

Mini-Conference "Making Connections" Summary Report

September 2009

Table of Content

Session 1/Table 1:	<u>How to Run Large Team Projects (Across Disciplines, Places, etc)</u>
Session 1/Table 2:	<u>How to Publish a Book</u>
Session 1/Table 3:	<u>Successfully Employing Mixed Methods</u>
Session 1/Table 4:	<u>Measuring Integration</u>
Session 1/Table 5:	<u>Finding, Creating, and Using Survey Data on Immigrants</u>
Session 1/Table 6:	<u>Writing Successful Grant Proposals</u>
Session 1/Table 7:	<u>How to Talk to Reporters about Immigration</u>
Session 1/Table 8:	<u>The Job Market – Tips and Advice</u>
Session 1/Table 9:	<u>IRB/ Human Subjects for Migration Research</u>
Session 2/Table 1:	<u>New Destinations and Local Migration Politics</u>
Session 2/Table 2:	<u>Immigrant Collective Action and Civic/Political Engagement</u>
Session 2/Table 3:	<u>Culture and Immigration</u>
Session 2/Table 4:	<u>Education and Immigration</u>
Session 2/Table 5:	<u>Religion and Immigration</u>
Session 2/Table 6:	<u>The 2nd Generation and Inequality</u>
Session 2/Table 7:	<u>Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration</u>
Session 2/Table 8:	<u>Mexican Migration</u>
Session 2/Table 9:	<u>Refugees</u>
Session 2/Table 10:	<u>National Migration Policy</u>
Session 2/Table 11:	<u>Immigrant Families</u>
Keynote Panel 1:	<u>(How) Can Social Scientists Affect Policy?</u>
Keynote Panel 2:	<u>Comparative Migration and Integration: Empirical and Conceptual Contributions Beyond the U.S.</u>

Acknowledgement

We very gratefully acknowledge the help from all of our volunteer rapporteurs, without whom this written record of our conference would not have been possible. It is our modest hope that these notes will provide section members who could not attend the mini-conference with the shared insights that these conversations generated and that they will stimulate further research.

Session 1/Table 1: How to Run Large Team Projects (Across Disciplines, Places, etc)

Presiders: David Fitzgerald (UCSD) & Philip Kasinitz (CUNY-Graduate Center)

Rapporteur: Helen B. Marrow (UC-Berkeley/UCSF)

David Fitzgerald

1. Has conducted large-scale survey research (Mexican Migration Field Research Program, UCSD) but will speak about doing comparative historical research
2. “Race, Immigration, and Citizenship in the Americas” – new project with David Cook-Martin (Grinnell College). Investigates the use of race, ethnicity, and national origin as grounds for selection of immigrants in Western hemisphere countries’ immigration policies. Addresses the alleged incompatibility of political liberalism and racial grounds for admission; finding that that the most liberal of countries are using race as a selection criteria more, not less
 - a. 22 countries, 150+ years time span, 15 people (2 PIs, graduate students, and undergrads), and case studies on largest countries (USA, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, and Mexico)
3. Involves both Quantitative and Qualitative methods, so steps involved:
 - a. Pick PI collaborators – want both similarities and complementarities
 - i. In this case, PIs are of same discipline (sociology) with similar training and interests. But have different country/time period foci
 - b. Select students – want those who bring in different skill sets
 - i. Graduate students (in this case, needed some quantitative ability, including an econometrician since are doing surveys of immigration laws, and sociology grad students for qualitative work with the history and country case studies)
 - ii. Undergraduate students (for lower-level or more clerical work)
4. Infrastructure – a lot is required!
 - a. Password-protected website (where can scan/upload primary and interview documents)
 - b. Database of immigration laws
 - c. Text-recognition software
 - d. Using Envivo to code
 - e. Create a coding manual-in-progress (which needs to be located on the website for all to see, and which keeps a detailed log of all steps/decisions made regarding coding along the way)
 - f. Google Documents (good for doing common summer research, because it is *free*, makes it possible to control access to documents among members, and also tracks who makes changes to documents)
 - g. Footnoting (are being extremely careful about this along the way, especially when doing comparative historical research)
 - h. Bibliography (helpful to keep this online on the password-protected website to avoid duplication of effort. More efficient. Have all members download this file every 6 months or so)
 - i. Frequent meeting among PIs (every few months, as tech only goes so far)
 - j. Remember the larger purpose/goal of the infrastructure (to do research, not just building complex tech infrastructure for its own sake)
5. Funding: NSF, ASA, UC-wide research units, intramural projects

- a. NSF has “REU – Research Experience for Undergraduates” fund, which is a supplement to their regular NSF grants. It’s a great fund for teaching undergraduates how to conduct research on large projects. NSF also likes collaborative projects, which is good to remember.

Philip Kasinitz

1. Speaking about “The New York Second Generation Project”, a 15-year, large-scale survey and interview research project on the children of immigrants in the 5 boroughs of NYC with John Mollenkopf (CUNY), Mary Waters (Harvard), and Jennifer Holdaway (Social Science Research Council)
2. Advantages of large team projects
 - a. Lots of eyes/points of view
 - b. More resources at your command
 - c. Work with people from other disciplines (here, sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, some of interviewers were psychologists; although regret that interdisciplinary work is less valued among junior scholar economists, because it would have been nice to have one as a PI on this project)
 - d. Creating and collecting one’s own data is hard, but it’s great for truly understanding data (especially quantitative data). Also creates humility (i.e., researchers sometimes have a tendency to be over-precise when analyzing external data that they are more divorced from collecting)
3. To maximize these advantages, he offers some advice from what they did:
 - a. Set a strong division of labor at the outset (not necessarily individually, but practically. In this project, we didn’t have a strong one among the 3 PIs; however, we did have a hierarchy down from the 3 PIs to the post-docs and graduate students. A lack of a good division of labor is good for learning from each other, but not for efficiency, so think about your goals and the pros/cons.)
 - b. Met regularly (it’s essential for touching base about what’s important)
 - c. Had a well-selected PI team
 - d. Got great graduate students (for in-depth interviews) and post-docs (for qualitative field case studies), across a lot of disciplines
 - i. Made the in-depth interviewers meet weekly (to communicate, find analogies, discuss findings and comparisons/contrasts, etc.)
 - ii. Ditto with the post-docs (especially for qualitative researchers who tend to operate as “lone wolves”; can even help shape your theoretical underpinnings)
 - iii. Phil even ran a seminar for 2 1/2 years to bring them all together
 - e. Had patience (a huge research project like this takes a lot longer than you think. Even the initial reviews of the proposal and project were difficult, so it takes patience not to quit; have faith it will eventually come together)
4. Some pitfalls to try to avoid:
 - a. Have to acknowledge the weird balance between (1) obtaining data consistency and (2) showing sensitivity to the uniqueness of each location in your field research (esp. when doing surveys in multiple locations; you need some of *both* if you are working in 2-3 fieldsites)
 - b. The issue of “who gets credit” for findings/publications is always touchy (in this project, PIs were probably over-generous in allowing many of the graduate students and post-

docs to write their own articles and books out of the material, and one of the post-docs eventually became a co-author; in general it's an issue to think about and establish guidelines around at the outset)

- c. "Ethnography superstition" (as an ethnographer, Phil just doesn't feel right writing up results about a place he's never visited. So for PIs, his advice is to get to know some of the fieldsites yourselves; do a few of the interviews, or the pre-test interviews, yourselves; don't over-bureaucratize yourselves away from the ground-level research)
- d. A good codebook is essential (*write it down*, log all of your developments and decisions regarding coding along the way, and make it available to all members; do it all in written form and not just "by understanding")
- e. Quantitative/qualitative collaborations (feel it would have been helpful to have someone with even more sophisticated quantitative background on this project; on the other hand, advises quant folks to be careful of using qualitative work just as "illustrations" rather than "analyses", or summed up as "percentages")

Questions & Answers

1. Filiz Garip (Harvard): What is the timeline for doing big projects as a junior scholar trying to get tenure? Will it take too long to be worth it?
 - a. Doug Massey (Princeton): Advice is to start small (consider proposing a pilot study that you can eventually expand on); also, don't make it your only thing (you also need to keep publishing papers)
 - b. Consider an NSF Career Award – tends to go to 5th-6th year professors, since they want evidence of good publications
 - c. Also consider funding programs *outside* of Sociology at NSF, which have more money available. Apply *outside* of the Sociology directorate
 - d. NIH – R03 (mechanism for pots of money)
 - e. Foundations – are quirky; apply if it's a great match; more and more they want policy-relevant work and are in fiscal crisis
 - i. Doug Massey says to write your proposals based on the science and throw some policy-relevance stuff in at the end
 - ii. NIH is in a state of transition (Obama is putting more emphasis on basic science, as opposed to Bush's focus on clinical and policy research), which is good. But be very careful about the title of your project in these applications → you don't want something that stands out and could be defunded right on the Congressional floor. Immigration is a controversial topic, so make your title "unnoticeable")
 - f. A participant: says that for EU comparative projects, the EU often requires separate funding to be won for the American components embedded in it (be careful)
 - g. Phil Kasinitz says that for their NYC second-generation project, they had a mix of foundation and federal funding. On the negative side, some of their provosts were annoyed that foundations provide less overhead than NSF does. Foundation leaders may also have their own objectives and feel some ownership over your project. On the positive side, however, foundation leaders are pretty creative about covering things that should otherwise go into overhead, so it could work out in the end
2. A participant: How much do you include community people?
 - a. Doug Massey says do so if you select and train them very carefully. And pay attention to *quality control* (have your core or researchers who can oversee/train/etc. them)

3. Wendy Roth (University of British Columbia): How do you strike a good balance between developing a good codebook at the beginning and developing it along the way?
 - a. David Fitzgerald says that he limits how many people can actually code the data. On their project, only the 2 PIs and 1 trusted graduate student are allowed to code. Because too many subtleties can be lost.
 - b. Phil Kasinitz says that they didn't limit who could code on their project as much as they should have, and yes, you should be careful about that. And as PIs, you should read a few of the transcripts and coding analyses.

