ethnic groups' resources, such as experience with border-crossing trade (Portes 1999, p. 464). Moreover, immigrants, who are geographically dispersed in the country of reception, are less likely to engage in transnational activities, whereas regionally clustered immigrants, who live in dense ethnic communities, are more likely to engage in these activities. Ethnic communities accordingly can nourish transnational engagement (Portes 2003, p. 880). Second, the general attitude that immigrants are confronted with is likely to impact their motivation for transnational engagement. Portes (1999, p. 466; 2003, p. 880) points out that hostile conditions in the country of reception can bring about "reactive ethnicity" and with it an array of transnational activities. "At the grass-roots level, economic transnationalism offers an alternative to some immigrants and their home country counterparts against low-wage dead-end jobs; political transnationalism gives them voice that they otherwise would not have; and cultural transnationalism allows them to reaffirm their own self-worth and transmit valued traditions to their young" (Portes 1999, p. 469). In this case, transnational involvement can be understood as a reaction to potentially unfavorable conditions in the receiving country. If the conditions of reception are more favorable, then any transnational activities will be a mere "linear extension" of the immigrants' interest to remain in contact with their country of origin (Portes 1999, p. 466). The work of Portes and colleagues has a stronger micro-sociological focus, in which the reconstruction of individual motives and opportunities is an integral part of any explanation of transnational activities among immigrants.

Then and Now Not only do Portes and his colleagues depart in their theoretical focus from the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues, they also disagree on the question of the phenomenon's novelty. Portes (2001, p. 183) and Portes et al. (1999, p. 224) point out that precursors of contemporary transnationalism have existed for a long time. Return migration as well as visits to the country of origin have always taken place among labor migrants. Most historic precursors of transnationalism took the form of diasporas, such as trade diasporas or political diasporas (Portes et al. 1999, p. 225). The authors mention Russian Jews fleeing the Tsar, Armenians fleeing Turkish oppression, and the Spanish citizens fleeing from the fascist regime, building a huge Spanish diaspora (Portes et al. 1999, pp. 224–225). At this point it furthermore becomes obvious that Portes and colleagues see continuities between past and present migration, since they do not draw a distinction between diasporic and transnational activities, as opposed to Glick Schiller and colleagues (see e.g. Glick Schiller 1999, p. 96). Referring to Curtin (1984) and Pirenne and Hasley (1980 [1925]), Portes et al. (1999, p. 225) call attention to early and even medieval examples of trade diasporas. These were communities of merchants who settled abroad and became integrated into the local society while preserving a collective identity as members of a trade diaspora,

maintaining relationships to the places of origin, and regularly traveling back and forth. However, in contrast to present day transnationalism, historical precursors of political diasporas and trade diasporas were an exceptional phenomenon. Only a small portion of the very affluent immigrants could engage in these time and resource intensive activities (Portes et al. 1999, p. 225).

Contemporary transnationalism differs from its historical precursors, since the opportunities to be transnationally active are very different today. Means of mass transportation and communication are readily available, even to less well-off immigrants, and the global economy is more interconnected than ever before (Portes et al. 1999, pp. 224–226). Thus, while Portes (Portes 1999, 2001, 2003) and Portes et al. (1999) clearly point to continuities in transnational migration, they agree with other scholars that due to technological innovations there are also vast differences—if only in scope and scale. With respect to the relation of transnational involvement and immigrant integration into the receiving society, Portes and colleagues discuss several possibilities. They point out that—and in this they agree with other scholars of transnationalism—older theories of immigrant integration do not account for substantial back-and-forth movements between the country of origin and the country of reception (Portes et al. 1999, p. 228). Conventional theories of immigrant integration equated successful adaptation with successful integration (or assimilation) into the receiving society (Portes et al. 1999, p. 229). Transnational involvement might offer an alternative path, potentially opening up new adaptation possibilities for immigrants and their offsprings (Portes et al. 1999, p. 229; Portes 2001, p. 188). In particular, four possible scenarios are discussed. First, transnationally active immigrants might eventually return to their country of origin. Second, transnational activities might accompany and support integration into the receiving society. Third, transnationally active immigrants might remain stable in the transnational field, while their offsprings become assimilated into the receiving society. And fourth, transnationally active immigrants might pass these practices on to their offsprings. While Portes et al. stress that these are possibilities and that it is too early to judge which will become empirically relevant, they state that "it seems clear that they can transform the normative assimilation story, with major consequences for both sending and receiving countries" (Portes et al. 1999, p. 229).

3.1.3   Transnational Social Spaces I: The Work of Faist and Colleagues

A yet different conception of transnationalism was put forth by Thomas Faist (1998, 2000a, b; Faist and Gerdes 1999), namely that of transnational social spaces. It shares some similarities with the concept of transnational fields as found with Basch et al. (1994, p. 24), but Faist develops the concept much further. Akin to the above depicted work of Glick Schiller and colleagues, Faist (2000b, p. 19) promotes to distinguish between different types of migration and thus migrants. In particular,

we find a differentiation between return-migration, circular migration and transnational migration. How do these forms of migration differ from one another and from transnational migration? Return-migration, although it ends with the return to the country of origin, does not necessarily imply any transnational activities during the stay in the country of reception. Circular migration "[...] is characterized by a frequent movement between two or more places, such as in seasonal labour migration. Circular migrants are different from transmigrants: the latter are persons who live in either the country of emigration or destination, and commute back and forth between the two locations. However, this is not the case of circular migrants. Rather it pertains to life-periods or a whole life among categories such as hypermobile businessman" (Faist 2000b, p. 19).

Transnational Social Spaces In face of the interconnectedness of sending and receiving country, Faist (2000a, p. 191; b, p. 8) argues against a conception of migration as a discrete event and a permanent move from one nation-state to another. Rather, migration should be understood as a multidimensional (economic, political, cultural, and demographic) process consisting of movements and links between two or more settings in various nation-states. Within the migration process, Faist attributes a central role to social networks and social capital (Faist 1998, 2000a, b). Immigrant networks help to reduce economic and psychological risks and costs associated with international long-distance migration. They facilitate traveling abroad, finding housing and work, keeping in touch with the country of origin, finding child care, and consummating communal and spiritual needs (Faist 2000b, p. 97). The networks and ties connecting sending and receiving societies make up transnational social spaces. As Faist (2000b, p. 199) puts it, transnational social spaces "consist of combinations of sustained social and symbolic ties, their contents, positions in networks and organizations, and networks of organizations that can be found in multiple states."

There are three types of transnational social spaces (Faist 2000b, p. 202). The first form of transnational social spaces are transnational kinship groups. Kinship groups, which are typical among first generation immigrants, are characterized by a strong reciprocity. Prime examples are the transnational family and sending remittances (Faist 2000b, p. 203). Such multilocal families can again take two forms: either parents living abroad with their offsprings (still) in the sending country or older migrants returning to their home country, while their (adult) children remain in the receiving country. Transnational circuits are the second type of transnational social spaces (Faist 2000b, p. 206). They are characterized by a constant circulation of goods, people, and information across the borders of sending and receiving states along the principle of exchange. Typically, these are trading networks and business networks spanning across borders. The third type of transnational social spaces are the so-called transnational communities (Faist 2000b, p. 207), which we also find with Portes' earlier work on transnationalism (Portes 1996a, b). Transnational communities emerge if migrants have strong and dense social and symbolic ties across borders. These communities do not necessarily require individual persons "living between cultures in a total 'global village' of de-territorialized space" (Faist 2000b, p. 207). They require, however, linkages through exchange, reciprocity, and solidarity in order to achieve a high degree of social cohesion and a shared repertoire of symbolic and collective representations.

Causes of Transnationalism   For Faist (2000b, pp. 211–212), too, changes and in-
novations in telecommunication and transportation technologies are important factors
contributing to transnational migration. These technological changes are a prerequi-
site as well as cause for transnational involvement. However, even if immigrants are
transnationally involved, this does not necessarily create transnational communities
(Faist 2000b, p. 239). Akin to Portes and colleagues (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo
2002; Portes 1999, 2003), Faist (2000b, p. 213) relates the emergence of immigrants'
transnational involvement to conditions in the receiving and the sending country.
Transnational communities will, however, only emerge if certain conditions are met.
First, contentious minority policies in sending countries contribute to the export
of politics and conflicts into receiving countries. Second, obstacles to integration
contribute to an orientation toward ethnicity and transnational ties. Third, in liberal
democracies, which do not try to assimilate migrants by force, immigrants have a
greater chance to keep their cultural distinctiveness and ties to their homeland. Taken
together, these conditions promote the development of transnational social spaces.
It is obvious that Faist's conception of the prerequisites for the emergence of sta-
ble forms of transnational social spaces links up well with Portes and colleagues'
conception of how the interplay of contextual factors creates conditions that pro-
mote transnational activities (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002; Portes 1999,
2003). In particular, this conception is compatible with the basic idea of the modes
of incorporation model that was discussed in the previous chapter.

Then and Now   In agreement with Portes and colleagues, Faist does not see transna-
tionalism as an entirely new phenomenon. Instead, multilocal and transnational
families, for example, with their members scattered across several countries, have
been a part of international migration for a long time (Faist 2000b, p. 11). But the
magnitude of transnational involvement of immigrants in international migration has
increased. Maintaining ties to those left behind, be they family, friends, or significant
others, involves costs: economic costs for return trips and remittances, and psycho-
logical costs that emerge when practicing one's religion or other customs and while
facing the need of adapting to a new environment (Faist 2000b, p. 126). However,
innovations in long-distance travel and communication technologies have greatly
reduced these costs. Thus, while incentives to remain in touch with the country of
origin remain the same, costs have been reduced, which then is likely to lead to an
increase in immigrants' border-crossing involvement.

Although transnational activities may have been part of international migration
for a long time, Faist (2000b, p. 9) argues that the existence of transnational social
spaces and transnational migration refute the predictions of classical assimilationist
frameworks: leaving the native country's security, passing through a period of risk,
(dis)stress, and turmoil, and then establishing a definite equilibrium in the receiving
society. According to Faist (2000b, p. 243), conventional theories of immigrant inte-
gration are unable to deal with the phenomenon of transnationalism adequately. The
main reason for their epistemological inadequacy lies in the theories' "container con-
ception of space" and "container conception of culture"—matching the criticism of
the so-called methodological nationalism in other works on transnationalism (Beck

2007a, b; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2009; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a, 2003; Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006). Conventional theoretical frameworks, which deal with immigrant integration into national societies, assume that the processes of integration are unaffected by (continuing) border-crossing activities. Furthermore, the container concept of culture renders culture as a fixed and essential phenomenon (Faist 2000b, p. 282). Culture is conceptualized as a baggage from the sending country and is only important in the sense that cultural distance between the sending and the receiving society inhibits successful integration. Still, transnational involvement of immigrants and their social integration into a receiving society are not incompatible (Faist 2000b, p. 10, 242). There are simultaneous trends toward incorporation into the receiving country's society and the creation and maintenance of social, religious, political and economic transnational ties. Transnational ties with continuing immigrant integration (in the sense of a partial assimilation) can coexist. Overall, Faist (2000b, p. 226) seems to regard transnationalism more as a novel perspective rather than a novel phenomenon. The transnational perspective on immigration shifts the emphasis from the 'classical' question whether immigrants lose or retain their cultural distinctiveness to how transnational social spaces are organized, how immigrants structure and experience their ties, and how they adapt to living in between two cultures.

