**Final exam**

Course No. : SOC 585

Course Title: Migration and Trasnationalism – Migrating People, Migrating Culture: Optics, Methods, and Impacts

(Fall 2013)

**Submitted to**

Mgr. Radka Klvaňová, M.A.

FSS

Masaryk University

**Submitted by**

Sanjoy Kumar Chanda

UCO: 420470

Q. 1. Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt (2007) identify five intellectual foundations of contemporary transnational scholarship. Please identify them and discuss briefly selected text(s) from the syllabus as examples of each of these intellectual foundations.

**Answer**

**Introduction:**

The discussion of migration is not a new phenomenon. Previously the study of migration was limited to economic base. Presently due to the invasion of technology and industry, the flow of migration especially in developed countries from less developed countries are observed more. This current myriad flow creates many problems both in receiving and origin countries. There is observing the social crisis in migrants in host countries. So migrants are now in the place of movement to establish their rights in host countries. About this Khagram and Levitt (2007) presented that social movements mobilized constituencies over the world on various social issues like human rights, gender justice, and family values campaigns (P.1). So the intellectual foundations to study migration take different direction and new ideas.

**Description:**

Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt identified five intellectual foundations such as empirical methodological, theoretical, philosophical and public transnationalism. Now these are briefly discussed below with example identifying from the selected texts.

**1. Empirical Transnationalism**

“It focuses on describing, mapping, classifying and quantifying novel, potentially important transnational phenomena and dynamics.” (Khagram and Levitt 2007:3) The description of empirical transnationalism is found as an example of text in “Social Remittances Revisited” written by Levitt and Lamba-Nieves. In this study they (2011) identified some transnational phenomenon. Firstly, it is shown how people’s experience before migrating strongly influences what they do in the countries where they settle; this, in turn, affects what they remit back to their homelands. Secondly, previously it was found the differences between individual and collective economic remittances but in this article Levitt and Lamba-Nieves newly identified differences between individual and social remittances as empirical intellectual foundation. For example, while individuals communicate ideas and practices to each other in their roles as friends, family members, they also communicate in their capacity as organizational actors, which have implications for organizational management and capacity building.

**2. Methodological Transnationalism**

“Reformulates existing data and accounts, invents new kinds of information and evidence, applies existing investigative approaches in novel ways, and designs novel research tools and approaches with which to analyze, explain and interpret transnational phenomena and dynamics” (Khagram and Levitt 2007). “De-Centering and Re-Centering: Rethinking Concepts and Methods in the Sociological Study of Religion” written by Cadge et.al (2011) is an example of Methodological Transnationalism study. Here four methodological edges are outlined such as provincializing the United States, moving beyond Christocentrism, considering religion outside of congregations and critical engagement. Paying attention to these edges—as a means to de-center to re-center our debates in new ways—not only broadens and deepens our knowledge of the “religious,” it encourages us to reexamine long-standing conceptual tools, unquestioned assumptions, and accepted methods in the sociology of religion.

**3. Theoretical Transnationalism**

A third intellectual foundation for the field of TS is to construct and test explanations and craft interpretations either parallel, complement, replace or transform existing theoretical accounts (Khagram and Levitt 2007:3). Transnational theories interact with conventional theories in four ways such as parallel, complementary, compete and combination. This transnationalism can be explained as an example by Boccagni’s (2011) theoretical progress in three regards: (1) a stronger connection with globalization studies; (2) further elaboration on the reference points of transnational ties; and (3) a deeper reflection on the relevance of identifications and senses of belonging to migrant connectedness with their homeland (P.1). Boccagni has identified a theoretical lens to study migration. He (2011) said that “for the biographic interdependence between migrants and their non-migrant counterparts, transnationalism has accelerated theory building, methodological elaboration and field research with a view to achieving a simultaneous understanding of immigration and emigration processes” (P.12).

This theoretical transnationalism is also explained by Pratt in her book “Imperial Eyes”. Pratt (1992) has crafted some terms and concepts to develop dialectic and historical approach to the writing of empire. She (1992) identified “contact zone” to refer to the space of imperial encounters-people geographically and historically separated; “anti-conquest” refers to the strategies of representation and “autoethnography” referring colonized subjects undertake to represent themselves in ways that engage with the colonizer’s term (Pp.8-9).