Session 1/Table 2: How to Publish a Book

Presiders: Kate Wahl (Stanford University Press) & Peggy Levitt (Wellesley)

Rapporteur: Ken Haig (Harvard)

Kate Wahl

1. Publisher's goal is to develop not just individual books, but whole series
2. Recommendation/introduction from someone who knows the publisher can help you get through the slush pile (but you still need a good proposal)
3. Scholarly review process can take up to a year; 20-24 months for the whole thing
4. Do your research ahead of time (think about size of press, will you be a small fish in a big pond, or vice versa?), talk to editors; write your proposal early, and re-write it often (different from intro chapter)
5. Proposals should include: 1) overview, what's the hook; 2) chapter-by-chapter arguments; 3) who's going to read this book, and why; 4) what are comparable works, how this fits into their list (look to see what's come out in the last 4-5 years); 5) think also about what your book is going to look like, use the voice you intend to use for the book
6. Also prepare cover letter (think about why this press is your first choice, what attracted you to them), CV, and representative sample chapter (do NOT send full manuscript at first)
7. Hard to predict where electronic books are going

Peggy Levitt

1. Remember, dissertations are not books, different styles
2. Think about books you like, which press are they?
3. Get someone who knows the press you're interested in to act as intermediary
4. Be prepared to do your own marketing (e.g. collect e-mail addresses to give to publishers)
5. Use presentations at conferences as opportunity to market/meet
6. Write articles while waiting, keep your CV current

Session 1/Table 3: Successfully Employing Mixed Methods

Presiders: Patricia Fernandez-Kelly (Princeton) & Monica McDermott (Stanford)
Rapporteur: Joanna Doran (UC-Berkeley)

Patricia Fernandez-Kelly

1. Ethnographies (& qualitative research) needs to go beyond descriptive-- go to the field with some kind of theoretical understanding (Michael Burawoy *On the Extended Case Method*), which means that
 - i. it is necessary to make pre-suppositions visible before entering the field
 - ii. make theory explicit, *then* allow reality to surprise you
 - iii. the point is to allow the data to reconstruct the theory
 - iv. e.g. Lynn Haney “Young girls in trouble with the law” is a good example
2. Difference between qualitative and quantitative methods (Andy Cherlin)
 - a. Quantitative methods are a mile long and an inch deep
 - i. generalizability is the advantage of large samples, but has disadvantage of always being descriptive (correlations)
 - b. Qualitative methods are an inch long and a mile deep
 - i. not necessarily representative, but can show process, i.e.:
 - ii. *sequence* of events that can lead to certain outcomes (e.g. earlier research about teen pregnancy and school drop out suggested the pregnancy causes teens to drop out; actually, later qualitative studies showed reversed causality—girls, not finding school acceptable, get pregnant)
 - iii. *meaning* that social actors impose on their own behavior

Monica McDermott

1. Definition: use of at least 1 qualitative and at least 1 quantitative method
 - a. Most common: Cross sectional structured survey with addition of in-depth interviews
2. When *not* to use mixed methods:
 - a. if there is no clear theoretical rationale to do so
 - b. if the use of one method is unlikely to enhance the validity of another
 - c. if insufficient resources
3. *How* mixed methods used
 - a. Triangulation
 - i. two points for results of two methods, third what trying to find out
 - ii. confirmatory if both results same; (but if not, might not be a problem since could be describing different aspects of the data)
 - iii. Qualitative could facilitate quantitative (e.g. running focus group first)
 - iv. Quantitative could facilitate qualitative (talking to people if data mining not successful)
 - v. Combining methods to get general picture (e.g. using census data for context)
 - (1) improve generalizability
 - (2) facilitate interpretation of relationship between variables
 - b. How to *write* a mixed methods paper
 - i. research question
 - ii. evidence that leads to conclusion
 - iii. ideally, merge methods

Good examples

1. Joao Biehl, *Vita: Life in a zone of abandonment*
2. Bourgois *In search of respect*
3. Stack *All our kin*
4. Patricia Fernández-Kelly & Alejandro Portes *Exceptional outcomes*

Additional points:

1. Researchers producing the best quantitative studies know the data very well – have interacted with their subjects
2. Ideally, researchers should conduct at least 1-5 interviews themselves
3. There is nothing wrong with using only one method

Session 1/Table 4: Measuring Integration

Presiders: Richard Alba (CUNY-Graduate Center) & Miri Song (Kent University)

Rapporteur: Catherine Bueker (Emmanuel College)

Miri Song

1. Song started the session by discussing how slippery the topic of immigrant integration is. Prime Minister Gordon Brown is currently talking about “active citizenship,” and citizenship being expedited for those who are actively engaging in British society. There is an increasing desire to see social integration, as well as economic integration, among the foreign born.
2. Intermarriage is often seen as the ultimate “litmus test” of integration. Milton Gordon argued that once large-scale structural integration took place, intermarriage would be inevitable. But what happens after intermarriage? Given the tremendous diversity in the population, intermarriages can mean many different things and come in many different varieties. What does it mean to be intermarried? For each of the members of the couple? For the children? When Gordon theorized the link between intermarriage and integration, he was looking at groups that were all viewed as white. Today, there are people of so many different racial categories that it is not clear what intermarriage really means when there is not a white person is involved.
3. The questions we need to ask are: how do we operationalize intermarriage? How do we count intermarried couples and children? What does intermarriage today really mean? Intermarriage, in theory, lessens social divides, but it is not as straight forward as often thought. It is essential to consider the racial categories and generation of each of the members of the couple.

Richard Alba

1. Richard Alba discussed two significant challenges in the measurement of integration. He says the growing diversity of the population makes it difficult to identify a series of “flat” measures. We really need to revise what measures we use to measure integration and perhaps vary it by group. Alba cites the second problem in the study of integration as a methodological one. The key measurement of time is not as useful today as it has been historically. We have, in the past, compared one generation to another to see how a group is doing. This approach made more sense when there were large groups of immigrants coming during a condensed period of time. People were experiencing the same history and events. Today, immigration from the same source country is spread out over a much more extended period of time. The second generation, even from the same source country, will not necessarily look similar to one another. The increasing time period means that the conditions may have varied considerably, even though they all are second generation. For example, the second generation today may not have the same characteristics of the parents of the third generation today, even though they are both considered second generation, according to migration measurements. We need to look at both the generation in the U.S. and the time of migration.
2. Alba suggests that one way to deal with this problem is to collect more longitudinal data to really determine how groups are faring. Cross-sectional data is no longer as useful as it once was, and really confuses what may be going on among groups.

Session 1/Table 5: Finding, Creating, and Using Survey Data on Immigrants

Presiders: Susan K. Brown (UC-Irvine) & Taeku Lee (UC-Berkeley)

Rapporteur: Mytoan Nguyen (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Susan Brown shares insights from her experience in survey data collection as Principle Investigator on the “Immigrant Intergenerational Mobility in Los Angeles” Project (2004), a study of the second-generation children of immigrants ages 20-40 that over-sampled on Mexican origin people and funded by Russell Sage Foundation (available in ICPSR).

1. Find the appropriate reference group - whether this would be non-Hispanic whites who constituted the “mainstream” and what indeed *was* the mainstream? They collected a sample of non-Hispanic blacks as a reference group with different immigrant groups all together (Filipinos, Chinese, Guatemalans, Mexicans, etc.). One of the remaining conceptual issue – who are you comparing? Across generations? If you look at Mexicans compared to third generation whites, or Mexicans compared to their parents ...
2. Nativity of research participants – where was respondent born, if 1.5 generation, what state of country, where they have been, citizenship status and the legal status of the immigrants (other studies hadn’t gotten this), and whether they volunteered their migration status (created a separate category).
3. Education comparability across US states - They wanted to compare the research participants with New York respondents – in striving for comparable data, this became an issue in examining education because “highest year of education” seems straightforward, but there are a lot of people who finished twelfth grade but didn’t graduate from high school. It matters if you need to weight the data by education
4. Look at true intergenerational mobility – look at how parents did and then look at how the children did; not just cross sectional first- and second- generation data.

Taeku Lee is one of four PIs in 2008 National Asian American Survey funded by Russell Sage and James Irvine, and Carnegie. Single largest data source on Asian Americans on political and social issues. Encountered some overlapping issues. Survey of 5,159 Asian Americans defined to cover 6 national origin groups of 600-1300 respondents for each major group. Some cautionary tales:

1. Finding Data/Anecdotes on past students’ pooled Data Set - At University of Chicago, 1992 or so. Someone wanted to do a MA on Asian American politics and looked for potential data sources. He decided to pool together 1973-1991 GSS, has country of origin identifiers to define all the Asian American respondents: 35 respondents. Then with pooled data set, wanted to do multivariate. Then 16-18 observations after missing data. Don’t try to answer a question just because the question hasn’t been answered before. Try to find out ways to get good data or move onto a different question.
2. Racial and Ethnic Politics and Levels of Analysis - we don’t think about matching our level of explanation with levels of analysis. Whether racism continues on after the civil rights movement. Four different standpoints: Sears and Kinders on Symbolic Racism – pre-adult socialization and how children are affected by symbolics; Paul Sniderman on principles of conservatism and the role of government and moral psychology; Larry Bobo and realistic group conflict theory and group processes; Social dominance theory and ideas of evolutionary biology- these all operate at different levels of explanation and they don’t match

each other in their data on levels of analysis. Level of analysis must match levels of explanation.

3. Be really careful about presuming that survey data are the best way to get at the research questions you have in mind – divide the world into two kinds of people – the ones who love to get their hands dirty and those who don't. More survey data researchers don't want to get their hands dirty, just want to address questions haven't yet been asked and writing up analysis. Getting a grant to answer a survey data question isn't always sufficient. Find other complementary qualitative work, Eric Schickler and American political history and gotten punch cards from Gallop Polls of the 1930s and 1940s. Think about getting your hands dirty and get at tricky research questions moving beyond survey data.

Questions & Answers

1. If you're a grad student, don't wait for survey data to be publicly available data (Taeku Lee)
2. It's relatively easy to get data now compared to 20 years ago, it's a great time: ICPSR and IPUMS. You can compare lots of datasets over long periods of time (Frank Bean, UC-Irvine)
3. Creating Our Own Survey -- Wait until you have tenure before undertaking a large survey collection project – for graduate students hold off or take this into consideration. Use survey data that's already there (Susan K. Brown). If your study involves documenting high-risk behavior or hard-to-reach populations, consider whether commercial firms are the best way to go (Taeku Lee)
4. Timesharing experiments in social sciences/NSF funded cooperative survey, apply for a short module of 5-10 questions and you become a part of a larger survey and get access to free demographic data. Now it's more than twice per year available

Session 1/Table 6: Writing Successful Grant Proposals

Presiders: Katharine Donato (Vanderbilt) & Aixa Citron-Velez (Russell Sage)
Rapporteur: Natasha K. Warikoo (Harvard)

Katharine Donato started with 6 points of advice on grant-writing:

1. Have patience! Let thoughts and ideas about your project gestate—in the shower, on the way to the office, etc. If you're patient enough, a theme will turn into a project idea.
2. When you have a project idea, put it down on paper. The transition from idea to paper is an important exercise.
3. Keep revising the written document to crystallize your idea.
4. Talk to friends and colleagues about your idea.
5. Look at other proposals that have been successful with the funder you're interested in. Get these from colleagues. Also, funders sometimes have these on their website. Figure out what the formula is for that funder.
6. Understand and get to know potential funders. Aixa later advised us not to send proposals without first contacting the relevant program officer.