3.1.4 Transnational Social Spaces II: The Work of Pries and Colleagues

The concept of transnational social spaces also takes a central role in the work of Ludger Pries (1996, 1997a, 1998, 2001b, c, 2002, 2005b), who contributed early to the development of transnational migration studies. Pries builds his work on transnationalism on what he describes as the connection and disconnection of social and geographic space (see e.g. Pries 2001b, p. 56 ff.). Geographic space is understood as a "[. . .] specific relational metrical-physical extension and relation of elements" (Pries 2001b, p. 70, 71) which can be conceived of in dimensions of distance, direction, size, shape, and volume (see also Gieryn 2000). Social space, in contrast, is described as a "[. . .] specific and concentrated complexity of social practices (routinized behavior, types of action, innovative and creative acting and so forth), systems of symbols (language, culture, status and social positioning, knowledge, rites and so forth) and artefacts (buildings, techniques, cultivated landscape and so on) with a certain extension in time and (geographic space)" (Pries 2001b, p. 71).[5] Transnational social spaces are then defined as dense, stable, pluri-local and institutionalized frameworks, which are composed of these social practices, systems of symbols, and

---

[5] Obviously, this conception departs from other understandings of social space as, for instance, Bourdieu's (1989, p. 17), in which social space is to be understood as the frame of reference for an individual's position in society.

artifacts (Pries 1998, p. 37; 2001a, p. 8, 18). Goebel and Pries also distinguish between different forms of migrants (Goebel and Pries 2002, p. 39 ff.): the "classical" immigrant, the return-migrant, the transnational migrant, and the diaspora migrant. The classical immigrant is characterized by the motive of permanent residence in the receiving country. The return-migrant stays for a limited period of time and then returns to her or his country of origin. The migrant belonging to a diaspora retains a strong orientation toward a potentially imagined homeland community, whereas the transnational migrant, although being possibly integrated into the local economy, participates in transnational activities and builds and maintains transnational ties.

Causes of Transnationalism In general, Pries (1997a, p. 16; 2001a, p. 23) seems to be more interested in understanding the consequences of transnationalism than its causes. We thus do not find an elaborate explanation for the emergence of transnationalism. However, we do find reference to globalization as an ongoing process that alters the relation between the local and the global, between geographic and social spaces, and the way the nation-state is able to claim its population (Pries 2001a, p. 23, 2001b, p. 56, 58, 68). Moreover, Pries (2001b, p. 57) asserts that "new and newly recognized forms of international migration processes, though not the only source of such a development, can thus bring about transnational social spaces." It is international migration itself which brings about the uncoupling of geographic and social space (Pries 2001b, p. 58). Unfortunately, the process by which international migration is causing this uncoupling is not specified. If we reconsider Pries' definition of social spaces (Pries 2001b, p. 71), especially the aspect of social practices, one is inclined to see migrants' individual actions as responsible for the creation of the transnational social spaces. Globalization and technological innovations can thus be conceived of as conditions that increase motives and forces to migrate and ease the maintenance of relations to the country of origin.

Then and Now According to Goebel and Pries (2002, p. 36), the conditions and patterns of international migration have changed greatly in the last decades. Not only is migration a growing phenomenon, its pattern is changing, too. While in the past migration was most often linked to permanent residence at the place of destination, in recent years these patterns of settlement have changed. Migration is no longer a unidirectional change in locality but becomes a recursive process (Goebel and Pries 2002, p. 36). Increasing pendulum-movements between sending and receiving countries are an indicator for transnational migration. Transnationalism has profound consequences on the relation between social and geographic space. Pries (2001b, p. 75) asserts that over the last two or three hundred years, social and geographic space were concordant. This concordance was especially strong in the bloom of nation-states, where territorially defined areas corresponded to national societies. But this correspondence between geographical and social space has been altered in the last decades of the twentieth century by globalization. It has been weakened, allowing for the emergence of transnational social spaces that extend across geographical space (Pries 2001b, p. 57). As a result, social spaces which were previously geographically and socially disjunct are now stacked within one geographic area (Pries 2001b, p. 57). Moreover, social spaces are no longer limited by geographical spaces. This means

that social spaces can now expand over several different geographical areas (Pries 2001b, p. 57). These multi-local social spaces are then what Pries (2001b) calls transnational social spaces. We see that Pries' conception of transnational social spaces and the central role the nation-states take in it share resemblance to the idea of "deterritorilized nation-states" in the work of Glick Schiller and colleagues (1995, p. 50, 52).

The border-crossing extension of social spaces as well as the stacking of socially disjunct spaces within one geographic space are historically new and lack comparable precursors (Pries 2001, p. 58). Pries (2001b, p. 57) acknowledges that different and distinguishable social spheres have always been stacked together in one geographic area, such as the different estates in feudal structures or social classes. Yet, these social spheres were always directly linked to each other by means of a shared worldview or cultural practices. Although technological innovations in previous centuries, as, for instance, in the nineteenth century the steam-engine and telegraphic communication, already unleashed globalization processes, they did not result in a similar decoupling of social and geographic space, because the nation-state's grip on a population was still too strong (Pries 2001b, p. 58). This transformation brings about the need for a theoretical reconceptualization of migration and integration processes.

3.2   Open Questions and Unsettled Issues

The appearance of transnationalism as a scientific concept in migration research spurred a debate on its theoretical and empirical relevance—which at times has been heated (see e.g. Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). Most scholars of transnationalism consider this debate to be passé, because the issues over which it erupted have been settled. Today, proponents of the transnational perspective maintain that their research is repeatedly confronted with "usual suspects criticisms" (Vertovec 2009, p. 16)—usual suspects, because these criticisms have apparently been dealt with (see e.g. Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006). Indeed, it is true, some of the issues that were discussed emphatically at the beginning (e.g. is transnationalism a novel phenomenon or a novel perspective) appear to be settled—most agree today that it is a new or rather different perspective. Other controversial issues, however, have not been dealt with adequately and some questions remain unanswered. There is, in particular, a striking imbalance between conceptual, theoretical work, on the one hand, and empirical evidence, on the other. In particular, little heed was paid to admonitions calling for more thorough empirical examinations, before advancing evermore conceptual and theoretical work. Some authors argue (Portes et al. 1999, p. 218, 233; see e.g. Durlauf 1999) that this is even a recurring pattern in the wider social sciences, when the discipline has discovered something new (or is convinced of a discovery). As Portes et al. (1999) put it, "it is not so uncommon in the social sciences that elaborate explanations are advanced for processes whose reality remains problematic."

Obviously, this is a problem that relates to the scope of transnational involvement among immigrants. The pioneer studies on transnational migration were solely ethnographic studies, which could not assess the prevalence of border-crossing involvement among immigrants. Today, we have, albeit still little, quantitative evidence with which we will deal more thoroughly later in this chapter. Having evidence on transnational involvement which goes beyond ethnographic descriptions, the question remains whether this is a new aspect of international migration. Some scholars claimed that transnationalism is an entirely new phenomenon, stressing a historic break between recent and 'older' migration. Transnationalism, in its present characteristic, therefore must be differentiated from other processes and aspects of international migration (Basch et al. 1994; Glick Schiller 1999; Glick Schiller et al. 1995; Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001; Szanton Blanc et al. 1995; Glick Schiller et al. 1992; Goebel and Pries 2002; Pries 2001b, 2005b; Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1213). Others questioned its novelty, stressing historical continuities in transnational migration, and warn that the research on transnationalism is reinventing the wheel, by applying new (and potentially incorrect) labels to well-known phenomena (Lucassen 2006; Portes et al. 1999; Morawska 2004; Portes 2001; Waldinger 2008b; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). Pendular migration, return migration, and the maintenance of ties with the country of origin are, for instance, anything but new.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, stressing differences or similarities between past and contemporary immigration experience is tied to the stance one takes in evaluating existing theoretical models. One of the major claims of early work on transnationalism was that a new phenomenon requires a new theory, because the old theories cannot adequately understand and explain the contemporary immigration. The old theories were constructed with reference to the 'old world'; new theories have to be built mirroring the 'new world.' For some, developing transnational migration studies was indeed associated with the rejection of a conventional conception of migration and integration (Glick Schiller 1999, p. 94). Transnational migration studies directly attacked the canonical research on migration by questioning its adequacy—thus legitimizing the claim for a new theoretical perspective. If we assume that migration and integration processes nowadays are completely different from previous decades—for whatever reasons—then it is unlikely that theoretical models, which have been built facing a different empirical reality, are still valid. However, if the world we face is not all that new, i.e. if there are historical continuities in transnational migration, then older theories on immigrant integration are not per se inadequate. These theories may not have focused explicitly on transnational aspects of international migration and immigrant integration, but they have dealt with an empirical reality that shares similarities with the world today. Nevertheless, if the phenomenon in question is real, existing theoretical approaches certainly suffer from incompleteness. In order to evaluate the validity of the claim of a historic break, we would need to compare transnational involvement of immigrants in the last centuries to transnational involvement among contemporary immigrants. Large-scale individual data, which would allow for such a comparison, is unfortunately unavailable for these historic periods. Even for contemporary migration large-scale data on transnational involvement is scarce—as we will see later in this chapter. Thus, when it comes to the relation between then and now, scholars of transnational migration have drawn on historic comparisons (see e.g. Lucassen 2006).

3.3   **Transnational Involvement Among Immigrants in the Past**

After two decades of research on transnationalism, it is clear today that transnational involvement among immigrants is not as new as it has been presented in early assessments. In fact, as Joppke and Morawska (2003, p. 20) state, "many important aspects of it resemble economic, social, and political translocal involvements of past cross-border travelers." Trade diasporas of itinerant merchants, for instance, have existed for centuries. Venetian, Genoese, and Hanse merchants in medieval Europe are early examples of economic transnationalism (Portes et al. 1999, p. 225 ff.). Furthermore, circular migration movements are also anything but new if we consider streams of circular labor migration at the turn of nineteenth to the twentieth century, as, for instance, the recruitment of foreign workers for the heavy industry in the Ruhr region and the mining industry in Germany (Hebert 2003, p. 55 ff., 65 ff.). Lucassen's (2006, p. 29 ff) account of transnational involvement of the Polish immigrants in the Ruhr region is instructive. The Ruhr region's rapid industrialization after 1870 attracted many immigrants, among which were thousands of Poles. These immigrants maintained their own language, founded their own associations, and were heavily involved in border-crossing activities. They kept close contact with relatives from the sending communities, frequently traveled back, and invested in property and housing there. Their transnational involvement also manifested in Polish associations: in 1896 there were 75 Polish organizations in the Ruhr region, in 1910 already 660, and at its peak in 1920 almost 1,450 (Murphy 1982, p. 141 ff.).