**4. Philosophical Transnationalism**

“Philosophical transnationalism is based on the metaphysical view that social life is transnational to begin with --- transnational phenomena and dynamics are the rule rather than the exception, the central tendency rather than the outlier” (Khagram and Levitt 2007:15). It focuses on two premises including a) social life is not automatically organized and b) social processes we assume to be bounded and bordered are as a rule. This Philosophical Transnationalism is observed from the article titled “Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society” by Levitt and **S**chiller. A transnational ontology is based on social phenomena and dynamics take place within transnational fields. About this The Manchester School proposed a notion of social field similar to Bourdieu which acknowledged that the migrants they studied belonged to tribal-rural localities and colonial industrial cities at the same time (Morawska, 2003). A transnational ontology goes hand and hand with a transnational epistemology. Individuals connected through social networks to a transnational social field make claims, take actions, and may even see themselves as members of a country in which they have not lived (Levitt and **S**chiller 2004).

**5. Public Transnationalism**

“Public transnationalism creates a space to imagine options for social transformation that are obscured when borders, boundaries and the structures, processes and actors within them are taken as given” (Khagram and Levitt 2007:18). For example, Tsing (2000) suggested that analysts need to give up several of the tools and frames and identified some imaginations for social transformation. These new imaginations are: *first*, we might stop making a distinction between "global" forces and "local" places. This is a very seductive set of distinctions, promising as it does to give us both focused detail and the big picture, and I find myself slipping into this vocabulary all the time; *second*, we might learn to investigate new developments without assuming either their universal extension or their fantastic ability to draw all world-making activities into their grasp. International finance, for example, has surely undergone striking and distinctive transformations in the last 30 years. Certainly this has effects everywhere, but what these effects are is unclear and *third*, globalisms themselves need to be interrogated as an interconnected, but not homogeneous, set of projects (Pp. 352-353). So it is possible to make social transformation through the contribution of individual being freed from global hegemony.

**Conclusion:**

Five intellectual foundations- empirical methodological, theoretical, philosophical and public transnationalism- of Khagram and Levitt have different direction of explaining migration. In empirical transnationalism, migrant’s social phenomena are identified exploring people’s experiences, differences and ideas and practices. De-center to re-center debates has contribution to understand methodological transnationalism encouraging to reexamine long-standing conceptual tools, unquestioned assumptions, and accepted methods. Boccagni’s theoretical progress and dialectic and historical approach of Pratt present the foundation of describing theoretical transnationalism. Philosophical transnationalism suggests researcher to consider the existing rules and obligations that shaped the life of migrants whereas people has opportunity to study migration without the global hegemony discovered in public transnationalism.
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**Q. 3. Discuss immigrant integration using the concepts of ‘cultural armature’ and ‘city scale.’**

**Answer**

**Introduction:**

Immigrant integration in different countries has various modes. Immigrants basically in developed countries integrates them either with the help of structural position of given city or with their own effort. Many migration and urban studies scholars raised questions of space, locality, and culture squarely into discussions of immigrant incorporation (Brettell 2005). Previous studies mainly focus on the economic position for which migrants from different countries come to the city of developed counties. But they did not sufficient attention into cultural resources. Jaworsky et.al. (2012) posed their observation how city’s cultural armature may supplement economic and demographic arguments by contributing more thorough explanations of why certain places integrate immigrants with greater ease than others (P.78). Besides, cities enter international migration scholarship as containers that provide spaces in which migrants settle and work.

**Discussion:**

**1. Cultural armature**

Cultural armature includes cultural elements and tools to identify immigrants in a city. Cultural armature helps to conceptualize cultural dimensions and provide tools for comparing how cities as units of analysis differently respond to immigrants (Jaworsky et.al. 2012). In shaping the extents of reception of immigrants, existing institutions plays important role as factors. About this Portes & Rumbaut (2006) emphasized the role of the receiving government, the characteristics of the host-country labor market and the characteristics of ethnic communities in shaping contexts of reception. Similarly, Reitz (2002) described four contextual factors, including: (a) pre-existing ethnic and race relations within the host population; (b) differences in labor markets and related institutions; (c) the impact of government policies and programs, including immigration policy, policies for immigrant integration, and policies for the regulation of social institutions; and (d) the changing nature of international boundaries, part of the process of globalization (Pp. 1005–1019). In addition to contextual factors like ethnic networks, social capital, and labor market conditions, this work stresses how programs, institutional cultures, and national and local policies affect immigrant integration (Fix & Zimmerman 2000; Waldinger 2001).