Aixa Citron-Velez gave some more advice. Her key advice was to “do your homework”. Approach funding like a job search. Know the culture of the funder, its idiosyncracies, procedures, requirements, etc. She gave some examples:

1. Sloan Foundation—Funds firm-level studies related to migration.
2. Rockefeller Foundation—funds projects on children and migration.
3. Ford Foundation—wants to fund non-profits and grass-roots organizations, but a researcher can be written into part of a grant for a non-profit.
4. MacArthur Foundation—more interested in applied research. Recently they're especially interested in migration from Africa.
5. Russell Sage Foundation—small foundation with a focus on immigration, inequality, and labor markets. It is:
 - a. Research center (they have year-long fellowships)
 - b. Mid-size publisher (about 15 books/year)
 - c. Project funding (\$2 million/year)—but no longer entertaining unsolicited proposals. Hence the importance of cultivating relationships with program officers.
 - d. For Russell Sage funding you'd need:
 - i. a well-written proposal.
 - ii. strong methods—they are open to innovative methods
 - iii. new questions.
 - iv. 10% limit on hardware, 15% cap on overhead (none allowed for small grants).
6. Private foundations tend to be less bureaucratic, have less onerous reporting requirements, and are more flexible with spending if you want to change your budget during the project to use funds for other costs.

Other words of wisdom

1. Katharine Donato: during one's early career start with small grants of about \$50,000 before asking for large grants. NSF especially likes small grants. Grant budget tends to be dominated by labor costs (research assistance).

2. Steve Gold (Michigan State) asked about qualitative research proposals. Katharine responded that qualitative proposals need to go beyond: “I’m going to code the data” in terms of analysis—lay out possible scenarios and how you’ll analyze them. Aixa pointed us to the NSF publication on qualitative proposals:
http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/soc/ISSQR_workshop_rpt.pdf
3. The Art of Writing Proposals, written by Adam Przeworski and Frank Salomon for SSRC, was also highly recommended:
http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B7a9cb4f4-815f-de11-bd80-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf

Session 1/Table 7: How to Talk to Reporters about Immigration

Presiders: Dowell Myers (USC) & Audrey Singer (Brookings Institution)

Rapporteur: Maria Medvedeva (University of Chicago)

1. *Why are reporters calling you?* You are (1) an expert on a specific topic of interest, (2) you have scholarly facts, (3) you have a particular point of view and can advocate for it.
2. *What are they looking for?* There are journalists looking for (1) a basic statistic or fact; (2) for a quote to add to their near-finished story; (3) for an expert comment as they are digging into the topic of their story; (4) for deep background, usually as they are starting or pitching a story.
3. *How to establish yourself as continuing source?* (1) Respond promptly (less than 2 hours) to inquiries. (2) Provide the info they are seeking. (3) Provide a usable quote. (4) Guide them to other experts with both supporting and differing views.
4. *How to present your research?* (1) Present a balanced position by fairly but dramatically characterizing the opposing extremes. (2) Use simple metaphors for complex dynamics. (3) Be careful about the naming of positions and dynamics: names are associated with existing positions and carry value judgments (for example, “illegal” vs. “undocumented”). (4) Never exaggerate or distort the facts, but feel free to be selective in choosing facts. (5) Beware the casual statements that are picked out for quotes. Solution: good quotes come when you think charitably but speak firmly, plainly, and sometimes colorfully.
5. *Example of framing your answer to the question about your opinion on a topic:* “There are two sides in the legalization debate. The opponents of legalization argue that... The proponents of legalization argue that ... However, what is really important is that we consider...”
6. *What’s in it for you?* (1) You have an audience. Journalists are curious to hear different points of view and to make sense of the issue. (2) They ask good questions that reflect the public’s skepticism or simple-minded viewpoint. Your response to the questions teaches you how to fit your research into the public mindset. (3) Dialogue with journalists can help to better position and justify your work (which can be useful in many other contexts like proposal writing), and to direct investigators to important new research questions. (4) This is your opportunity to engage a bigger audience, and through this wider – though shallow – exposure, possibly influence public opinion.
7. *Don’t forget.* (1) You can ask the journalist questions too, including: what is their story about and why are they writing it. (2) Every thing you say is “on the record” unless you specifically state otherwise. (3) “Warm up” with a colleague, communications specialist, or friend and get some “talking points” together. (4) Prepare 3 summary points backed by a single, simple fact/number each. (5) Try speaking in shorter sentences with pauses in important places to help journalists shape your message.
8. *What happens when you don’t like your quote?* Just eat it or pick a fight. There is little to be gained: retraction is unlikely, and you risk alienating the journalist and his/her organization. Fortunately, misquotes are rare!

Handout for roundtable on “How to Talk to Reporters about Immigration”

Prepared by: Dowell Myers (USC) & Audrey Singer (Brookings Institution)

Roles, Responsibility and Opportunity

1. Who are you and why are they calling you?
 - a) you are an expert on a specific topic of interest
 - b) you have scholarly facts
 - c) you have a particular point of view and can advocate for it
2. What kinds of journalists are there? (also different types of media: print, radio, tv, film, blogs, YouTube)
 - a) those looking for a basic statistic or fact
 - b) those looking for a quote to add to their near-finished story
 - c) those digging into the topic of their story and need to get experts to comment
 - d) those looking for deep background, usually as they are starting or pitching a story
3. What is your responsibility to talk with reporters?
 - a) certainly don't have to speak to reporters if you don't want to
 - b) you can help to educate journalists by providing facts/stats, by explaining/analyzing phenomena, you can reframe an issue or advocate for a point of view
4. What's in it for you?
 - a) Journalists usually are curious to hear different points of view and to learn for themselves how to make sense of the issue. So you have an audience.
 - b) They ask good questions that reflect the public's skepticism or simple-minded viewpoint. So your response to the questions teaches you how to fit your research into the public mindset.
 - c) Dialogue with journalists can help to position your work, to prepare better justifications that are useful in many other contexts (like proposal writing), and to direct investigators to important new research questions.

Respect the Fundamental Requirements for Establishing Yourself as Continuing Source:

1. give the journalists something they can use (no wasted calls)
2. respond promptly (less than 2 hours) to inquiries
3. provide the info they are seeking
4. provide a usable quote
5. guide them to other experts with both supporting and differing views

Constraints:

1. unusually complex topic in its dynamics and interrelationships
2. unusually divisive topic in its social overtones and political & economic implications
3. journalists need a simple, clear message
4. journalists also prefer very clear contrasts:
 - a) an opposing position
 - b) new, first-ever information
 - c) surprising or contradictory information
5. journalists also prefer responses to a sudden perceived emergency, rather than a report on a steady ongoing problem – focus is on what's new

Responding to Constraints:

Easy ways to fall in line with these constraints

Just offer a message consistent with Item 4 above about clear contrasts

But what if you want to promote a storyline that does NOT fall into this scheme?

- a) a nuanced problem explanation?
- b) a balanced policy conclusion?
- c) a middle of the road political position?
- d) explanation of a background condition rather than a new crisis?

Strategies for Presenting Your Research:

1. Take cues from the journalists' questions
2. Frame your research in ways that satisfies the journalists' constraints
3. Present a balanced position by fairly but dramatically characterizing the opposing extremes
4. Use simple metaphors for complex dynamics
5. Be careful about the naming of positions and dynamics, because those names often frame the issue:
 - a) names are associated with existing positions
 - b) names carry value judgments
6. Never exaggerate or distort the facts, but feel free to be selective in choosing facts
7. Beware the casual statements that are picked out for quotes:
 - a) a 30 minute interview can be hijacked by 30 seconds
 - b) journalists want you to boil down your assessment into colorful language that speaks to the common reader
 - c) to protect against embarrassment, never make extreme or disparaging statements in an interview
 - d) Solution: good quotes come when you think charitably but speak firmly, plainly, and sometimes colorfully

What Happens When You Don't Like Your Quote:

Just eat it or pick a fight. There is little to be gained: retraction is unlikely, and you risk alienating the journalist and his/her organization. Fortunately, misquotes are rare!

Don't Forget:

1. You can ask the journalist questions too, including up front: what is their story about and why are they writing it
2. Every thing you say is "on the record" unless you specifically state otherwise
3. "Warm up" with a colleague, communications specialist, or friend and get some "talking points" together
4. Prepare 3 summary points backed by a single, simple fact/number each
5. Try to speak in sentences!

Session 1/Table 8: The Job Market – Tips and Advice

Presiders: Tomas Jimenez (Stanford) & Jody Agius Vallejo (USC)

Rapporteur: Sofya Aptekar (Princeton)

1. Migration people have an advantage because of the topic and the fact that the field cuts across subfields of sociology
2. There are three job markets: tenure track jobs, post docs, and lectureships → post docs give you extra time to build your tenure case
3. Writing sample – include solo published publications if you have those, don't send too many as they are looking for reasons not to like you
4. Interview includes: individual meetings with faculty and deans, job talk, informal activities
5. Questions to ask during meetings:
 - a. latest research project
 - b. where department is headed
 - c. what students are like
 - d. tenure process
6. Job talk is the most important part – have a clear beginning, middle, and end – engage people in the room with similar interests – don't be afraid to make bold statements, arguments, describe your contribution – don't say “I don't know” or “I'll have to think about it” but try to think on your feet – also don't say “Does that answer your question?” – you can ask the institution what type of talk to give – stick to time limit – ask your department for a practice talk – start with an anecdote, picture, engage
7. If you get an offer, don't be too enthusiastic, say you will talk with your advisors – always negotiate, even if that's your only offer – get everything in writing - \$50,000-70,000 is a typical starting salary – state your needs, don't name numbers – don't piss people off
8. It helps to have your advisor send emails to people they know – these go into your file
9. Make a website with your picture for recognition and include a statement of research interests
10. CV – don't put any papers that you couldn't produce immediately if asked -if you have an R&R, say what journal but if it's just submitted, leave out
11. A teaching institution will often want to know why you want to be there
12. In terms of dealing with this difficult job market – be open to different types of positions, try to stay in grad school another year – let people know that you are willing to move
13. Informal networking – don't cold call – best to have met the person or have your advisor make the connection – if there are interests in common, contact but don't mention the job opening

Session 1/Table 9: IRB/ Human Subjects for Migration Research

Presiders: Robert Courtney Smith (CUNY-Graduate Center), Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo (USC), & Hernan Ramirez (USC)

Rapporteur: Sam Fitzgerald (UC-Berkeley)