Immigrants' transnational involvement was not limited by continental Europe's borders. As in the current case, technological innovations in travel and communication technology greatly facilitated transnational activities and return migration among immigrants who came to the US in the nineteenth century (Cinel 1991; Wyman 1993). Ocean-going steam ships dramatically reduced the time needed to travel from the old to the new continent. The invention of telegraphy allowed for instantaneous communication across great distances. And a prominent testimony of keeping ties with the country of origin is Thomas and Znaniecki's study on "*The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*" (1919). Of those immigrants, 35 % returned to their country of origin and those who stayed kept in touch with relatives in their country of origin (Wyman 1993, p. 10, 33). Moreover, the consolidation of the nation-state in the nineteenth century already created "long-distance nationalism" (Glick Schiller 1999, p. 101 ff.), with immigrants contributing money to political movements in their respective countries of origin. In the German case, for instance, "Germanness abroad" ("Deutschtum im Ausland") was actively promoted by the newly founded German state in the late nineteenth century and aimed at keeping the German national identity alive and preventing German immigrants from assimilating to the receiving countries (Dann 1993, p. 191). Glazer (1954) has documented similar patterns for the American immigration experience.

As Joppke and Morawska (2003, p. 21) put it, "[. . .] the perception is unfound that, as one-way transplants, earlier migrations were permanent ruptures with home-country affairs, irrevocably dividing past and present lives of immigrants, whereas

present day shuttlers' lifeworlds span their home and host society in new transnational spaces." Even those who initially depicted transnationalism as new (Glick Schiller 1999, p. 95, 99 ff.) now point to the late nineteenth century when referring to precursors of current transnationalism. While most authors now seem to agree that precursors to present day transnationalism existed, there is disagreement on the reason why it has not received a lot of attention. Portes et al. (Portes et al. 1999, p. 225 ff.) claim that these early forms of transnational involvement among immigrants have mainly been an elite phenomenon, limited to wealthy immigrants who could afford cost-intensive maintenance of long-distance networks and long-distance travel. Transnationalism in history was of minor significance and thus was not incorporated into theoretical models of migration and integration. In face of the above mentioned historical work on immigration, this position appears disputable. Still, the costs for being transnationally active have reduced drastically. Assuming that most immigrants have some attachment to their country of origin, the scope of transnational activities has *probably* increased.

Glick Schiller et al. (1995, p. 51) attribute the negligence of transnational involvement among immigrants to the predominant (political and scientific) narrative of assimilation. From this perspective, it was not the limited empirical scope that averted the incorporation of transnationalism into theory. Instead, the prevailing concentration on immigrants' adaption in the receiving country prevented scholars from taking note of border-crossing activities. If we consider Gans' (1992, p. 49; 1997, p. 884) note on the potential selectivity of immigrants that were subject to sociological inquiry in the early models on immigrant integration—as discussed in the last chapter—it does not come as a surprise that traditional accounts of immigrant integration did not focus on border-crossing activities and ties to the country of origin. Immigration historians, however, have extensively documented border-crossing, bi-national social-cultural, economic, and political involvement among almost all immigrant groups in the US—although they did not call it transnationalism (Joppke and Morawska 2003, p. 21). Still, there was need for a concept that identifies this phenomenon. The common character of present and earlier forms of transnationalism has to be overlooked if we do not have a theoretical concept which identifies the phenomenon in question. As Portes (2001, p. 184) puts it, "[t]he parallels between Russian and Polish émigré political activism and the trading activities of the Chinese diaspora, for example, could not have been established because there was no theoretical idea that linked them and pointed to their similarities. In its absence, the respective literature remained disparate and isolated from each other, as well as from present events."

Most scholars today seem to have reached the conclusion that transnational migration studies do not deal with an entirely new phenomenon, but that they offer a novel perspective on processes of migration and integration. Treating transnationalism as a perspective allows us to focus our research and theory on the ties that immigrants build and sustain across the borders of two or more nation-states (Portes 1999, 2001, 2003). In this sense, the transnational perspective simply calls our attention to a specific aspect of migration and integration, which has always been a ubiquitous part of international migration (Waldinger 2008a, p. 24). This perspective can provide us

with a tool to understand and explain specific and possibly new or previously disregarded processes of integration. It is an analytical tool, enabling us to cover aspects of migration to which conventional theories of migration and integration have been blind.

3.4   A Note on Terminology

In the above depicted work, we are presented with an abounding number of new terms for processes that describe immigrants' cross-border involvement. Do we need all these terms? It might depend on the specific term and the process it describes. In any case, we should avoid conceptual conflation and overuse, as they render any analytical concept useless. If a concept is extended to every aspect of reality, it is stripped of its heuristic value. For a concept to retain a heuristic value, its scope has to be limited (Portes 2001, p. 219).

In this context, a distinction between transmigrants and circular migrants and sojourners appears hard to maintain, as the demarcation lines between their definitions seem a bit artificial. It is noteworthy that the term transmigrant was actually coined by William Peterson (1969, p. 261), who defined transmigrants as "those who move into an area for a period and then out of it." This early definition already shows that the boundaries between the concept of transmigrants and sojourners and circular migrants are not clear. I would argue that the concept of immigrant (or migrant) is well applicable even in the face of immigrants' border-crossing involvement. Another example of introducing a new concept, where an already existing would do, is that of "social remittances" (Levitt 1998, p. 927; 2001, p. 54). In her seminal ethnographic study on a village in the Dominican Republic, Levitt describes how the village's life is influenced by its residents' back and forth migration to Boston. To illustrate how ideas, behaviors, identities, and social capital flows from the receiving country to the country of origin through transnational ties and how they influence and restructure the village's daily life, Levitt suggests the concept of social remittances. To begin with, this is not a particularity of contemporary migration. Returnees from the US at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, for instance, imported various ideas and practices to Europe and profoundly influenced their countries and communities of origin (Wyman 1993, p. 151 ff.), which Levitt (2001, p. 59) acknowledges. However, the usefulness of introducing a new term referring to the phenomenon in question is limited if we already have a term at hand. The transmission of ideas, practices, and the like has been studied before under the term "cultural diffusion" (Strang and Meyer 1993; Strang and Meyer 1994), even explicitly so with focusing on how ideas influence and restructure local communities and the relations therein (see already Brown 1944). Although Levitt points to cultural diffusion, she does not give reasons why a new term seems necessary. Moreover, the term transnationalism itself can be perceived as problematic. As Smith (2002, p. 148) points out, transnationalism often seems to indicate a "third space," which, albeit divorced from

both the origin and the receiving country, implies an entirely new way of living simultaneously in both places. As we will see in the next part of this chapter, evidence for such transnational modes of living is rather scarce. Thus, for the rest of this work, I will use the terms transnational or border-crossing activities and involvement rather than the term transnationalism. Transnational activities are more tangible and more narrowly defined—as individual immigrants' border-crossing activities—and do not necessarily imply a simultaneous mode of living in-between two societies.

3.5   A Note on Methodological Nationalism

Before we proceed to reviewing the empirical evidence of immigrants' transnational involvement, an excurse on the so-called 'methodological nationalism' seems due. It has been mentioned in the above discussion that proponents of transnationalism criticize conventional theories for the way they depict (the receiving) societies—the alleged methodological nationalism (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Pries 2005a; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a, b, 2003; Mau 2010). Methodological nationalism is assumed to take the nation-state (and national society) as the natural social and political form in the contemporary world (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002a, p. 302) and with this metatheoretical assumption it prevents conventional frameworks from grasping processes outside national containers. This critique is not limited to the bounds of migration studies. Instead, it has been developed into a critique of general sociological theory, which unquestionably takes the nation-state as its point of departure (see e.g. Beck 2007a, b; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2009; Mau 2010). However, it appears rather premature, because most of its claims justifying a paradigmatic shift are—once again—based on assumptions that lack empirical foundations.[6] Within the study of immigrant integration, methodological nationalism can be interpreted as a catchword that points to the shortcomings of conventional theoretical frameworks. From this perspective, there is something to it: by taking the national society as the unquestioned point of departure, we are likely to miss parts of the picture—as, for instance, immigrants' multiple inclusion into receiving and sending society. But do we have to reformulate all existing theories? Theoretical completeness calls for including border-crossing activities in any account of immigrant integration and the possibility of multiple inclusion in both sending and receiving society—a prominent demand in the literature on methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002b, p. 233). As we have seen in Chap. 2, the model of intergenerational integration, which this work proposes, explicitly takes multiple inclusion into account. While this originally referred to multiple inclusion into the receiving society and the

---

[6] There is a related debate in the literature on immigration and citizenship. Although different terms are used in this literature, i.e. national, multicultural, and postnational models of citizenship are discussed, there are similar claims about the declining importance of national contexts for immigrant integration (for an overview see Bloemraad et al. 2008). Yet, results from empirical research in this area show that the nation-state still decisively influences immigrant integration as compared to postnational contexts (see e.g. Koopmans 2004; Koopmans and Statham 1999).

ethnic group, this can easily be extended to encompass multiple inclusion regarding the country of origin as well. Moreover, if we are interested in assessing immigrant integration, group comparisons are a very flexible way of measuring integration (see Chaps. 2 and 4). Of course, this is not confined to comparing an immigrant group with the autochthonous group, although this probably still is the most important dimension of comparison. However, we can easily choose a different comparison group, i.e. a group in the country of origin, a group belonging to a supranational structure, as the European Union, and the like. If we concentrate only on what is happening within the borders of one society, we might miss important aspects of immigrants' lives. But if the enlargement of our perspective is compatible with existing theoretical frameworks, then the call for abandoning all these frameworks appears premature.

3.6 Transnationalism and Immigrant Integration

After having established how research on transnational migration became prominent in the social sciences, we now turn to the available empirical evidence on immigrants' border-crossing activities and how they relate to integration into the receiving society. First, the studies' most pertinent findings on the prevalence of transnational activities are summarized. Second, it is examined how these studies try to bridge the transnational perspective and frameworks of immigrant integration.

The focus is on quantitative studies. The reason for this is plain: investigating the prevalence and scope of transnational involvement among immigrants can only be achieved via representative studies. Since qualitative studies do not aim for representativeness, the focus on quantitative studies follows naturally. Of course, this does not imply that any quantitative study is automatically representative. Ethnographic studies on immigrants' transnational involvement provide, as Mahler (1998, p. 82) notes, "detailed information on a limited set of activities and practices, [but] not a clear picture of the breadth of the social field, nor of the demography or intensity of players' participation in the activities people engage in." Quite naturally, the early ethnographic studies of transnational migration saw transnationalism everywhere. It was portrayed as a dominant feature of contemporary migration, which has led to an overuse of the concept. Not only was every immigrant portrayed as being transnational, suddenly everything immigrants were doing was in some way or the other transnational. Of course, it is a sociological truism that our theories shape what we perceive (Schütz 1962). Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that *transnational* migration studies see everything as relating to border-crossing involvement, while studies on immigrant integration see everything as relating to integration.

The implications drawn from the early qualitative studies on immigrants' transnational involvement were, at times, problematic in another respect. While case studies provide a deep insight into the processes associated with transnational migration, they oftentimes sample on the dependent variable (for a detailed discussion see: King et al. 1994, p. 130; Portes et al. 2002, p. 279). Cases are—unknowingly or not—chosen

according to the value of the attribute of interest, which is associated with two different problems. On the one hand, the range of the phenomenon is likely to be strongly overestimated. On the other hand, the absence of variation in the phenomenon—looking only at migrants who engage in transnational activities—creates difficulties in detecting the factors that account for the phenomenon. This is a widespread problem not only in qualitative work (for a critical assement see Collier et al. 2004) and it is not limited to studies on transnational migration. We can illustrate this problem with the study of Marger (2006), although its findings point in the exact opposite direction than the early studies on transnational migration. Marger's study investigates how integration and transnational activities are linked by looking at a sample of 70 business immigrants in Canada. These immigrants entered Canada in the 1980s and 1990s and were interviewed during this period and re-interviewed in the early 2000s. However, only 28 who had stayed in Canada could be re-interviewed. Most of them were rather assimilated. From this data the author concludes that adaptation through assimilation is the dominant mode of integration. Marger (2006, p. 883) states that a "[. . .] cohort of the contemporary global immigration who enter the host society with sufficient human and financial capital resources may bypass ethnic communities and the social capital provided by them in moving swiftly along an assimilation trajectory. Moreover in adopting an assimilationist course, these immigrants demonstrate the limitations of the transnational model, possessing, as they do, seemingly perfect characteristics to operate in a transnational setting." Marger disregards, however, that the attrition of his sample—he cannot re-interview those who have returned to their country of origin—is likely to systematically vary with his "dependent variable," i.e. the integration outcome and/or being transnationally active. Of course, the problem of (sample) selection is not limited to qualitative work.

The data sets of the studies reviewed here are quite heterogeneous—ranging from non-representative, small snowball samples (Snel et al. 2006) to larger cross-sectional samples (Portes 1999; Waldinger 2008a) to longitudinal data (Haller and Landolt 2005; O'Flaherty et al. 2007). The countries in which these data sets have been collected, the US, Australia, and the Netherlands, differ in many respects. Many of the countries' differences shape migration and integration processes (Teltemann and Windzio 2011) and are accordingly also likely to influence immigrants' transnational involvement. Consequently, the results from these studies are not easily comparable. In particular, we cannot systematically investigate effects of the sending and receiving context. This would require large-scale data sets from many receiving countries (see e.g. Tubergen 2006; Tubergen and Kalmijn 2005; Tubergen et al. 2004). Unfortunately, this kind of data is not available. Nonetheless, we can, with ample care, compare the studies' (descriptive) results to get an impression of how prevalent transnational activities are among immigrants in these countries and how transnational activities are related to measures of integration. This is obviously only possible if the data is representative, ruling out unrepresentative (e.g. non-random) samples. We know from the previous chapter that transnational migration studies have developed partly in direct opposition to classical models of immigrant integration. Despite the abundant conceptual work on transnational involvement, there are only few elaborate theoretical considerations on how immigrant integration might

relate to transnational involvement that allow for deriving testable hypotheses. One reason for this may lie in the fact that many studies on transnational migration have not been concerned so much with the immigrants' position in the receiving society but instead with the question how immigrants build and sustain ties across borders. Thus, it is mainly a question of perspective.

3.6.1 Empirical Evidence on Transnational Activities

Today, there are a handful of quantitative studies from which we can gain an impression on how widespread transnational activities are among immigrants. First, the results from the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP) are discussed (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2005; Portes et al. 2002). The CIEP is up to now the most influential study on immigrants' transnational involvement. It is extensively cited even in very recent work (e.g. Glick Schiller and Levitt 2006, p. 13; Vertovec 2009, p. 77 ff.; Kivisto and Faist 2010). Still, the CIEP is not the only source of quantitative evidence on border-crossing involvement. Haller and Landolt (2005), Kasinitz et al. (2002), Rumbaut (2002), and Waldinger (2008a) are among the few quantitative studies which examine immigrant integration and its relation to transnational activities. All these studies target the US, however. Outside the US, the only studies on this subject were conducted in the Netherlands (Snel et al. 2006) and in Australia (O'Flaherty et al. 2007).

The CIEP was explicitly designed to investigate transnational involvement among contemporary immigrant groups (Colombians, Dominicans, and Salvadorians) in the US. The data was collected from 1996 to 1998. The large sample and specific sampling strategy produced the first at least partially generalizable results (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2005, p. 780; Portes et al. 2002, p. 282). Table 3.2 summarizes descriptive results from various studies that use the CIEP data (Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, 2005; Portes 2003).[7]

Among economic border-crossing activities the CIEP provides information of two types: on transnational entrepreneurs, on the one hand, and on border-crossing financial involvement, like remitting, on the other. The former are defined as firm-owners whose business activities require frequent travel abroad and whose entrepreneurial success depends on regular contacts with other countries, primarily the country of origin (Portes et al. 2002, p. 287). The CIEP data show that transnational entrepreneurship is very uncommon; on average, only about 5 % of the immigrants interviewed for the CIEP engage in transnational business endeavors (see Table 3.2). Other forms of border-crossing economic activities are much more common. More than two thirds of immigrants in the sample send remittances to family members or friends in the country of origin. Regarding border-crossing political activities, which encompass electoral and non-electoral activities aiming to influence conditions in

---

[7] All figures in Tables 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 are presented without decimals, because not all of the studies reported percentages with decimals.

Table 3.2 Transnational activities among immigrants in different studies. (Source: Modified from Portes 2003; Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002; Waldinger 2008; Snel et al. 2006)

	CIEP[a]		Waldinger 2008	Snel et al. 2006
	(N = 1,202)		(N = 4,213)	(N = 250)
Receiving country	USA		USA	Netherlands
	Regular	Occasional		
	%	%	%	%
Economic				
Transnational entrepreneur	5	–		3–9
Transfers money to family/friends in the country of origin	74	–	47	28
Political				
Keeps in touch with politics in country of origin				53
Reads newspaper from the country of origin				74
Member of political party in country of origin	10	18		10
Gives money to political party in country of origin	7	12		
Takes part in political campaigns and rallies in country of origin	8	14		
Votes in elections in the country of origin			15	
Socio-cultural				
Member of hometown civic association	14	28		
Member of (charity) organization active in country of origin	14	31		8
Gives money to community/charity projects in country of origin	10	25		
Travels to attend public festivities in country of origin	6	17		
Participates in local sports club with links to country of origin	8	18		
Real home is country of origin			61	
Is country of origin national first			68	
Made at least one trip to country of origin since migration			66	
Travels annually to the country of origin	19			
Visits family and friends in the country of origin				76
Frequent contact with family in country of origin				88
Plans to move back to country of origin			35	

[a]From different publications

the country of origin (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1223), the CIEP has revealed that only a minority of immigrants—not more than 10 %—regularly partake in such activities (Table 3.2).[8] Occasional political involvement, e.g. monetary donations to parties in the country of origin, across borders is a little more common, with almost a fifth of the immigrants in the sample (Table 3.2). Most widespread are socio-cultural forms of transnational involvement. These types of transnational activities most often come in the form of membership in charity organizations or hometown civic associations. Up to 31 % of the immigrants are occasionally involved in such activities (Table 3.2). Moreover, the CIEP shows that there are considerable differences in the extent to which the different immigrant groups engage in cross-border activities, which is likely to be due to differences in the sending contexts and receiving contexts (Guarnizo et al. 2003, pp. 1219–1221).

A second study on first generation immigrants' border-crossing involvement was conducted by Waldinger (2008a). His study draws on data from the 2002 PEW Hispanic Survey, a large-scale representative survey of Latinos living in the US (for a detailed description see ICR 2002). The largest ethnic groups in the 2002 PEW are from Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, and El Salvador. Although this survey was not conducted with an explicit focus on transnational activities, it, nevertheless, contains an array of indicators on this topic. Among those are activities such as sending remittances, traveling to the country of origin, political participation in the country of origin and in the US, plans to move back to the country of origin, as well as questions referring to ethnic identity and feelings of belonging. Table 3.2 shows that economic border-crossing activities in form of sending remittances are also common among immigrants interviewed for the 2002 PEW: Almost half of the immigrants (47 %) report that they regularly send remittances to the country of origin. Visits to the country of origin are common, too, as two thirds reports that they have visited their country of origin at least once. Political participation is less prevalent. Only about a sixth of the sample (15 %) reports to vote in elections in their country of origin. We have to consider, however, that this relatively low percentage may result from legal restrictions and citizenship rights.

When it comes to Europe, so far only one quantitative study addresses transnational involvement among immigrants. The study of Snel et al. (2006) was conducted in the Netherlands, covering immigrants from six different countries of origin: Morocco, Dutch Antilles, Iraq, former Yugoslavia, Japan, and USA. The data was generated by a snowball method, and thus the ability to generalize from the results is severely limited (Snel et al. 2006, p. 289). Therefore, one is well advised to exercise caution regarding this study's empirical findings. The authors follow the differentiation of transnational activities into economic, political, and socio-cultural. Snel et al. (2006) find that transnational activities are a common practice among their sample of immigrants. Mostly, immigrants' transnational involvement comprises

---

[8] Although, by relative standards, if ten to 18 % of the immigrants in the survey report that they are a member of a political party in the country of origin, this is a very high figure. In Germany, for instance, party membership in 2010 was at about 2.2 % among those who are entitled to vote (Weichs 2011).

Table 3.3 Transnational activities among newly arrived immigrants in Australia. (Source: O'Flaherty et al. (2007, p. 828))

	Wave 1 (6 months)	Wave 2 (18 months)	Wave 3 (48 months)	Visited at least once	Visited at least twice
Visited the country of origin (%)	3	15	37	43	11

(N = 3,618)

socio-cultural and political activities (Table 3.2), whereas transnational economic activities, foremost professional economic activities, are rather scarce. This does not apply to remitting money to family members, as about 28 % of the sample report regularly sending money to the country of origin. Transnational political activities are more common among the sample. The rather cost-efficient types of transnational activities, i.e. reading newspapers from the country of origin and following the politics there, are quite widespread (on average 53 and 73 %, respectively), whereas more cost-intensive activities, such as being a member of a political party in the country of origin, is much less common (around 10 %). Keeping in touch with family members, which Snel et al. (2006) classify as belonging to the socio-cultural realm of border-crossing involvement, is by far the most common form. Around 88 % report that they have frequent contacts with their family in the country of origin and 76 % report visiting their family.[9]

O'Flaherty et al.'s study (2007) investigates transnational involvement among newly arrived immigrants in Australia. They draw on data from the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (hereafter LSIA), which is a representative sample of permanent newly arrived offshore immigrants coming to Australia in the beginning- and mid-1990s (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 826). Since the focus of this survey is on immigrant integration and not on transnational activities, information on transnational activities is limited to one item, i.e. visits to the country of origin. The main descriptive findings of the study are presented in a separate table (Table 3.3).

Taking a look a Table 3.3, we can see that visiting the country of origin is rather common among newly arrived immigrants in Australia. This becomes especially obvious if one looks at the fourth column of the table, which refers to the third wave of the LSIA data. 48 months after settlement, on average 37 % have visited their country of origin. Over time, visiting home becomes more likely: in the first wave—which covers the newly arrived—on average only 3 % have visited their country of origin, in the second wave it is already 15 %, and in the third wave—as mentioned above—it is already 37 %. The tendency to pay a visit to the country of origin seems to increase with the time spent in the receiving country. This result is not surprising, because immigrants might lack financial resources and time in the initial stages of settlement that would allow for such a trip. Moreover, the longer the immigrants are in the receiving country, the longer is their 'time at risk.' Even if immigrants visit their country of origin only once, the observed probability of visiting this country will

---

[9] Unfortunately, Snel et al. (2006) do not provide information on the frequency of visits.