1. How to work well the IRB
 - a. *Remember the core mission of the IRB*: It is to ensure the protection of human subjects. Thus, show evidence that you are upholding this mission.
 - b. *Read the requisites meticulously, and address each one*.
 - c. *Engage with the IRB in a cooperative manner*. Often it helps to meet with someone from the IRB face-to-face to save time and frustration.
2. Variations in IRB review processes
 - a. *Among research institutions*. Some institutions have IRBs that engage in more stringent review processes than others. Familiarize yourself with proceedings at your institution.
 - b. *Over time*. Remember that the IRB is composed of people. Over time, depending on the members of the IRB, reviews might be more or less stringent within the same institution.
 - c. *Among disciplines*. Some disciplines as a norm pass research before IRB, and others (e.g. oral historians and journalists) do not even though they are dealing with human subjects.
3. Ethical issues
 - a. *Signatures of undocumented migrants*. Sometimes it might more protective of human subjects to obtain oral consent rather than written consent. A written consent with an undocumented migrant's signature provides evidence of illegal presence in the country. Oral consent avoids this problem.
 - b. *Obligations to human subjects beyond IRB review*. Don't be lured into a false sense of security by having a project approved by the IRB. You might need to take additional steps to protect subjects. Also ethical issues can arise after you obtain IRB approval.
 - c. *Certificate of confidentiality*. A certificate of confidentiality, issued by the NIH, enables you to maintain privileged information in confidence by enabling you to remove identifying information prior to turning over data collected to authorities. A certificate of confidentiality can protect both the participants and you.
 - d. *Data collection*. Be selective about taking notes. Or perhaps consider using fake names or destroying data when a project is completed.
 - e. *Compensation for participants*. You should be mindful of the point at which compensation induces coercion rather than signifying respect.
 - f. *Be careful what you publish*. Sometimes ethical research might entail withholding some material from publication in order to protect human subjects and to uphold trust.
 - g. *Individual rights versus community integrity*. The IRB looks at individual rights and not community integrity. Ethics might warrant you to be mindful of both.
4. Additional concerns raised
 - a. *IRB composition*. In the long-term, try to have a voice in IRB composition to ensure that there are IRB members who are sympathetic to your discipline, your methodology, etc.
 - b. *Balance of risk*. There are different levels of risk: risk to the institution, risk to participants, and risk to the researcher. You should be cognizant of all three.
 - c. *Caution*. Immigration is a trigger issue in this political climate. Proceed cautiously.
 - d. *Classroom activities*. If instructors want students to engage with human subjects other than their classmates, they should emphasize the method and not substantive material. If

students use preliminary data gathered during a classroom activity for a subsequent project reviewed by the IRB, they should word the proposal carefully.

Session 2/Table 1: New Destinations and Local Migration Politics

Presiders: Rubén Hernández-León (UCLA)

Rapporteur: Helen B. Marrow (UC-Berkeley/UCSF)

Rubén Hernández-León

1. Has conducted research on immigration into Dalton, Georgia, USA (one case study over 2 decades) with Victor Zúñiga (Universidad de Monterrey).
2. Paradox of “new destinations”: thinks most immigration scholars (probably more so with sociologists than political scientists) pay little attention to local politics, period
 - a. They have a tendency to study immigration within immigrant communities/enclaves, rather than as connected to local and regional configurations of political forces
 - b. Doesn't know if or how much this comes from a bias of scholars working in traditional destinations
 - c. An understanding of local dynamics, histories, and cultural configurations would lead to different ways of explaining subsequent dynamics
 - i. Examples: immigrants' ability to organize politically and participate in local political arena; intergroup relations and interactions in the workplace (where we cannot understand these only by focusing on immigrants and their communities but also need to understand pre-existing structures of relations and power)
3. So if he had to start his project over: he would actually start with a local historical, contextual, and cultural background of the place itself
4. There is also a need for future comparisons of more “new destinations”
 - a. Examples: getting a food into the door of local politics (a comparison of Mexicans in NYC, which has lots of established immigrant institutions, versus places in the Southeast); or urban receptivity to immigrants' needs (i.e., Nashville, TN) versus many rural localities' more hostile reactions
 - b. Our understanding of local migration politics across different contexts will be esp. important if amnesty goes through, because local political histories will affect how legalization programs take place
 - i. We have precedent studies about IRCA, and about how local political contexts were important at that time for taking advantage of and implementing amnesty policies

Questions & Answers

1. Katharine Donato (Vanderbilt): Yes, we will miss patterns of incorporation if just focus on the immigrants themselves
 - a. Example: Nashville is indeed open and receptive to immigrants' needs, but it's because of its local political culture and organization of city governance. However, Nashville also has a 287g program that has deported lots of people in the past 2 years. Still, the city's strong immigrant-oriented aid and advocacy network does help shield families of deportees left behind although not necessary the deportees themselves), and can be an infrastructure to deal with future immigrants
2. Aixa Cintron (Russell Sage Foundation): Perhaps we can call this giving attention to the “local ecology of place”, not just the “local political context” (since it will include giving attention to employers, neighborhood settlement layouts, religious organizations, etc.)
 - a. Rubén – agreed. And need to pay attention to the significance of religious conversion for immigrants, especially in the religious belt of the country, which has a huge network and

- infrastructure of churches and organizations which interface both with immigrants and local political structures
3. Audrey Singer (Brookings Institution): Agrees with the need to go comparative, beyond the study. But points out that doing so is very difficult in practice – not only is it hard to model differences in political dynamics across places, but such differences are dynamic over time
 - a. Katharine Donato: perhaps it's time to go back to people who wrote about new destinations in early years, and ask each of them to comment on what has happened and how things have changed over time in their own communities? To begin building our knowledge about this question, and to help us understand similarities and uniquenesses. Or perhaps it's the moment for someone to write up a "meta-analysis" of what we know in the field of new destinations so far and where we need to be headed
 4. Ryan Center (Tufts University): What factors of "new destinations" matter to our understanding? And if we agree we do not want to go toward "endless specificity", how do we want to choose our cases, and based on what factors?
 - a. David Kyle (UC-Davis) – we need to look at the key decision-makers in them (i.e., local organizations, transnational organizations, all of those involved in initially attracting immigrants to new destinations). All are complex organizations in and of themselves – so we should think of new destinations places as intermixed with this kind of "organizational matrix" or "migration infrastructure"
 - i. Rubén – yes, this decision-making focus is tremendously consequential to immigrants' lives, although the research into it is getting harder and harder to conduct as the context of reception toward immigrants in new destinations worsens
 - ii. Katharine agrees – we need to recognize how easy it was to conduct research on this in the 1990s, versus how extremely difficult it is starting to be now within the new climate of fear, paranoia, enforcement, etc. (And people tell various stories of the greater difficulty of getting employers, immigrants, government officials to talk to researchers today as confirmation...)
 - iii. Rubén says that this is where an extended case study can be beneficial, as it allows you to build trust, rapport, and relations of "mandatory patience" over time
 - b. Rubén – and yes, it would also be helpful to think about what points of entry we will make our comparisons through (i.e., through counties/localities signing up for 287g programs, or through state-level debates about in-state tuition, etc.)
 - c. Another suggestion to also look at different points of view in a new destination – part of understanding the debate around immigration, to understand how decisions get to where they are, and to understand why certain views either do or don't prevail in local debates
 - d. Helen Marrow (UCB/UCSF) – and perhaps begin focusing more on the "2-way street" of immigration in new destinations. Looking more at the effects of immigration on natives, particularly children, if we truly want to understand its effects on the transformation of American life here

Session 2/Table 2: Immigrant Collective Action and Civic/Political Engagement

Presiders: Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo (USC), Dina Okamoto (UC-Davis) & Lisa Martinez (University of Denver)

Rapporteur: Catherine Bueker (Emmanuel College)

Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo began the discussion by talking about the religious activism that has developed on behalf of immigrant rights. The connection between religious activism and social justice related to immigrants has a history dating back to the 19th century, with the rise of mutual aid societies and the social gospel movement. During the 1980s, every major city founded an immigrant rights coalition which fostered the sanctuary movement of that period. During the 1990s, many groups began to develop organized legal strategies. The marches of spring 2006 brought immigrant rights to the forefront for many, but since 2006, turnouts at such rallies have dwindled.

Hondagneu-Sotelo poses the question of what qualifies as immigrant collective action. Is it only when millions take to the streets? What is the content of immigrant collective action? Are foreign-born parents organizing with native-born parents to meet educational goals for their children a form of immigrant collective action? What is an immigrant issue versus a general issue?

Hondagneu-Sotelo sees three types of rights at the forefront of immigrant issues: workers rights, border rights, and sibling rights. She predicts that religious activism on behalf of immigrants and immigrant issues will continue.

Dina Okamoto states that much of the research in this area is based upon surveys on participation or case studies. We need studies that explore patterns of immigrant collective action across time and space. Currently, Okamoto is working on a project that looks at 52 different metropolitan areas in the year 2000. Eventually this project will expand to cover from the year 1990 to 2006 on a smaller subset of cities.

The three major questions that Okamoto thinks must be asked are: 1) what constitutes collective action? Is it protests and marches exclusively? What about smaller scale activities? 2) What constitutes an immigrant group? 3) Is civic participation a sign of incorporation? What is it we are actually capturing?

Lisa Martinez focuses on how immigrant political activity has come together in a place like Denver, Colorado. She is exploring the intended and unintended consequences of this type of immigrant collective action. What is the group really trying to accomplish? What are the goals? How do you cover enough issues so that all the various groups within a coalition feel they have a vested interest? The initial coalition that formed in 2006 has broken down since then, in part as a result of the different interests that groups hold. Where does the movement go from here? Martinez also asks the question of how we define political participation. To use measurements like voting or participation in protests is very limited for immigrants, many of whom cannot vote and are too frightened to protest. The notion of civic participation needs to be broadened to allow for the engagement of undocumented immigrants. Martinez is also interested in exploring

the role of women in the protests of recent years. How do their roles in the private sphere influence what is going on in the public sphere?

Session 2/Table 3: Culture and Immigration

Presiders: Michele Lamont (Harvard) and Mario Small (University of Chicago)
Rapporteur: Natasha K. Warikoo (Harvard)

The roundtable on Culture and Immigration was a provocative and thought-provoking conversation on the role of culture in the study of immigration and inequality. Michele Lamont and Mario Small have recently written three articles on culture and the study of inequality and poverty, including a forthcoming special issue of *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (with David Harding). In particular, they want to address what the literature on culture brings to public policy debates on poverty and inequality. They hope to influence policymakers and economists on how culture matters.

Mario Small began the session by outlining the motivation for this work. He suggested that although cultural sociology has grown over the last thirty years, the literature on inequality hasn't caught up. He suggested three key issues in the study of culture and inequality:

1. What do we mean by "culture"? Some of the disagreements in the field have stemmed from people meaning different things by culture: norms and values vs. aspirations; framing versus evaluating the world, etc. On a deeper level, do we conceive of culture as housed in the minds of individuals? Intersubjective? Societal/institutional?
2. Does culture matter, and if so how do we show that culture matters? This is an empirical question that unfortunately has become a political debate. How do we measure the influence of culture?
3. How can we translate qualitative analyses of culture in ways that those who do quantitative research will understand and take seriously?

Michele Lamont brought up the utility of a boundaries approach to these questions. She is working on a study of anti-racist strategies among stigmatized groups in the United States, Brazil, and Israel, which have different contexts for race. She is interested in the question of how ordinary people try to change boundaries at the group level.

Mario is hopeful that the young generation of scholars who are reading Swidler and other cultural sociologists in graduate school now have more nuanced understandings of culture.

Michele asked about teaching culture to students. He suggested that we should not be afraid to address the hard questions, and have students look empirically at questions such as "are blacks lazy?" and "what is the empirical evidence for genetic differences in intelligence?" These are empirical questions that we should take on rather than shying away from them. Also, what data do we need to understand questions of culture? What's missing?