Table 3.4 Transnational activities among 2nd generation immigrants in the US. (Source: Modified from Haller and Landolt (2005, p. 1193))

	Percentage	Mean
Visits to parents' country of origin		3
Has lived in the parents' country of origin for 6 months or longer	6	
Remits money to parents' country of origin		
Never	76	
Less than once a year	6	
Once or twice a year	8	
Several times a year	8	
Once or twice a months	2	

Haller and Landolt (2005) do not explicitly mention the number of cases for the descriptive analysis. $N = 1,841$ is the number of respondents that were interviewed in the third wave of the CILS (Haller and Landolt 2005, p. 1191)

increase, the longer we observe them in a survey (which is in this example equivalent with the time spent in Australia), because they simply had more time to visit.[10] With respect to the frequency of visits to the country of origin, we see that over the whole period, i.e. from arrival to 48 months later, only 11 % of the immigrants visit their country of origin twice or more, while 43 % have visited it at least once.

The studies discussed so far concentrate on first generation immigrants. In the last chapter, however, we have heard that it would be especially interesting to investigate transnational involvement among immigrant offsprings (Portes et al. 1999, p. 229). Haller and Landolt (2005) examine transnational involvement among second generation immigrants in the US. They draw on data from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (hereafter CILS), a wide-ranging survey of the second generation in the metropolitan areas of Miami/Fort Lauderdale and San Diego (for a comprehensive description of the study see Portes and Rumbaut 2005). The initial wave was carried out in 1992, a first follow up was conducted in 1995/1996 and a second follow up in 2001/2003 (Portes and Rumbaut 2005, p. 987). The study included the children of immigrants from Cuban, Nicaraguan, Colombian, Haitian, or West Indian backgrounds. Since the CILS was not conducted with explicit regard to transnational activities, the array of items on transnational activities is relatively small. The CILS contains, nonetheless, information on visits to the parents' country of origin, how often the respondents remit money to the parents' country of origin, and in which country, i.e. the US or the parents' country of origin, the respondent feels more at home.

As Table 3.4 shows, part of the second generation is transnationally active, too, albeit much less compared to the first generation. On average, the second generation has made three visits to the country of origin in the 11 years between the first and the

---

[10] See Chap. 7 for a more detailed discussion of this. At the moment it suffices to say that even if the probability to visit the country of origin declines with time spent in the receiving country, the cumulative probability still increases, which is likely to produce the above association—a point which O'Flaherty et al. (2007) neglect to discuss.

last wave of the survey (1992–2003). However, among those who have visited the parents' country of origin, the percentage that has lived there for a longer period is rather low with only 6 %. Haller and Landolt's (2005) analysis reveals that sending remittances is uncommon among the offsprings of immigrants: more than three quarters do not remit money to the parents' country of origin (Table 3.4). And among those who do, occasional remittances are more common than regular—only 10 % send money at least several times a year.

So what do these studies tell us? Despite the differences in data sets and study designs, the studies suggest that a substantial share of the immigrants in the surveys is transnationally active today. The degree of involvement depends on the type of activity. The majority of first generation immigrants regularly sends money to the country of origin—findings that are in line with the literature on remittances (e.g. Brown and Poirine 2005; Massey and Parrado 1994; Taylor 1999; Dustmann and Mestres 2009; Sana and Massey 2005). Visiting the country of origin is also common among first generation immigrants. A driving force behind transnational involvement seems to be family-ties and potentially family-obligations. It appears that border-crossing activities are a normal part of the migration process, as these findings match up with the assessment of transnational involvement among immigrants in the past (e.g. Lucassen 2006; Wyman 1993). As Waldinger (2008a, p. 8) puts it, "large flows of remittances, migrant associations raising funds to help hometowns left behind, and trains or airplanes filled with immigrants returning home for visits to kin and friends are features encountered wherever large numbers of international migrants are found throughout the contemporary world."

If we compare first generation immigrants with their offsprings, we see that border-crossing activities are less common among the second generation. Only a minority still remits money and visits to the parents' country of origin are mostly uncommon, too. The latter finding is very much in line with the predictions of conventional theories of immigrant integration which assume that the orientation toward the country of origin declines intergenerationally. But as we will see in the following review, the relation between transnational involvement and immigrant integration is not that straightforward. All the studies also report considerable variation in the different immigrant groups' transnational involvement, which the authors link to differences in sending and receiving contexts (e.g. Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1219 ff.; Portes 2003, p. 879; Snel et al. 2006, p. 291; Portes et al. 2005, p. 1034). Thus, the situation immigrants face when leaving their country of origin and the situation in the receiving country are deemed to shape their border-crossing involvement. This brings us to the relation between transnational involvement and immigrant integration, because the latter is nothing else than an investigation into the immigrants' position in the receiving society with reference to the autochthonous population.

3.6.2 *Immigrant Integration and Transnational Activities*

Despite plentiful conceptual work on transnational migration, there are only very few theoretical considerations on how immigrant integration might relate to transnational involvement that allow for deriving testable hypotheses. In the following we

will review the findings of the above discussed studies on the relation of immigrant integration and transnational involvement. In the field of immigrant integration we look back at a century of theoretical and empirical work. As we have seen in the previous chapter, there are many elaborate theoretical models aimed at explaining immigrant integration. Up to now, the transnational perspective on migration has not been incorporated thoroughly in the study of immigrant integration. Consequently, we cannot draw upon detailed theoretical models, with the work at hand being limited. What adds to this is the fact that most studies linking immigrant integration with transnational activities are so far rather inductive, trying to explore possible connections between the two.

Obviously, one of the central questions concerning the relation of immigrant integration and border-crossing activities is whether these processes are opposed to each other. In this vein, Guarnizo et al. (2003, p. 1215) and Portes et al. (2002, p. 288) set up transnational involvement as a potential alternative to integration into the receiving society. According to traditional frameworks of immigrant integration, the authors argue, one would expect that transnational activities are temporary and bound to disappear over time, as immigrants become more integrated into the receiving country. But how does transnational involvement come into being in the first place? In line with his work on immigrant integration, as discussed in the previous chapter, Portes (1999, p. 464; 2003, p. 879) emphasizes that transnational involvement varies with differences in sending and receiving contexts. Immigrants coming from unfavorable sending contexts, e.g. having experienced war and violence in their country of origin, are more likely to seek rapid integration into the receiving society and less likely to actively remain in contact with the country of origin.[11] Immigrants coming from more favorable sending contexts, conversely, are more likely to maintain contacts with the country of origin and engage in border-crossing activities. Likewise, the conditions immigrants face in the receiving country influence their probability to engage in border-crossing activities connecting receiving and sending country. Immigrants who are subject to hostile conditions in the receiving country and who are organized in closely-knit ethnic communities have multiple opportunities for transnational involvement. In contrast, if conditions in the receiving country are favorable and if immigrants are dispersed and inconspicuous, they have fewer incentives and opportunities to engage in transnational activities (Portes 1999, p. 466; 2003, p. 880).

Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo (2002, p. 772) similarly posit that transnational involvement emerges through an interplay of the immigrant's attachment to the country of origin, her or his financial resources, which are supposed to exert an enabling effect on border-crossing involvement, and the immigrant's experiences in the receiving country. To test this, the authors (Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, 2005; Portes et al. 2002) investigated how factors that are commonly associated with immigrant integration are linked with different forms of transnational involvement. First, analyses of the CIEP data (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p.

---

[11] However, one could also turn Portes' argument around: immigrants coming from unfavorable sending contexts, i.e. refugees, may plan to return once the conditions in the sending context improve and may therefore abstain from seeking integration into the receiving society.

1215; Portes et al. 2002, p. 288) do not support the idea that transnational involvement and integration into the receiving society exclude one another. On the contrary, factors such as education, which are typically assumed to ease integration into the receiving society, actually increase the chance of being transnationally active (findings of the different studies are summarized in Table 3.5.) Moreover, years of residence seem to increase an immigrant's tendency to become transnationally active, both politically and economically. The length of the stay in the US can be associated with economic stability and security and as such might enable transnational involvement (unfortunately, the analyses conducted with the CIEP did not control for income). The same may hold for the negative effect of unemployment, which might be an indicator for the lack of financial resources. Interestingly, the acquisition of US citizenship is unrelated to transnational political activities. This could be due to the fact that acquiring the US citizenship can actually be a valuable resource in cross-border traveling for some immigrants, while being an indicator for a greater identification with the US for others. The opposing trends then may well explain the absence of a systematic effect on transnational activities. Not very surprising are the findings that directly relate to one's attachment to the country of origin: planning to return to this country increases immigrants' border-crossing involvement. Second, Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo (2002, p. 772) report evidence of what they term 'reactive transnationalism,' i.e. border-crossing involvement as a reaction to dissatisfactory life circumstances in the receiving country (see also Portes 1999, p. 465): experiences of discrimination and a negative perception of the receiving country increase the probability of being transnationally active (see Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo (2002, p. 778) and Table 2.5). Third, there is considerable variation in the different groups' transnational involvement, which indicates that the modes of incorporation, the conditions at exit and entry (see also Chap. 2) shape transnational involvement, too (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1232 ff.; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, p. 774 ff., 786 ff.; Portes 2003, p. 886 ff.).

Another piece of the puzzle is provided by Waldinger (2008a), who uses PEW 2002 data to examine the relation between transnational activities and immigrant integration. Waldinger (2008a) focuses less on investigating the differences between ethnic groups, but more on political and structural conditions of the receiving society that promote or hinder border-crossing activities. Accordingly, he argues that social and economic resources, settlement plans, and legal status might mitigate the differences between immigrant groups (Waldinger 2008a, p. 12). Among all sets of explanatory factors, characteristics associated with settlement display the most unambiguous effects. Contrary to the findings of the CIEP, the longer immigrants stay in the US, the lower their probability of being transnationally active. This holds for all indicators of transnational involvement except for visiting the country of origin (see Table 3.5). However, refined analyses show that this effect is mostly due to an accumulation of visits to the country of origin over time and not to an increased incidence. Waldinger (2008a, p. 17) also finds that using English language as the first language as well as being bilingual lowers the probability of transnational involvement compared to having Spanish as the first language.