Margaret Chin shared her technique of asking her students at Hunter College about family members who aren't doing well, and why, in order to get past simple group culture explanations.

Michele asked the group what we think are the pressing questions in the study of culture and inequality. Margaret replied that US culture is constantly changing, making the study of

“assimilation” hard to grapple with. Michele described the impact of different levels of cultural repertoires: national, metropolitan, neighborhood.

Mario pointed out the importance of studying different variables and levels of analysis rather than race/ethnicity. In his new book, *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality*, he showed how institutions, rather than race/ethnicity, most influenced the kinds of social networks new mothers had.

Natasha Warikoo asked about which other variables others felt are important to emphasize rather than race/ethnicity, to better understand how culture matters. Miri Song brought up British studies’ emphasis on locality, such as neighborhood cultures. Michele agreed that it’s easier to think about cultural processes if ethnicity/race is not the unit of analysis. Mario suggested thinking inductively, beginning with a research question rather than method. For example, if thinking about education focus on how schools matter. E.g., looking at kids’ aspirations without also analyzing the school context misses an important dimension of the story. He pointed out that there’s always more variation within ethnic/racial groups than between them. Michele brought up Margarita Mooney’s new book, *Faith Makes us Live: Surviving and Thriving in the Haitian Diaspora*, which analyzes the role of the Catholic Church in immigrant incorporation in three cities.

Mario concluded by asking us to challenge our students, think harder, and don’t be afraid of the data. Michele asked us to think outside the box of the assimilation paradigm, and rather to think about culture as path-dependent.

Session 2/Table 4: Education and Immigration

Presiders: Min Zhou (UCLA) & Vivian Louie (Harvard)

Rapporteur: Norma Fuentes (Fordham)

Topics included in this roundtable: The role of communities on the educational outcomes of immigrant groups; the Context of Reception and the role of institutions within new destinations; Gender Inequality and Education: Culture or Structure; Intra Ethnic Group Differences and Methods of Analysis; Access to Community Resources, Class Differences and Isolation.

Community Effects and Interactions between Structural and Social Variables:

Vivian Louie: The main objective of this round table is to discuss how education and immigration in the US accounts for differences in students' outcomes and what we know accounts for those differences.

Min Zhou: What are the factors that account for inter cultural differences in Educational outcomes? Why some groups do better than others, controlling for things like socioeconomic differences?

She explained her years of work on the role of communities on education.

Segmented Assimilation has been the main focus used to understand variations within ethnic communities – community interaction effects between structural and social variables, putting emphasis on economic resources of the groups, not only individual characteristics, or families.

Her research finds that when the community has greater resources, all groups benefit, irrespective of position in the class or social strata.

So, we need to ask, what are the social resources available to different community members, i.e., Chinese and Korean in LA? Findings demonstrate that groups who live in China town do better; Chinese families have more access to community resources than other children like Mexicans who don't have access to these community resources.

Differences in outcomes among the different communities (i.e., Latinos and Asians) – not due to cultural values, since all groups know the importance of education as the most effective way to get ahead; but that not all communities have the economic resources to access available resources (tutoring, better schools, better housing, etc.).

Different immigrants living in the same neighborhood may be exposed to different 'ethnic environments' and social capitals which may connect members to different forms of resources. This is the research I have been doing for the past 10 years and this summer I will begin to write (laughter!).

I pay attention to the role of role of ethnicity – how the ethnic community is organized and how the organization of communities could possibly facilitate or inhibit the creation of social capital.

The Context of Reception and the Role of Institutions in new Destinations:

Participant: What do we know about immigrants moving to new destinations? How have the experiences of non-traditional sites of receptions affected the integration or education of immigrant children within different context of receptions? How are the schools organized within different contexts? The prevalent perception is that teachers may not help students; because they are not able to see the intangible resources that Min points out.

Norma Fuentes: briefly discussed her findings about Moroccan families in Amsterdam and the role of the family and siblings in explaining the greater success of girls versus boys. Fuentes' study will compare Dominican youths in NYC to continue to examine the role of schools and the families in the integration of youth within different contexts and school systems and the role of communities.

Robert Morehead: has studied children of immigrants in Japan at UC Davis. He looks at how schools deal with immigrant populations when they are not used to immigrant children?

Min Zhou: What is the parallel in the relationship between teachers and parents?
- teachers usually focus on the lack of social capital from parents – and blame the parents for not wanting to assimilate. Negative relationship between immigrants and institutions (via teachers) may affect the integration of second generation.

Monica Gaughan, participant: Teacher's interaction is very important even in higher education. The socialization of teachers (the need to educate them about the population they are to work with), for example, in science and engineering in the US is lacking among professors in these institutions. 40% of science and technology professors are imported as foreign scientists, disproportionately males. Many of them are not used to working with women as equal, neither with members of minority groups in America.

Vivian Louie: How do you measure the effects of teachers' expectations on students? You can see the acts; but, how do you know how they function to affect the students' outcomes?

Min Zhou: Powerful teachers' interactions affect students at all level. If society thinks that a certain group is not good in an area, the group gets discouraged. How do teachers reinforce the stereotype? (i.e., if you are Asian and you are not going to Science and Technology, then you have problems); similarly, when the peer group does not have too many people in an area of studies, new members are discouraged. The same takes place in the labor market, in top professions. I.e., in LA, we have lots of Asian students doing Science and Technology because of pressures from parents, peers, and market opportunities. But, many of them are miserable and do it just to please their parents' or teachers' expectations.

Gender Inequality and Education: The Interaction of Culture and Structure

Julie Park (U of Maryland): Gender and education: the great advancement women have made in the US is in education, will this be replicated; will these gains be passed down to the next generation? Or, would race, ethnicity and gender affect these transfers?

Monica Gaughan: 1967 CRM and 1968 Immigration Reforms have affected what we have studied.

Prema Kurien: In India you are pushed into math careers whether you are a man or a woman; so, the foreign born are equally trained. The concept of gender differences in science is mostly a US-based concept. When it comes to ethnicity, most sociologists reduce ethnicity to structural measurable outcomes. How do we translate 'culture'?

Min Zhou: culture is very important. There is a difference; however, on whether culture is important or cultural factors or arguments are used to explain outcomes.

Culture can arise from structural circumstances. They are certain cultural behaviors that attach to structural circumstances. For example, ethnicity can be a 'cultural or structural' variable which needs to be unpacked. When you model 'ethnicity, i.e., being Mexican or Chinese, compared to White, and being Chinese has a positive effect on education, versus Mexicans. But, when you look into what composes being Chinese or Mexicans, you see lots of structural differences, like education access, college degrees, professions; this is explained by class differences. In our interpretations, we should be careful to speak of structural and cultural effects. Sometimes, people try to control all 'measurable' important ethnic variables. But, some of these are group socioeconomic status variables; not individual effects.

When we proposed Segmented Assimilation theory, we try to focus on how the context of reception and ethnicity interact.

Prema Kurien: Sociologists tend to run away from 'cultural' explanations. But, there are differences among immigrants, for example, we are Indian and immigrants, education is the only thing we have; although I know there are differences between immigrant groups and Americans. For example, we pay for college so the kids won't suffer and do well; but, most Americans don't believe in this.

Min Zhou: how do you define the meaning of success? Jennifer Lee and I are working on the second generation, what is success for different groups. If you are looking at 'happiness' and 'success', we find the Latino have greater sense of happiness and success. Asians have by all measures advance degree, good jobs, no spouses; yet they are not happy because their reference points are higher groups. Latino groups, on the other hand, with just a college education, a good job, or a business, think it is important to have a family. When you look at statistics, they report they are very 'successful.' So, our start off measure is how first to define 'success.' We (Asians) push our kids too much; but, Asian parents, once their kids get into college, they worry about them getting married.

Vivian Louie: also, one should think of how we compare the groups: I studied Dominicans and Chinese; Chinese frame of reference was higher 'successful Chinese' nationals; while, for Dominicans their frame of references were usually transnational, comparing themselves with other co-ethnics back at home.

Explaining Intra Ethnic Group Differences and Methods of Analysis

Daniel Fass: UCB & Trinity College, Dublin. Presently conducts research among Turkish immigrant groups in Germany on Identity Formation as a model of integration, rather as it is studied in the US. He finds that although Turks rank at bottom of the educational attainment strata, the outcomes are different and also the group's levels of success. So, we can't just base findings on statistics but need also include qualitative studies to capture the internal variations within the ethnic groups.

Monica Gaugham: Communities influenced how groups are treated, perceived and how they will ultimately perform. If you look only at individuals, you can miss group effects. Patriarchy, mainly the structure of ethnic groups for Turkish immigrants; so, boys put more significance to national identity. We see this in statistics on labor markets; but less on patterns of integration between men and women. They say immigrant women more successful; but, if you examine individual cases, you will see women are less privileged. Foreign men are focused on certain professions; so, they also create different gender segregations.

Monica Gaugham: Most women in the world are drastically disadvantaged to men; and, when they migrate, men come first; although among some groups, women are in a better situation. The men want their women to stay in that cultural box where they come from.

Min Zhou: Cautions 'Gender Effects': If you compare foreign born women to native women, on average foreign-born tend to do better; not true for foreign-born man.

Robert Moorhead: UC Davis: we often fall into tradition versus modern dichotomies. Coming to US is viewed as coming from 'traditional' to modern. I.e., Eastern Asia coming to US; but how can we talk about changing gender dynamics?

Monica Boyd: What are the critical questions in education and immigration we have discussed? One clearly is: a) the role that communities play in the education of children; most clearly, among the second generation; and, how cultural and structural resources get transferred to children; b)'gendered' nature of change through the immigration process; c)teachers-parents dynamics; d)what do we know and what are the critical questions.

Daniel Faas: suggested we need more research on how to manage migration at macro political level but also at the more micro level and how these relate to education. Both terms are loaded as we usually frame research questions on 'multiculturalism' not so much on structural 'assimilation.' In the 'multiculturalism' framework, the perspective is to allow migrants to retain aspects of their own culture. But, do we want to emphasize diversity but also emphasize the things that draw the children of immigrants together with native children? Should we create more inclusive settings? In US and UK we have lots of national pride, so maybe this is a uniting theme; of belonging to both the local and the national community.

Norma Fuentes: What about the theoretical underpinnings that now exist to explain the educational integration of children? Would Segmented Assimilation theories continue as the best lens for reflecting differences?

Min Zhou: Segmented Assimilation is still a way of understanding different groups and stratification in the society; but looking at group's characteristics and how the host society receives them. How to measure this is still a challenge; before hastily abandoning the SA theory, it is good to continue to measure the integration of second and third generation since we only have proxies. This is why we need qualitative and quantitative theory. SA is a midrange theory, one of many, so we need to continue to conduct research.

Monica Gaughan: One point that we did not mention; the finances available in different public schools; State funding and different outcomes; so, not to conflate cultural and structural disadvantages at once!

Access to Community Resources and Class Isolation

Min Zhou: community resources: this is where social and cultural capital comes. The Chinese residents living in China Town go to different schools; they are bused to different school system; the family think these programs are good; they are able to by-pass marginalized, poor local schools; so, this is 'ethnic resources;' the Mexican families also want their children to do well, but they don't have the information; they don't feel safe sending their children outside of the community.

Vivian Louie: I find the same findings in NYC among Dominicans, but there is variation by class.

Min Zhou: in Asian community they interact more with lower classes; but, among Dominicans they don't interact as much with lower classes. Chinese more class integrated at the group levels.

Koreans have the church, its organizing entity; interesting thing is that Koreans are spread out; but their churches organize in cluster; and, the working class that lives there benefits a lot. Chinese go out of community because their middle class is much larger. The Chinese have the ethnic resources in the suburbs.

Central Americans and Mexicans in Los Angeles are very class isolated. In NYC, working class undocumented concentrated more.

Session 2/Table 5: Religion and Immigration

Presiders: Peggy Levitt (Wellesley), Wendy Cadge (Brandeis) & R. Stephen Warner (University of Illinois-Chicago)

Rapporteur: Weishan Huang (Max Planck Institute)

Peggy Levitt started with introducing important questions and directions for this field. First, it is important to think outside of the Christian box. Many religious groups are not Christian-based. Some of them take different forms and have different religiosities. Sometimes we forgot to question the framework of the Christian box. It's important to define new categories that would better help us understand the groups we study.

Besides thinking outside of the Christian box, we can also think of religious practices as thick and dense broad networks. The religious experience does not only connect the individual but also helps explain how rituals, leaders and money circulate beyond national boundaries.

Not only should we compare religions from separate countries, but also see them as interconnected. To think of religions as cultural templates in different places also helps us to see cultural influences in such contexts. Levitt encourages researchers to rethink the meanings of religion and religious pluralism, which is similar to the theme of Courtney Bender's "After Pluralism."

Wendy Cadge continued to remind us that the congregational paradigm is not sufficient to study immigrant religions. Although congregational study is important, we run the risk of overlooking the roles which religions play in immigrant life. Or we run the risk of understanding only one piece of immigrant life. One example of a different approach is, for examples, studying other secular organizations, such as hospitals and universities, with which immigrants are involved and compare the differences. For example, we can study how immigrants first set up their organizations, such as Catholic and Jewish hospitals, and other first generation immigrant associations, and use those models to compare with different immigrant groups. By gaining a better understanding of the relationship between religious and secular organizations, it will help us to further understand immigrant experiences.

Another example of this approach could focus on cities. We can study how religious and secular organizations influence immigrant life in different cities and compare them in these different urban contexts.

Stephen Warner stressed that religion means many different things in the process of immigration. One such approach is considering the religious political-geography of the sending countries. For example, there are only about 25 percent of Christians in Korean, but there are over 75 percent of Korean Christians among Korean immigrants in the Untied States. He said that his research team learned that immigrants are not randomly affiliated with certain religions 20 years ago. His recent study in Chicago also discovers that recent immigrants have been involved with popular agencies, and he has been comparing their activities between secular and religious organizations.

The second important direction is to focus on the religious diversity in different countries. Religions work differently in different countries. He tried to get to the root of it and compare this with other countries. Stephen stressed that in United States people welcome all religions. But the word “religion” makes the world nervous. For example, European countries may not want diversity because Europe is originally Christian-based. But people in United State are not bothered by diversity because the United States has always been influenced by the boundaries of race and ethnicity.

Session 2/Table 6: The 2nd Generation and Inequality

Presiders: Richard Alba (CUNY-Graduate Center), Philip Kasinitz (CUNY-Graduate Center) & Jennifer Lee (UC-Irvine)

Rapporteur: Jody Agius Vallejo (UC-Irvine)

Richard Alba

1. When studying immigrant incorporation and the second generation, too much credence is given to approaches that focus on mechanisms that reproduce inequality, rather than mechanisms that promote mobility.
2. We are approaching a period in society where racial/ethnic minorities will have unique opportunities to achieve upward mobility, especially as baby boomers retire and the demographics of the United States shift. Therefore, we need to strike a better balance in studies of immigrant mobility by not only illustrating the mechanisms that reproduce inequality but also by developing approaches that examine opportunities.

Jennifer Lee

1. How do you measure incorporation? If you make a cross-sectional comparison and measure incorporation as convergence to the mean you miss an extreme amount of intergenerational mobility among particular groups. In our follow up to the IIMMLA study, Min Zhou and I find that Mexicans experience an extraordinary jump in intergenerational mobility that is not captured among the Chinese and Vietnamese second generation. If you only examine cross-sectional data and if you define incorporation as convergence to the mean, particular immigrant groups are on par with native-born whites, yet they have actually achieved less mobility relative to their parents.
2. We also examine subjective perspectives of success. We find that ethnic groups define success differently and that native born whites are not the reference group by which the second generation measures their success. For example, Mexicans who complete high school and earn an associate degree feel successful because they are upwardly mobile relative to their parents. Conversely, Chinese with advanced degrees do not feel successful because their reference group has high levels of education.

Phil Kasinitz

1. One of the most complicated issues when discussing immigrant incorporation or definitions of success is what are people relating to? There are several biases in the current research. First, academics use middle-class standards to define success but there are differences between the more affluent, the middle class, the working class and those who live in poverty.
2. Another bias is that we always compare today's immigrants with earlier waves of immigration. Very few made the jump directly into the middle class, even by the second generation. Upward mobility took much longer. We generalize from extreme cases, like the rapid progress of the Jewish population.
3. In general:
4. When scholars focus only on education gaps between immigrants and the native born it appears that some Latin American immigrants have not made as much progress. This research elicits negative responses from conservatives, subsequently reinforcing the idea that

these national origin groups are not experiencing upward mobility. We need to take that same data, turn it around and highlight the progress that is made.

5. Another bias in the research is that relatively low levels of education or teenage pregnancy lock particular groups into downward mobility. One way to demonstrate progress is to focus on 'second chances' that promote the mobility of the second generation later in life.
6. Immigration incorporation is multi-dimensional and education is not the only avenue to mobility. Some immigrant groups might employ different strategies to achieve upward mobility, such as property attainment, because they are shut out of educational opportunities or because they do not know how to navigate the educational system.

Session 2/Table 7: Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration

Presiders: Frank Bean (UC-Irvine) and John Skrentny (UCSD)

Rapporteur: Wendy Roth (University of British Columbia)

Participants: Hanna Brown (Berkeley), Phil Wogan (Berkeley), Jane Yamashiro (Loyola Marymount), Angela Fillingim (Berkeley), Tiffany Joseph (Michigan), Ivy Forsythe (Michigan-Dearborne), Ming Chen (Berkeley), Nancy Foner (Hunter), Kim Ebert (UCDavis), Patrick Simon (Natl Demographic Institute in Paris), Wendy Roth (University of British Columbia)

Frank Bean

Racial, ethnic status, how to define it, conceptualize it, think about it, and assess its role in what happens to native born groups and to new immigrant groups is certainly one of the most critical issues in immigration studies because of the role this could play in immigrant group incorporation. We don't have a consensus in the field about these matters, so we can't fully answer questions about immigrant group incorporation.

John Skrentny

Do we ever study race/ethnicity without talking about immigration anymore? We don't do that so much. Older studies used to – in talking about “race and ethnic relations”, but this seems old school now – just comparing blacks and whites. Tocqueville talked about race in terms of whites, native Americans and blacks. At that time, you could talk about whites and blacks and not talk about immigration, but now we always seem to group them together.

Frank: Talking about race was viewed by historians as southern history, so it was even more compartmentalized.

John: We'd also talk about race and ethnicity without talking about immigration when we talked about other countries (e.g. places in Europe where borders are drawn in crazy ways, minority populations in China).

Some of the key questions in the field: 1) in explaining black/white/immigrant inequality, or racial hierarchy in the US, is the key way to talk about it white vs. non-white or black vs. non-black? John is interested in talking about these issues in a way that incorporates culture (without blaming the victim). 2) Identities, and categorizations which may or may not incorporate an identity component (e.g. the Portes & Rumbaut study – do you identify as an ethnic group, a panethnic group, etc.).

A couple of questions for discussion:

1. A question that hasn't been addressed is whether we can talk about immigration or ethnic cultures without talking about whether there's a white culture. We tend to assume that the mainstream is white, but is it really? Is it an amalgam?

2. How do we tease out the distinctions between race and ethnicity? In John's graduate seminar, he still struggles with teaching this. His research is on whether new waves of immigration affect how civil rights law is implemented, and civil rights law distinguishes between national origin and race. Employers have very muddled notions of race, ethnicity, and national origin. He doesn't know how to write about it. There's a lot of overlap, especially when talking about how

immigrants themselves think about it. There's a distinction between how we use these categories and how the immigrants themselves use these categories.

Nancy: It's further confused by the way the media use these categories. Even if it's defined, people bring public discourse conceptions of it. For purposes of a study, you want to make some distinction, but the terms overlap. George Frederickson in his book (and his book with Nancy) talks about this (e.g. in the Intro to his book with Nancy). He discusses the difficulties of defining them separately because they overlap.

Some of us hedge by talking about "ethno/racial".

This is a particular issue with Latinos.

The way Americans conceptualize race today is as a kind of color coded category. We know that wasn't always true historically. In Europe, they also talk about race in terms of Muslims. Our American conceptions are very much social conceptions.

How has the immigration of the last few decades been changing Americans' views? This is hard to study because they're in the process of change. Maybe they're always in the process of change and always hard to study! It also varies by location within the U.S.

The way the field used to be done was if you're working on African-Americans you talk about race, and if you're working on European immigrants you're talking about ethnicity. Some scholars say that ethnicity is something you choose and race is something put upon you. But this idea needs to be updated.

People talk about the black-white dichotomy of race, but one thing scholars don't get at is the similarities between black and white experiences in the US. Because of the racial hierarchy and how we've constructed race, it seems much more divided than it actually is. The black experience in Chicago or Detroit in the early days is just a Southern experience. For example, soul food – in the South, they share this with white folks, but their taste in food becomes glaringly different when they move to the North. How similar or different is black and white culture in the US compared to an immigrant from the Middle East who's coming from very different traditions. Middle Easterners are classified as white in the census, but no student would put them in a white category.

There's more reaction if a white person marries a black person than if a white person marries a Middle Eastern person, even though this is a much bigger cultural difference.

There's a difference between the official classifications of race and ethnicity and what happens on the ground in person.

In the law & society literature, there's a lot of discussion between formal or legal classifications and social categorization. Social categories can shape the legal in some cases, but the legal can shape the social in others. One way immigration changes how the legal maps onto the social is in terms of legal citizenship status. This picks up a lot of differences that go beyond the social (e.g.

voting). A complicated line is drawn between people saying education is available to non-citizens, but voting is not. That makes this status much more visible and more attention gets paid to it.