Table 3.5 Summary of the findings on the relation between immigrant integration and transnational involvement. (Source: Modified from Portes 2003; Guarnizo et al. 2003; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002; Waldinger 2008; Snel et al. 2006; Haller and Landolt 2006; O'Flaherty et al. 2007)

	CIEP[a]	Waldinger 2008	Snel et al. 2006	O'Flaherty et al. 2007	Haller and Landolt 2006
Country	USA	USA	Netherlands	Australia	USA
Study	Cross-sectional	Cross-sectional	Cross-sectional	Longitudinal	Longitudinal
Dependent variables	Various activities	Various activities	Index of activities	Visits	Visits/remittances
Selected independent variables					
Length of stay	+	−[b]	0		
Age at migration		+	+		
Born in the receiving country					+/−[d]
Education	+	0/+	0	0/+	0
(Full-time) Employment/formal paid job			0	+/−	
Unemployed/non-working	−	0/+	0		0/+
Income		0/+		−/+[c]	0/−
Acquisition of the receiving country's citizenship	0	0/+	0	−	
Experienced discrimination in receiving country	0/+				
Intention to return to country of origin	+				
Receiving country language proficiency		0/−		+	
Sending country language proficiency					0/+

[a] From different studies
[b] Curvilinear, overall negative effect (except for visits to country of origin)
[c] Curvilinear effect; study does not allow inferring overall effect
[d] Positive effect for visiting, negative effect for remitting

Human and financial capital and labor market participation, such as education, employment, and income, display ambiguous effects in Waldinger's analysis in the sense that some confirm predictions from conventional models of immigrant integration and some correspond to hypotheses derived from work on transnational migration: being employed increases the probability to remit money but decreases the chance to visit the country of origin; education increases the probability to visit the country of origin but decreases the chances to identify with the country of origin. From the analysis, Waldinger (2008a, p. 24) concludes that encompassing transnational modes of living are an exception among the respondents in the survey, because border-crossing activities do not cluster. For instance, while the probability of traveling to the country of origin increases with time spent in the US, the probability to remit declines. Still, the results from these analyses are akin to the results from the CIEP (e.g. Portes 2003) in the sense that immigrants who are better integrated and possess a secure legal status are more likely to engage in border-crossing activities involving physical presence in the country of origin (Waldinger 2008a, p. 24).

O'Flaherty et al. (2007) investigate how different degrees of integration on the several dimensions (see Chap. 2) relate to differences in transnational involvement. Specifically, the authors look at the economic and the cultural dimension of integration; the authors subsume motivational, cognitive, and emotional aspects of integration under the latter term (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 823). Assuming that the degree of integration can be either high or low on each dimension, this provides us with a fourfold typology, in which each type is associated with specific incentives and opportunities to become transnationally active: successful economic integration and low cultural integration should be most strongly associated with transnational activities, while the opposite, i.e. low economic integration and high cultural integration, should be least associated with these activities. In the former case, immigrants have the resources and motive to become transnationally active, while in the latter case the immigrants lack the motive and the resources. The other two typologies are somewhat ambiguous, since they provide either the opportunities or the motive. Focusing on visits to the country of origin, O'Flaherty et al.'s (2007) analysis of the longitudinal LSIA data only partly supports the hypotheses. It appears that (the lack of) cultural integration plays a more important role than economic integration. The influence of economic factors even seems to decline over time, while cultural aspects of integration, for instance language proficiency and the wish to acquire the Australian citizenship, retain their influence or become even slightly stronger (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 835). It should furthermore be noted that the visa categories exert a significant and strong influence: humanitarian visa holders have a considerably reduced probability for visiting their country of origin, while holders of 'Business Skills' visas have strongly increased chances (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 836). As the visa categories are likely to be proxy measures of conditions at exit and entry, this finding is very much in line with the assumptions of the modes of incorporation model presented in the previous chapter.

The studies discussed so far investigate how immigrant integration influences the probability to engage in border-crossing activities. Snel et al.'s (2006) study

goes further, as it investigates both relationships, i.e. how transnational involvement influences integration and, vice versa, how integration influences transnational involvement. Regarding the former relationship, they do not find any relation between indicators of immigrant integration and transnational activities. In contrast to the studies conducted in the US, education, labor market participation, citizenship, length of stay are not significantly associated with engaging in activities connecting the sending and receiving country. Only age at migration seems to increase transnational involvement, i.e. the older the immigrant is at the time of migration, the higher is her or his transnational involvement (see Table 3.5 and Snel et al. 2006, p. 295).[12] When it comes to the effect that border-crossing activities have on measures of integration, Snel et al. report a positive association of political, socio-cultural, and everyday economic border-crossing activities with the identification with compatriots in the country of origin (Snel et al. 2006, p. 298). Yet, among their sample of immigrants, ethnic identification with compatriots living in the Netherlands is much more common than a transnational ethnic identification, which leads them to conclude that "[i]t is certainly untrue that space has lost its meaning in late-modern society and that contemporary migrants function in transnational communities rather than in their country of residence, as adherents of transnationalism sometimes argue" (Snel et al. 2006, p. 297). Moreover, the social dimension of integration appears to be unrelated to transnational activities: being transnationally active, regardless of the type of activity, is not significantly related to the number of native Dutch friends in the respondents' networks (Snel et al. 2006, p. 302).

The above studies deal with explaining transnational involvement among first generation immigrants. Haller and Landolt (2005) link transnational involvement to the second generation's integration by drawing on aspects of segmented assimilation theory. Among the predicted outcomes of segmented assimilation theory for second generation immigrants—selective, consonant, and dissonant acculturation (for details, see Chap. 2)—Haller and Landolt (2005, p. 1189) argue that only selective acculturation predicts high levels of interest in or involvement with the sending society, because it involves interest in the country of origin's cultural heritage. Consonant and dissonant acculturation do not predict a particular level of transnational involvement. The empirical analyses conducted deliver mixed evidence. Overall, it appears that factors the authors link to selective acculturation—family cohesion and knowledge and preference of a foreign language (Haller and Landolt 2005, p. 1195, 1197)—are important predictors for remitting as well as feeling equally at home in the US and the parents' country of origin. Interestingly, regarding visits to this country, only family cohesion functions as a significant predictor. Moreover, the authors find limited evidence of an association between downward mobility with higher rates of sending remittances among some ethnic groups (Haller and Landolt 2005, pp. 1202–1205), as the associations between unemployment and criminal conviction with transnational involvement indicate. These findings can also be

---

[12] Since the authors use an index score for transnational involvement based on various different items (Snel et al. 2006, p. 292), one can unfortunately not examine whether this holds for all types of transnational activities or just for some.

interpreted from the perspective of the other studies discussed above. If we conceive of border-crossing involvement as a reaction toward unfavorable conditions in the receiving country (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, p. 772) (see also Portes 1999, p. 465), then it is rather plausible that the marginalization (i.e. being unemployed, having been convicted for a crime) as well as cultural segmentation (see Chaps. 2 and 4) are associated with increased transnational involvement.

3.6.3   Concurrent or Competitive Processes?

What do these studies have in common? Where do they differ and what do these studies tell us about the relation of immigrant integration and transnational involvement? Before turning to these questions, we should remind ourselves that there are many plausible explanations for similarities as well as discrepancies of the studies' findings at hand. We have to bear in mind that these studies have been conducted in different countries with different migration histories and embedded in different migration systems. However, the comparability of the studies is limited not only due to their different settings, but also because of the differences in data sets.

Still, there are noteworthy similarities as well as differences in the findings of these studies. All studies find that occasional transnational activities, especially socio-cultural activities, visits, and remittances are common among immigrants. Transnational modes of conducting one's life, as is the case with the transnational entrepreneurs, however, are the exception. The interpretation of these results with respect to the different theoretical paradigms promoting or criticizing the concept of transnationalism is ambiguous. We can see them as supporting the claims of the transnational perspective on migration, when looking broadly at the proportion of immigrants who are to some extent involved in transnational activities. But we can also see them as supporting the position of traditional theories on immigrant integration, when we reflect on the fact that those activities are the most widespread which are occasional and least cost-intensive (in the sense of compatibility of integration and transnational involvement). These studies' multivariate analyses, unfortunately, do not reveal one shared pattern. Regardless of the problems of comparability, there are two discrepant sets of findings which are worth discussing.

First, this concerns the relation between the time spent in the country of origin and border-crossing activities. Studies conducted with the CIEP generally report that transnational involvement increases over time. The longer the immigrant lives in the receiving country, the more she/he is transnationally active. At least from this perspective, transnational involvement and integration into the receiving society do not appear to be mutually exclusive processes. Waldinger's (2008a) analyses, in contrast, suggest that transnational involvement decreases over time. Of course, time itself in the receiving country does not increase an immigrant's integration into the new society (Esser 1981). Rather, processes of integration unfold over time—acquiring language skills, becoming economically integrated, and taking up social relations with the autochthonous population all happen over time. In this sense, time spent in

the receiving country is more of a proxy for integration than a concrete measure of it. Therefore, a conclusion on the compatibility of transnational involvement and immigrant integration solely based on associations of years of residence and measures of transnational involvement appears premature.

Second, this concerns the relation between prominent predictors of immigrant integration and transnational involvement. There are two sets of measures that are especially important in this regard. The first set concerns measures of structural integration, such as income and education, because they are usually assumed to ease and facilitate integration into the receiving society—the former is also often used as an important measure of it (Dustmann 1994; Dustmann and van Soest 2001, 2002). At the same time, they might function as important resources for transnational involvement, as some of the above studies indicate (e.g. Guarnizo et al. 2003). However, the evidence on this is mixed. In some instances, these resources appear to increase border-crossing involvement, potentially through providing opportunities and reducing costs, whereas in other cases, they work in the opposite direction (see Table 3.5). Of course, they may very well depend on the type of activity we are looking at, e.g. visiting the country of origin, sending remittances, being politically involved in origin country affairs, etc. But even with such a differentiation, the evidence remains inconclusive (e.g. Haller and Landolt 2005; Portes 2003; Waldinger 2008a). The other set of measures concerns aspects of cultural and emotional integration. Although the theories of integration discussed in Chap. 2 in general remain silent with regard to transnational involvement, we can generally infer that the higher the sense of belonging to and the orientation toward the receiving country, the lower will be an immigrant's transnational involvement. And there is indirect evidence that this might be the case. Plans to return to the country of origin, experiences of discrimination, a negative perception of the receiving country, higher age at migration, all seem to increase immigrants' ties with the country of origin (see Table 3.5 and Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo (2002) as well as Haller and Landolt (2005)). Yet, measures of cultural integration, for instance receiving country language proficiency, are again ambiguous in their effects across the different studies (see Table 3.5 and Landolt (2001), Haller and Landolt (2005), and Waldinger (2008a), O'Flaherty (2007)).

Despite this, there seems to be one conclusion that most of the above studies agree on. Transnational involvement and immigrant integration—at least for the first generation—appear as concurrent rather than competitive processes. The studies conducted with the CIEP data conclude (Guarnizo et al. 2003, p. 1233, 1238; Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2005, p. 917; Portes et al. 2002, p. 289–290) that predictions from traditional theoretical models are consistently rejected. It is the better qualified, more experienced, and more secure immigrants who most often engage in border-crossing activities. Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo (2005, p. 917) state that transnational involvement does not hinder immigrants' integration into the receiving society. Snel et al (2006, p. 304) come to a similar conclusion, saying there is no evidence that transnational involvement is related to the various factors that determine integration into the receiving society, and hence integration and transnational involvement may well be simultaneous processes that do not impede each other. In part, Waldinger (2008a, p. 25) also commits to this interpretation, as

he argues that the same factors that promote cross-border involvement might promote integration into the receiving society. In contrast to the above studies, however, Waldinger (2008a) stresses that transnational modes of living, i.e. engaging in deep and manifold activities across borders, are an exception. Different types of transnational activities coincide with different settlement periods and most immigrants are likely to eventually lose their ties to the country of origin. Haller and Londolt's study (2005) can, of course, hardly be compared to the other studies, as it investigates the second generation's transnational involvement. Still, we find similarities to the above studies in the sense that different integration outcomes are linked to differences in transnational involvement, for instance as poor and marginalized second generation immigrants sustain ties with their parents' country of origin via remittances (Haller and Landolt 2005, p. 1203).