When do laws and official categorizations matter and affect things? Padilla's book on Latino political mobilization shows how coming together as a group can reinforce panethnic identities.

In France, there are almost no Maghreb ethnic organization. It's not relevant to organize on that basis. You'd find some Moroccan organizations devoted to recent immigrants, helping them integrate into situation in France. But no groups are organized around lobbying or rights. There's a black organization that's overtly using the name black (noir) that's trying to bring together people from Caribbean and African background. North Africans are not involved, though. There have been very violent reactions from most of political establishment in France.

Middle Easterners lobbied very hard to be in 2000 census as a separate category. Groups want to be officially recognized and claim a census identity for purposes of political identification and bargaining. This has also increased the likelihood of whites, especially white males, defining themselves as a group that's discriminated against.

There are differences within the Mexican origin population that are widely recognized. There was a recent PBS documentary about a civil rights case in the 1950s that granted civil rights status to the Mexican origin population (Hernandez vs. State of Texas). It was a jury selection issue. The documentary focused on how that lawsuit had come about and its repercussions. One thing it pointed out was that after the civil war a sizeable population of white southerners left the south and went to South Texas. They transferred their views about other people to the native Mexican origin population there which is mostly 'North Mexican'. North Mexico is very different from the rest of Mexico (it was on the verge of secession from the rest of Mexico). Mexicans from Texas are much more likely to define themselves as white than Mexicans elsewhere, in part because that's the way Northern Mexicans saw themselves. But also educational progress – how much is discrimination holding back the Mexican origin population now – in the 20th century, average education levels of the Mexican population started going up. But if you take out Texas and look at the Mexican origin population in Texas vs. those elsewhere, Texas lags 2-3 decades behind the rest of the country in their education levels. So there's a Texas effect and a historical legacy effect. Sometimes we talk about there being a single form of discrimination that holds the whole population back, but that masks a lot of diversity.

The distinction between race and ethnicity – people may be working with different definitions and even if you define it, people still have baggage that they bring to what you write or say about it. Someone from another field may want you to use those terms differently. How do you locate your work semantically? Do you use the terms race and ethnicity? Or do you use different terms to make it more clear and specific what concepts you're using and what you take these to mean?

In Brazil, the term race itself signifies 'racism'. So in her work Tiffany changed it to asking about skin color – how do you see yourself in terms of skin color?

Rogers Brubaker has been pushing the approach of studying group-making activities, since there are no groups out there. Don't predefine it, let them define it (but that assumes a unified "them").

A lot of the terms we use in sociology have been corrupted by people in different disciplines. Just own the terms. You may have to use a term several times in a piece to keep everyone on task, but it's good to create a space for the sociologists and separate ourselves from people who aren't tying it to another body of literature.

There's the question of how individuals define their own race and then there's the question of racism. Some German people may say 'we have no racism because we have no blacks.' It's one thing to say we should be sociologists and own it, but if you're working with a population that insists they're not racist, it can help to use another term.

In the US case, we have this radical categorical imposition – what had been absolutist categories imposed on people historically which led us to use the term a certain way (suggesting that race is something very real). France has a different kind of categorical imposition – of no categories!

It's not specific to France – it's common to much of Europe (except Britain). Post-1945, the decision to dismiss race as a category didn't touch the UK, but touched the rest of Europe. They decided it's not a category you can use except to say it doesn't exist. So if you raise the term, you're creating controversy just by using the term. Do social scientists have to invent a new word? Then no one knows what you're talking about. And in the end you're talking about race. It's not a major issue for qualitative interviews, but more for quantitative surveys. You can't have a sentence like "you know what I'm talking about". What you ask about should be understood the same way by everyone in surveys, and be acceptable by everyone. And there's major controversy about this in Europe today. Race exists, so how can you find a way to create something to discuss it that would be useful? We haven't found any smart solution yet. For political reasons, there's a consensus not to identify in status groups that are defined by ethnicity or race. You can use status like where you're born or citizenship or one of your parents, but this relies on 'objective' information, not an identity.

The term "visible minority" is used in Canada, as a "pseudonym" for race. Has this been used in France? The concept is there, but it's not used in statistics or surveys. It's considered too messy a category.

In Toronto, do they refer to Caribbean people as a visible minority, as Caribbean or just as Black?

A relevant book is "The Lumbee Problem" by Karen Blu (Cambridge University Press). It's about identity and how this group, the Lumbee, tried to establish themselves as Native Americans (because many look White).

How you identify on a census is also important for the resources that go to the group. In Germany, if you identify as Catholic, some of your taxes go to the Catholic Church.

Frank suspects there'll be much more under-enumeration of the Mexican population in the next census because some groups are encouraging migrants not to enumerate on the census because of concern over illegal immigration.

There was a non-trivial amount of double counting in the 2000 census – people who filled out the census more than once.

In Britain, they used a “race relations model” for commonwealth immigrants who came in the 1950s and 1960s. The reaction now is that religion needs to be part of this and it's not all about race, especially for Muslims. Tariq Modood writes that they're not focusing on discrimination against Muslims. If the law against discrimination is framed as a race relations law, then you have a problem. The argument is about the legislation to fight or prevent discrimination on the grounds of religion.

Jane Yamashiro asked about recommendations for teaching material – books articles, movies, etc.—for a course on race and ethnicity in global perspective, particularly material on the idea that concepts of race and ethnicity are used differently, with different social structures in each society, and the people who migrate between those have to negotiate between those different structures and concepts. Please email any relevant material to: janey@hawaii.edu

Session 2/Table 8: Mexican Migration

Presiders: David Fitzgerald (UCSD) & Robert C. Smith (CUNY-Graduate Center)

Rapporteur: Filiz Garip (Harvard)

What are the new directions for research on Mexican migration? What is missing?

1. More representative data that is also focused on “process”
 - a. One example is Mexican Migration Field Research Program (UCSD), which combines household census in 3 Mexican communities with detailed qualitative information from targeted groups (migrants, smugglers, etc).
 - b. Another example is stratified sampling for qualitative data collection (i.e., identify the relevant subgroups in population, interview respondents from each group)
 - c. Researchers should think about the claims the data will allow for before starting a project (examples of good qualitative methods reading: Mario Small’s article in *Ethnography*, or David Fitzgerald’s article in *Qualitative Sociology*, Mitch Duneier’s work)
2. New questions, new approaches to old questions
 - a. New migrant destinations present a natural experiment to test old theories about immigrant assimilation, and carry potential for new insights. (e.g., Most undocumented immigrants live in small locales. How do local governments respond to increasing immigrant concentration?) Comparing new and old destinations could help us better evaluate long-term prospects for assimilation.
 - b. Interdisciplinary research provides opportunities to gain new insights (e.g., recent research by Harvard psychologists tests the impact of undocumented status on child development.)
 - c. Other fruitful directions are:
 - i. Going further back than the second generation in older destinations (fifth, sixth generation present in Texas or California) – see Tomas Jimenez’s work and new book (forthcoming November 2009).
 - ii. Adding a longitudinal dimension to ethnographic work (e.g., Robert Smith’s forthcoming book on trajectories of children of immigrants in NY followed over 12 years)
 - iii. Using new survey data (e.g., Mexican Family Life Survey)
 - iv. Studying the consequences of migration for Mexican communities (e.g., “Ghost towns” depleted by the migration of young adults; impact of the return of convicted gang members or deportees from the U.S. What are the implications for local politics?)
 - v. Studying the impact of agricultural changes in Mexico (and the United States) on migration patterns
 - vi. Focusing on the impact of immigration on local, rather than national, politics, which is currently under-theorized
 - vii. Studying the long-term effects of legal status on assimilation

Session 2/Table 9: Refugees

Presiders: Silvia Pedraza (University of Michigan), Steve Gold (Michigan State) & Nazli Kibria (Boston University)

Rapporteur: Richard Smith (UC-Berkeley)

Steve Gold

1. Since 1991 and the fall of the Soviet Union there have been different places of origin and smaller flows of refugees. During the cold war, refugees were often pre-revolutionary elites such as entrepreneurial minorities who also ejected capitalism and subject to harsh treatment, ejection, and scapegoating by Soviets.
2. US resettlement in co-ethnic agencies offered political and economic resources. For example, Cubans and Soviet Jews, had non traumatic exit and high quality resettlement with 3 years of benefits. The youth have done quite well. However, not all came skilled, (e.g. Cambodian, Hmong, and Vietnamese). These groups experienced culture shock, poverty and settled in declining neighborhoods.
3. Although policy on refugees towards resettlement priority is reserved by UNHCR, cold war arrival groups still dominate in US. Most new refugee groups are from Somalia, Burma, Bhutan and Burundi. Because of anti-immigrant movements, post 9/11 restrictions, and welfare reform, the US is less welcoming to refugees. However, national origin is probably more of a predictor than period. These new refugees come from refugee camps, are traumatized, and usually unskilled and experience a pattern of resettlement in smaller communities like Lansing, MI by experienced, well developed, pan-ethnic organizations.
4. Although most refugees are from African, the US is placing more Asians and reducing the number of African arrivals. African refugees express frustration with racialization. For example, the Sudanese “lost boys” title is both racialized and sentimental. However, studies show that unaccompanied minors from the Sudan are showing promising signs of successful adjustment in school attendance, ESL attainment and are attending 2 year college.

Silvia Pedraza

1. Discussed research from her new book, *Political Disaffection in Cuba's Revolution and Exodus*.
2. Pedraza interviewed in person over 120 Cubans from four different waves of migration and used theoretical sampling to compare migrants who held different political attitudes. In the first two waves migrants were mostly white middle class, educated and opposed communism. In the last two waves following 1991 migrants were more blacks and mixed race and from lower classes.
3. Although the community is successful by structural indicators, member have seen the seedy side of life, seen violence, experienced trauma and been beaten.
4. Families contain members who are politically active on both sides of the revolution.
5. When refugees leave, they take different processes of social maturation in the life span with them. For example, college students who left in the 1960s compared to 1992 share a similar “period” effect, but have different “cohort” effects because one left to escape the revolution and the latter left after becoming disenchanted that Cuba did not open up even after the Soviet Union fell.
6. Many struggles were family struggles, people not just living as individuals but as a family constellation. A family is like a decorative plate traced with veins and when it breaks, it

breaks along the lines that were already there.

7. Pedraza uses theoretical frameworks from Hirschman (1970), who writes of exit, voice or loyalty of Cubans and Wright (1976) who analyzes assent, dissent and consent within political movements in the USA.
8. Refugees experience a micro level distinct psychology with the following characteristics: high rates of self employment, a desire to be involved with the community, and a memory of trauma that desires to be passed onto the next generation a “refugee conciseness.” At the macro level, refugees easily become pawns in political game of chess.