3.6.4   Previous Studies' Shortcomings

Despite the invaluable importance of estimating how prevalent cross-border ties are among contemporary immigrants and of exploring how these may relate to their integration into the receiving society, the above studies have a number of shortcomings. The discussion of these shortcomings does not intend to demean the studies' importance and their contributions to the study of immigrant integration and transnational involvement. But if we are interested in a reliable assessment of immigrants' cross-border involvements as well as an understanding how this relates to the immigrants' integration in the receiving society, we cannot ignore aspects that might impact the studies' generalizability and the reliability of the results.

The first aspect to consider is certainly the process of data collection. Generalizing a study's findings to the underlying population is only possible if the data at hand is representative. In this respect, the study of Snel et al. (2006) cannot serve as a basis for any generalizations, because the data was collected via a snowball sampling scheme. Their results therefore cannot be generalized to the immigrant population in the Netherlands. Thus, we have to conclude that despite 20 years of research on immigrants' transnational activities, we still do not have a reliable assessment of the prevalence of immigrants' transnational involvement in any European country. For the US, the situation is different, with three large-scale data sets, the CIEP, PEW 2002, and CILS, available. The data of arguably the most influential of these studies, the CIEP, combines a random and non-random snowball sample (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2005, p. 905). Waldinger (2008a, p. 6) emphasizes that immigrants belonging to the non-random part of the sample differ from the random sample part both in their degree of transnational involvement as well as with regard to socio-economic characteristics, with the level of transnational activities being generally higher in the non-random part. Waldinger (2008a, p. 7) even states that the description of "transnationals" (e.g. in Portes 2003) "seems to largely reflect the characteristics of the members of the referral sample." The 2002 PEW data used

by Waldinger (2008a) provides better grounds for estimating the scope of border-crossing involvement among immigrants in the US, since the data was collected through a random sampling procedure. The CILS used by Hallor and Landolt (2005) is a random sample of second generation immigrants, which is, however, confined to South Florida, including Miami. Hallor and Landolt (2005, p. 1184) use the Miami sample of the CILS. Since Miami is rather particular, being the center of finance and trade between the US, Latin America, the Caribbean, and the rest of the world (Haller and Landolt 2005, p. 1204) and a stronghold for the Cuban exile, their results may be specific to the unique context of Miami.

The data from the LSIA used by O'Flaherty et al. (2007, p. 826) is only representative of permanent immigrants in Australia who entered the country between 1993 and 1995 and were living in capital cities and major centers near these capitals. Immigrants without an identifiable country of origin, temporary immigrants, and immigrants who were granted a visa while already residing in Australia were excluded from the sample—as were New Zealand citizens who do not need a visa to live and work in Australia (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 826). Moreover, the immigrants were only followed throughout the first 4 years after coming to Australia. While the "embryonic stages of settlement" (O'Flaherty et al. 2007, p. 840) are without doubt important for the further trajectories of integration, it might be too short of a time-period to assess how integration and transnational activities relate to each other. Moreover, one might argue that excluding temporary immigrants from the sample is problematic, as the intention to return to the country of origin is theoretically and empirically relevant for engaging in border-crossing activities. It is, nevertheless, informative to investigate transnational activities among a population in which they are by default less likely, i.e. among immigrants who intend to settle permanently in the country, because this tells us probably more about the relation between integration and transnational involvement than the investigation of this relationship among short-term or pendular migrants would.

The second aspect to consider is data structure and data analyses. Since the social sciences can rarely rely on experimental data to test or establish theories, we have to rely on analyzing non-experimental data. The problem with social science data is that we never have perfect measurements and rarely take all relevant factors into account. And we have to carefully consider this in any data analysis, for ignoring these issues can severely bias our results (see Chap. 5 for a detailed discussion). First, cross-sectional data is usually a weak basis for causal analysis—and this is what we are eventually interested in when asking questions such as how does immigrant integration relate to transnational activities. Despite the fact that many of the studies' hypotheses are not directly formulated as causal mechanisms, they imply such mechanisms. For instance, the hypothesis on 'reactive transnationalism' (Itzigsohn and Giorguli-Saucedo 2002, p. 772)—that *if* an immigrant is dissatisfied with her or his life in the receiving country *then* she or he will engage in border-crossing activities—is a causal claim. Only if very specific and unlikely conditions are met (see Chap. 5) can cross-sectional data analyses provide us with unbiased estimates of predictors. One necessary condition is that we can rule out that any (unobserved) confounder biases the analyses. Regarding the CIEP data and the analyses carried

out with it, it is unfortunate that factors which are likely to influence transnational activities were either not collected (e.g. receiving country language skills—see also Waldinger (2008a, p. 7)) or for whatever reason not included in the analyses (e.g. residence status or income).[13]

An additional problem in cross-sectional data is that we cannot distinguish causal processes from (self-)selection processes. This seems especially pressing if we remind ourselves that immigrant integration is a process over time. Longitudinal data offers some improvements over cross-sectional data when it comes to handling these problems. In this regard, both the LSIA and the CILS data surpass the other data sets, because they are longitudinal. But effectively using longitudinal data requires the application of adequate techniques of longitudinal data analyses. Unfortunately, neither O'Flaherty et al. (2007) nor Hallor and Landolt (2005) do take full advantage of the potential of longitudinal data. One might argue that this is hair-splitting. It is not, as will hopefully become clear in Chap. 5.

Taken together, we can thus conclude that "[w]hether defined in broad or narrow terms, the incidence of immigrant cross-state exchanges and loyalties has been established beyond doubt; still up for debate, however, are questions related to the prevalence of migrant cross-state social action and to the conditions and characteristics that either facilitate or hinder sustained home-host ties" as Waldinger (2008a, p. 6) puts it. The above studies are important first steps in assessing the scope of transnational activities among immigrants around the world and in exploring the relation these activities have to immigrant integration. As most of the above studies have a sizeable exploratory element in them, we should not be surprised that they do not deliver fully conclusive theoretical models that link border-crossing involvement to integration in an unambiguous way. Nevertheless, they can guide further theoretical development, as all studies implicitly or explicitly assume that opportunities and motivation for transnational activities are shaped by the interplay of conditions in the sending country, the receiving country, and characteristics of the individual immigrant. The following chapter thus presents an attempt to incorporate border-crossing activities into a general model of immigrant integration, more specifically the model of intergenerational integration.

References

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N., & Szanton-Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations unbound: Transnational projects, post-colonial predicaments, and deterritorialized nation-states*. Langhorne: Gordon and Breach.

Beck, U. (2007a). Beyond class and nation: Reframing social inequalities in a globalizing world. *British Journal of Sociology, 58*(4), 679–705.

Beck, U. (2007b). The cosmopolitan condition—Why methodological nationalism fails. *Theory Culture & Society, 24*(7–8), 286 − +.

---

[13] It is justifiable not to include income as a predictor for transnational entrepreneurship in cross-sectional data, because the relation may be endogenous. However, one is hard pressed to find arguments for not including it in the analyses of other forms of border-crossing activities.

Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2009). Global generations and the trap of methodological nationalism for a cosmopolitan turn in the sociology of youth and generation. *European Sociological Review, 25*(1), 25–36.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34,* 153–179.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Die feinen Unterschiede. Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 14–25.

Brown, G. G. (1944). Missions and cultural diffusion. *The American Journal of Sociology, 50*(3), 214–219.

Brown, R. P. C., & Poirine, B. (2005). A model of migrants' remittances with human capital investment and intrafamilial transfers. *International Migration Review, 39*(2), 407–438. (Article).

Cinel, D. (1991). *The national integration of Italian return migration, 1870–1929* (Interdisciplinary perspectives on modern history). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collier, D., Mahoney, J., & Seawright, J. (2004). Claiming too much: Warnings about selection bias. In H. E. Brady & D. Collier (Eds.), *Rethinking social inquiry. Diverse tools, shared standards* (pp. 85–102). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Curtin, P. D. (1984). *Cross-cultural trade in world history* (Studies in comparative world history). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dann, O. (1993). *Nation und Nationalismus in Deutschland, 1770–1990* (Originalausg. ed., Beck'sche Reihe, Vol. 494). München: Beck.

Durlauf, S. N. (1999). The case "Against" social capital. *Focus, 20*(3), 1–5.

Dustmann, C. (1994). Speaking fluency, writing fluency and earnings of migrants. *Journal of Population Economics, 7*(2), 133–156.

Dustmann, C., & Mestres, J. (2009). Remittances and temporary migration. *Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration Discussion Paper Series, 09*(09), 1–18.

Dustmann, C., & van Soest, A. (2001). Language fluency and earnings: Estimation with misclassified language indicators. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 83*(4), 663–674.

Dustmann, C., & Van Soest, A. (2002). Language and the earnings of immigrants. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 55*(3), 473–492.

Esser, H. (1981). Aufenthaltsdauer und die Eingliederung von Wanderern. Zur theoretischen Interpretation soziologischer 'Variablen'. *Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie, 10*(76–97).

Faist, T. (1998). Transnational social spaces out of international migration: Evolution, significance and future prospects. *Archives Europeennes De Sociologie, 39*(2), 213 – +.

Faist, T. (2000a). Transnationalization in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 23*(2), 189–222.

Faist, T. (2000b). *The volume and dynamics of international migration and transnational social spaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faist, T., & Gerdes, J. (1999). Transnationalism from below. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22*(6), 1092–1093.

Gans, H. J. (1992). Ethnic invention and acculturation, a bumpy-line approach—Comment. *Journal of American Ethnic History, 12*(1), 42–52.

Gans, H. J. (1997). Toward a reconciliation of "assimilation" and "pluralism": The interplay of acculturation and ethnic retention. *International Migration Review, 31*(4), 875–892.

Gieryn, T. F. (2000). A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26,* 463. (Annual Reviews Inc.).

Glazer, N. (1954). Ethnic groups in America. In M. Berger, T. Abel, & C. H. Page (Eds.), *Freedom and control in modern society* (pp. 158–173). New York: Van Nostrand.

Glick Schiller, N. (1999). Transmigrants and nation-states: Something old and something new in the U.S. immigrant experience. In C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, & J. DeWind (Eds.), *The handbook of international migration: The American experience* (pp. 94–117). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Glick Schiller, N., & Fouron, G. E. (2001). *Georges woke up laughing: Long-distance nationalism and the search for home*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Glick Schiller, N., & Levitt, P. (2006). Haven't we heard this somewhere before? A substantive view of transnational migration studies by way of a reply to Waldinger and Fitzgerald. *CMD Working Paper 06–01*. Working paper.

Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Szanton Blanc, C. (Eds.). (1992). *Towards a transnational perspective on migration: Race, class, ethnicity, and nationalism reconsidered*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Szanton Blanc, C. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly, 68*(1), 48–63.

Goebel, D., & Pries, L. (2002). Transnationale Migration und die Inkorporation von Migranten. In F. Swianczny, & S. Haug (Eds.), *Migration—Integration—Minderheiten—Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft* (Vol. 107). Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.

Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A., & Haller, W. J. (2003). Assimilation and transnationalism: Determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(6), 1211–1248.

Haller, W., & Landolt, P. (2005). The transnational dimensions of identity formation: Adult children of immigrants in Miami. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(6), 1182–1214.

Hebert, U. (2003). *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.

ICR, I. C. R.-. (2002). Kaiser/PEW 2002 Latino Survey Methodology Report. (pp. 1–6).

Itzigsohn, J., & Giorguli-Saucedo, S. (2002). Immigrant incorporation and sociocultural transnationalism. *International Migration Review, 36*(3), 766–798.

Itzigsohn, J., & Giorguli-Saucedo, S. (2005). Incorporation, transnationalism, and gender: Immigrant incorporation and transnational participation as gendered processes. *International Migration Review, 39*(4), 895–920.

Joppke, C., & Morawska, E. T. (2003). *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states* (Migration, minorities, and citizenship). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kasinitz, P., Waters, M. C., Mollenkopf, J. H., & Anil, M. (2002). Transnationalism and the children of immigrants in contemporary New York. In P. Levitt & M. C. Waters (Eds.), *The changing face of home* (pp. 96–122). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Khagram, S., & Levitt, P. (2008). *The transnational studies reader: Intersections and innovations*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis.

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton.

Kivisto, P. (2001). Theorizing transnational immigration: A critical review of current efforts. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24*(4), 549–577.

Kivisto, P., & Faist, T. (2010). *Beyond a border. The causes and consequences of contemporary immigration*. Los Angeles: Pine Forge.

Koopmans, R. (2004). Migrant mobilisation and political opportunities: Variation among German cities and a comparison with the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 30*(3), 449–470.

Koopmans, R., & Statham, P. (1999). Challenging the liberal nation-state? Postnationalism, multiculturalism, and the collective claims making of migrants and ethnic minorities in Britain and Germany. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(3), 652–696.

Landolt, P. (2001). Salvadoran economic transnationalism: Embedded strategies for household maintenance, immigrant incorporation, and entrepreneurial expansion. *Global Networks, 1*(3), 217–241.

Levitt, P. (1998). Social remittances: Migration driven local-level forms of cultural diffusion. *International Migration Review, 32*(4), 926–948.

Levitt, P. (2001). *The transnational villagers*. Berkely: University of California Press.

Levitt, P., DeWind, J., & Vertovec, S. (2003). International perspectives on transnational migration: An introduction. *International Migration Review, 37*(3), 565–575.

Levitt, P., & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review, 38*(3), 1002–1039.

Levitt, P., & Jaworsky, N. (2007). Transnational migration studies: Past developments and future trends. *Annual Review of Sociology, 33*, 129–156.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science. Selected theoretical papers* (1st ed.). New York: Harper.

Lucassen, L. (2006). Is transnationalism compatible with assimilation? Examples from Western Europe since 1850. *IMIS, 29,* 15–35.

Mahler, S. J. (1998). Theoretical and empirical contributions toward a research agenda for transnationalism. In M. P. Smith & L. E. Guarnizo (Eds.), *Transnationalism from below* (pp. 64–102). New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Marger, M. N. (2006). Transnationalism or Assimilation? Patterns of Sociopolitical Adaptation among Canadian Business Immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(5), 882–900.

Massey, D. S., & Parrado, E. (1994). Migradollars: The remittances and savings of Mexican migrants to the USA. *Population Research and Policy Review, 13*(1), 3–30. (Article).

Mau, S. (2010). *Social transnationalism. Lifeworlds beyond the nation-state* (International library of sociology). London: Routledge.

Merton, R. K. (1987). 3 Fragments from a sociologists notebooks—Establishing the phenomenon, specified ignorance, and strategic research materials. *Annual Review of Sociology, 13,* 1–28.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology, 103*(1), 144–181.

Morawska, E. T. (2004). Exploring diversity in immigrant assimilation and transnationalism: Poles and Russian Jews in Philadelphia. *International Migration Review, 38*(4), 1372–1412.

Murphy, R. C. (1982). *Gastarbeiter im Deutschen Reich: Polen in Bottrop 1891–1933*. Wuppertal: Hammer.

O'Flaherty, M., Skrbis, Z., & Tranter, B. (2007). Home visits: Transnationalism among Australian immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(5), 817–844.

Peterson, W. (1969). *Population*. Toronto: The MacMillian Company.

Pirenne, H., & Halsey, F. D. (1980 [1925]). *Medieval cities; their origins and the revival of trade* (3. print., renewed ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Portes, A. (1996a). Global villagers: The rise of transnational communities. *American Prospect, 25,* 74–77.

Portes, A. (1996b). Transnational communities: Their emergence and significance in the contemporary world-system. In R. P. Korzeniewicz & W. C. Smith (Eds.), *Latin America in the world-economy* (pp. 151–168). Westport: Greenwood Press.

Portes, A. (1999). Conclusion: Towards a new world—The origins and effects of transnational activities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22*(2), 463–477.

Portes, A. (2001). Introduction: The debates and significances of immigrant transnationalism. *Global Networks, 1*(3), 181–193.

Portes, A. (2003). Conclusion: Theoretical convergencies and empirical evidence in the study of immigrant transnationalism. *International Migration Review, 37*(3), 874–892.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2005). Introduction: The second generation and the children of immigrants longitudinal study. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(6), 983–999.

Portes, A., Dore-Cabral, C., & Landolt, P. (Eds.). (1997). *The Urban Caribbean: Transition to the new global economy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. (1999). The study of transnationalism: Pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and racial relations, 22*(2), 217–237.

Portes, A., Haller, W. J., & Guarnizo, L. E. (2002). Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review, 67*(2), 278–298.

Portes, A., Fernandez-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(6), 1000–1040.

Portes, A., Escobar, C., & Radford, A. W. (2007). Immigrant transnational organizations and development: A comparative study. *International Migration Review, 41*(1), 242–281.

Portes, A., Escobar, C., & Arana, R. (2008). Bridging the gap: Transnational and ethnic organizations in the political incorporation of immigrants in the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(6), 1056–1090.

Pries, L. (1996). Transnational social spaces. A theoretical-empirical sketch based on Mexican-American labor migration. *Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie, 25*(6), 456-&.

Pries, L. (1997a). Neue Migration im Transnationalen Raum. In L. Pries (Ed.), *Transnationale Migration*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Pries, L. (Ed.). (1997b). *Transnationale migration*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Pries, L. (1998). "Transmigrants" as a type of labour migrants in pluri-local social spheres. The example of labour migration between Puebla/Mexico and New York City. *Soziale Welt-Zeitschrift Fur Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung Und Praxis, 49*(2), 135 − +.

Pries, L. (2001a). The approach of transnational social spaces. In L. Pries (Ed.), *New transnational social spaces* (pp. 3–33). London: Routledge.

Pries, L. (2001b). The disruption of social and geographic space. *International Sociology, 16,* 55–74.

Pries, L. (Ed.). (2001c). *New transnational social spaces*. London: Routledge.

Pries, L. (2002). Transnationalization of the social world? *Berliner Journal Fur Soziologie, 12*(2), 263–272.

Pries, L. (2005a). Configurations of geographic and societal spaces: A sociological proposal between 'methodological nationalism' and the 'spaces of flows'. *Global Networks-a Journal of Transnational Affairs, 5*(2), 167–190.

Pries, L. (2005b). Labour migration, social incorporation and transmigration in the New Europe: The case of Germany from a comparative perspective. In T. Geisen (Ed.), *Arbeitsmigration: WanderarbeiterInnen auf dem Weltmarkt für Arbeitskraft* (pp. 81–105). Frankfurt a. M.: IKO.

Rumbaut, R. G. (2002). Severed or sustained attachments? Language, identity, and imagined communities in the post-immigrant generation. In P. Levitt (Ed.), *The changing face of home* (pp. 43–95). Berkeley: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sana, M., & Massey, D. S. (2005). Household composition, family migration, and community context: Migrant remittances in four countries. *Social Science Quarterly, 86*(2), 509–528. (Article).

Sassen, S. (1991). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schütz, A. (1962). *Collected papers volume I*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Smith, R. C. (2002). Life course, generation, and social location as factors shaping second-generation transnational life. In P. Levitt & M. C. Waters (Eds.), *The changing face of home. The transnational lives of the second generation* (pp. 145–167). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Snel, E., Engbersen, G., & Leerkes, A. (2006). Transnational involvement and social integration. *Global Networks, 6*(3), 285–308.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. W. (1993). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society, 22*(4), 487–511.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. W. (1994). Institutional conditions for diffusion. In R. Scott & J. W. Meyer (Eds.), *Institutional environments and organizations* (pp. 100–112). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Szanton Blanc, C., Basch, L., & Glick Schiller, N. (1995). Transnationalism, nation-states, and culture. *Current Anthropology, 36*(4), 683–686.

Taylor, J. E. (1999). The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration, 37*(1), 63–88. (Proceedings Paper).

Teltemann, J., & Windzio, M. (2011). Die "kognitive Exklusion" junger Migranten im Ländervergleich. Effekte institutioneller und sozialstruktureller Faktoren. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie, 21*(3), 335–361.

Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F. (1919). *The polish peasant in Europe and America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tubergen, F. van. (2006). Self-employment of immigrants: A cross-national study of 17 western societies. *Social Forces, 84,* 709–732.

Tubergen, F. van., & Kalmijn, M. (2005). Destination-language proficiency in cross-national perspective: A study of immigrant groups in nine western countries. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(5), 1412–1457.

Tubergen, F. van., Maas, I., & Flap, H. (2004). The economic incorporation of immigrants in 18 western societies: Origin, destination, and community effects. *American Sociological Review, 69*(5), 704–727.

Vertovec, S. (1999). Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22*(2), 447–462.

Vertovec, S. (2004). Cheap calls: The social glue of migrant transnationalism. *Global Networks, 4,* 219–224.

Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism* (Key ideas). Milton Park: Routledge.

Waldinger, R. (2008a). Between "Here" and "There": Immigrant cross-border activities and loyalties. *International Migration Review, 42*(1), 3–29.

Waldinger, R. (2008b). Immigrant "Transnationalism" in the presence of the past. In E. R. Barkan, H. Diner, & A. M. Kraut (Eds.), *From arrival to incorporation: Migrants in the U.S. in a global era* (pp. 267–285). New York: New York University Press.

Waldinger, R., & Fitzgerald, D. (2004). Transnationalism in question. *American Journal of Sociology, 109*(5), 1177–1195.

Wallerstein, I. M. (2005). *World-system analysis: An introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Weichs, K. (2011). Demokratie und politische Partizipation. In S. Bundesamt, & WZB (Eds.), *Datenreport 2011* (pp. 365–376). Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002a). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks, 2*(4), 301–334.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002b). Methodological nationalism and the study of migration. *Archives Europeennes De Sociologie, 43*(2), 217–240.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2003). Methodological nationalism, the social sciences, and the study of migration: An essay in historical epistemology. *International Migration Review, 37*(3), 576–610.

Wyman, M. (1993). *Round-trip to America: The immigrants return to Europe 1880–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.