Discussion

1. Liberian and Ghanaian refugees tend to be middle class and resent being settled in slum housing, racial patronization and receiving second hand goods.
2. Resettlement in small communities creates problems in that only the elites know English and become interpreters for the rest of the community. Feel burdened and talk about going back and rebuilding. Churches must sponsor a family and they do not continue help after the official resettlement period is over. Refugees complain that US citizens assume that their life in US is better.
3. The US stopped resettlement for while after 9/11 and had to re-screen many refugees. Those from the former Soviet Union were cleared, but not others. Even those who fed soldiers under duress were considered to be helping terrorists.
4. According to Dan Haber--Canadian Geographer, refugees just stay where inserted because they get language and training and skills.
5. Ethnic philanthropy is interesting. For example, Koreans create a surplus of churches. Also, Jewish philanthropy played an important role. Some evidence that when assimilated Jews move into professions then WASPs move into other professions.

Session 2/Table 10: National Migration Policy

Presiders: Kitty Calavita (UC-Irvine) & Mae Ngai (Columbia)
Rapporteur: Joanna Doran (UC-Berkeley)

Mae Ngai

1. A historical perspective – that what is considered normal is contingent and changes over time -- can move the debate on national migration policy beyond the box in which it is stuck
 - a. e.g. in 1940s, INS had many programs to legalize the undocumented, showing that illegality can be made and unmade
 - b. while the 1965 immigration Act is heralded as important piece of civil rights legislation, its passage prevents a pan-Americanism according to a European Union model, or freedom of trade *and* movement
 - c. consider using the legal precedent from 1920s, when there was a statute of limitation on undocumented presence, after which deportation could not occur
 - i. prevented accretion of undocumented population
 - ii. statute of limitations deeply integrated into current legal system, length of time would be a political question

Kitty Calavita

1. Progressives are often at a loss of what a policy should look like. To move forward it is important to recognize that migration policy needs to be a part of *economic* policy. Opening borders or creating guest worker programs without addressing economic inequity will only reinforce exploitation.
2. Currently we have a *de facto* two-tiered system. We need to adopt a two pronged approach to reverse this:
 - a. enforce the labor standards that are already in place
 - b. increase wages to living wages
3. Such an approach would decrease the appeal of undocumented labor and bring displaced native workers back into the labor market. This would be cheap and would not create new backlash.

Discussion

1. Unfortunately, migration policy is too often considered in the absence of the sending countries. Perhaps bilateral negotiation should be considered, especially given countries like Philippines, whose developmental policy is based on the exportation of its workers?
2. Human rights discourse for migration ought to also be considered
3. Trade unions may play an important role (see Jennifer Goldman “Transnational Unions” as imperative component of any national system)
4. To what degree is opposition to immigration a proxy for racism?
 - a. Likely, but it is important to not exaggerate the importance of public opinion. Even at times of strong anti-immigrant opinion it has been possible to achieve policies that go against public opinion.
 - b. Racialization changes according to when immigrants come and the labor market position they are able to achieve
 - c. Outcomes are to a large degree dependent on institutional integration. The New Deal was affirmative action for European but not Latino immigrants [see *When Affirmative Action*

Was White, by Ira Katznelson, for the larger discussion of how the New Deal benefited whites and largely excluded people of color]

- d. The Canadian point system leads people to believe that all immigrants have desired characteristics, which is not true (fact that many family reunification immigrants would have insufficient points for entry is made less visible)
5. Migration policy needs to consider integration of migrants once here. With a New Deal type of policy, immigrants and their children could better incorporate, leaving fewer at the margins. In turn, they could make greater economic contributions to their receiving society.

Session 2/Table 11: Immigrant Families

Speaker: Douglas Massey (Princeton)

Rapporteur: Maria Medvedeva (University of Chicago)

1. *Context:* Over the last three decades, the militarization of the U. S. borders has reached its record high in the number of Border Patrol Agents and the Agency's budget. Immigrant apprehension and detention have increased, and the number of deportations has bypassed past records of the 1930s. As a result of the border militarization and enforcement, rates of return migration fell sharply and the size of undocumented population increased. In public mind, immigrants, and particularly immigrants from Mexico, have become the scapegoats for the fear of terror. A War on Terror has turned into a War on Immigrants, with its unforgiving system of policies. The rights of undocumented immigrants are severely limited; however, even a legal status of a permanent resident does not protect against deportation from the United States.
2. *Key question:* How are immigrant families holding up under the deportation pressure?
3. *Consequences for immigrant families:* Deportations hurt family connections and leave immigrant population stressed and nervous. Deportations increase the number of single-parent families thus limiting familial moral and material support. Deportations have a tremendous impact on current well-being and future prospects of children of immigrants. Foreign-born children of undocumented immigrants, who entered the United States as minors and who account for 3 millions out of an estimated 12-million undocumented population, are held responsible for violations committed by their parents. They live in limbo, between the uncertainty of their status in the U.S. and the possibility of deportation to their home country of which they have little knowledge. Native-born children of undocumented immigrants are no different. They live in fear of being separated from their families and are unlikely to make any long-term educational and professional plans for their future in the United States. The divided and repatriated immigrant families are a human rights tragedy.
4. *Challenges:* Policy-wise, it might be too late to hope for a positive change given the success of framing the issue in terms of law-abiding and law-breaking (see, for example, the Blue Dog Coalition's position of immigration). In fact, recent drop in rates of new undocumented migration is frequently attributed to the success of the enforcement policies, while growing guest worker program and bad economy are rarely acknowledged as possible alternative explanations. Research-wise, it is necessary to expand academic studies of undocumented immigration and immigrant families and to enrich the traditional framework of the segmented assimilation theory. It is also critical to educate immigrant families about their rights, responsibilities and available resources (particularly related to educational opportunities for children), and to inform mass media and general public about the hardships and challenges that the immigrant families are facing.
5. *Supports:* Church networks and unions are the main constituency for the immigration reform and the main venue through which academics can influence public opinion and produce change. Churches are particularly important because of their close attention to immigrant

families as the main bearers of any intended and unintended consequences of any immigration reform (see, for example, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops).

Keynote Panel 1: (How) Can Social Scientists Affect Policy?

Panelists: Maria Echaveste, UC-Berkeley & former senior White House official
Demetrios Papademetriou, President of MPI
Roberto Suro, USC & former Director of the Pew Hispanic Center
Audrey Singer, Brookings Institute (*moderator*)

Rapporteur: Roberto G. Gonzalez (University of Washington)

Which research findings over the last couple of decades have made an impact on immigration policy?

ME: Studies looking at IRCA's implications and failures have shaped today's discussion about verification systems (No-Match, E-verify).

DP: Research on irregular migration before IRCA. These studies, while not always perfect in design, provide to be fairly accurate, and built in a brick-by-brick fashion the foundation of what we know today. Also, industry studies of the late 1970s and early 1980s, and the role immigrants played in the change in these industries.

RS: "I wish there were more examples of empirical research that influenced policy." Importance of labor networks driving migration. Business cycle effects – effects of downturn in economy to migration flows, and what happens during the upswing.

ME (again): There is not enough research-based policy making. Engaging early with those connected to policy making would help scholars to frame questions relevant to policy.

DP (again): It is important to analyze and dissect what is research and what influences it – field research, theory. Also, what are the parameters of change? All too often, we focus on the people who make laws, but we can also work with regulatory agencies – e.g. detention centers, wage-claim agencies.

RS (again): There's not a linear process in Washington. Defining the issue is almost the most important task. Think about Massey's circularity frame and the currency that has had.

Accessibility and usefulness - How do we retool our findings? And how do we reach the right people?

RS: I have been trying to popularize academic research in order to disseminate. It's important to think of multiple product lines—framed differently to be disseminated to different outlets. Think of it as a spectrum of products. Take the product when it's finished and retranslate it into different frames.

DP: If the social sciences are truly interested in helping to shape debates and policy, then it's important to look at how the field is organized. The reward structure of academia is very different from policy making. We all think about our audience, and who will make things happen for us. We have to ask the right questions and go after these questions.

ME: What is needed is more cross-collaboration across disciplines. And we need to have more impact at regional and local levels.

Holes and how people outside academia look for answers and where they find them - How can we go beyond national issues to local issues, and what is the useful knowledge we do not have enough of?

RS: With respect to new settlement areas, we should be watching the implementation of the Census very closely, and the potential for inaccurate counts. The numbers right now don't make

sense. At a local level, we should examine policies on education and health care that do not explicitly target immigrants but have profound effects on them.

ME: We need data on 287g agreements. Also, we need to know more about the 2nd and 3rd generations and why they should care about immigration reform.

DP: The real game of immigration is what happens after immigrants come in, i.e. immigrant integration. We need to focus our attention on what happens after they come in. How are communities being made or remade? Tell us what is happening on the ground.

What are the prospects and timing of immigration reform and what kind of legislation should we expect seeing passed?

ME: It's going to happen, but not before next year, and maybe not until the year after. But it's hard to imagine any type of expanded temporary worker program.

DP: It depends on how wounded will Obama be by the time he gets to immigration. The battle will be uphill, hard fought and it's unclear whether or not it can be won. Currently, immigration is the number 4 priority. There will be legalization. There will be some sort of backlog reduction for families. There will be more enforcement on the border and in the interior (there will be collateral damage), and probably a commission on labor markets and immigration.

Keynote Panel 2: Comparative Migration and Integration: Empirical and Conceptual Contributions Beyond the U.S.

Panelists: Nancy Foner, Hunter College & CUNY-Grad Center
Demetrios Papademetriou, President of MPI
Patrick Simon, INED (France)
Irene Bloemraad, UC-Berkeley (moderator)

Rapporteur: Vivian Louie (Harvard)

Patrick Simon

1. New paradigms of immigration and integration in Europe
2. European migration/integration
3. Social science and policies
 - a. 2nd generation issue
 - b. Towards European conception of integration
 - c. New political framing/new challenges
 - d. Different and competing objectives.
 - e. Contradictions between integration and antidiscrimination
 - f. Statistics as sensitive issue
 - g. Europeanization of research on immigration and integration
 - h. Social science used more in policy making

Demetrios Papademetriou

Comparativists have to be mindful of the following:

1. Data are not always available as we have come to expect in the United States.
2. Some data exist but are only available to some (favored institutions) as compared to independent agencies that do not rely on public money.
3. Lack of transparency of how analysis of data is deployed in public policy.
4. Differences in analytic traditions and tools used
5. How the societies are organized, where the real levers of power are, and who controls them.

Nancy Foner

1. Challenges for immigration second generation in United States that counterparts in Europe do not face as much
 - a. Race – African ancestry/phenotype & attending segregation
 - b. High numbers of undocumented immigrants
 - c. Lack of strong welfare state as compared to Europe (health insurance, housing stock, unemployment benefits)
2. Positives for immigrants/second generation in United States
 - a. Race – immigrants and their children benefit from the fruits of the Civil Rights movement
3. What might United States researchers learn from research conducted elsewhere?
 - a. Study of same national origins group in different settings
 - b. Importance of institutional arrangements
 - c. United States-Europe collaborative efforts
 - d. Take the “international” in *international migration* more seriously

Irene Bloemraad

Why would a finding in one society apply to another? The tension between desire for generalizability and desire for respect for society's particularity