Cities have particular cultural resources or what we call cultural armatures that they deploy in particular ways. Brettell (2005), for example, stresses the importance of a dominant set of values or an urban ethos in shaping immigrant incorporation (p. 247). Immigrants also make the place competitive and resulting the change of city from previous position. Glick & Caglar (2009) identified, “immigrants can be marketable assets in the places where they settle, even enabling some cities to reposition themselves within the geopolitical hierarchy” (Pp. 177–202). Therefore it is needed to maintain the force of immigrant to be competitive for economic gain. About this Caglar (2007) urges to focus on the “entanglements between immigrant incorporation, cultural diversity and urban development” (p. 102).

Jaworsky et.al. (2012) explored four factors as Cultural armature those help to integrate immigrants at Portland and Danbury in the USA. These are as follows:

(1) *History and cultural geography*: People in different countries would like to go the place where is known from earlier. They find their cultural similarity and people engage in conversation and ‘folk ethnography’ (Jaworsky et.al. 2012: 82). For example, on the basis of this historical and cultural connection “Portland and has been producing ‘global citizens’ since the 1800s” (Jaworsky et.al. 2012: 82).

 (2*) Urban self-presentation*: It represents the reserving the historical arts so that people can attract to see it. For example, Jaworsky et.al. (2012) explored that Portland attracted especially members of the artistic and LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) communities through the process of revitalization in 1970 of its housing and historic buildings (P. 83).

*(3) Cultural responses to demography*: Attitudes and values of people act as a force to make their remaining generation educated and skillful that increase social capital.

 *(4) Municipal strategies*: It refers to the prevailing ethos toward immigrants particularly evident in municipal responses. For example, Jaworsky et.al. (2012) identified services to immigrants of Danbury’s municipal like ESL programs in the public schools, School-Based Healthcare Services and so on (p. 85).

**2. City scale**

The integration process of immigrants is determined with the city scale. City scale is defined as “the differential positioning of cities determined by the articulation of institutions of political, cultural and economic power within regions, states and the globe” (Schiller and Caglar 2009). This definition reflects a comparative approach to the articulation of migrants and cities that builds on, but reaches beyond, a world cities framework which places cities within a ‘hierarchy of spatial articulations’ (Friedmann 1995: 22) From this perspective, Beaverstock et al. (1999) identifies that city scale is a relative measure operating on a field of power, rather than a measure of the density of population or of new-economy connections such as that posited by world cities researchers (Pp. 445-458). For example, it is possible for cities large in physical extent and population to be relatively less significant in terms of power than cities which are smaller in size but serve as up-scale or top-scale (world) cities because they are centers of economic, political or cultural capital (Schiller and Caglar 2009).

Migrants have a contribution to the development of cities in all levels. They supply labor, wealth and reproduce social institutions. Thus they facilitate cultural representation of the city and become engaged as facilitators of neoliberal governance. Schiller and Caglar (2009) identified four scaling process city and showed the nature of integration with each of them. These are as follows:

*Top-Scale*: It represents multiple new-economy industries and their massive accumulations of cultural and political capital such as London or New York. It offers migrant incorporation and transnational connection. For example, “top-scale cities depend on large and ready supplies of highly educated migrants, who are located through global talent recruitment industries” (Schiller and Caglar 2009:190).

*Up-scale*: It represents new-economy industries can be considered as occupying relatively upscale positions. For example, the hi-tech economic base requires a large supply of computer professionals, engineers and health professionals. Many of these positions are filled by migrants, who are recruited through migrant networks such as Pakistani are the second most import source for the recruitment of Dallas’ doctors (Sturgeon 2006).

*Low-scale*: It represents the restructure of local economies and reposition globally. For example, by settling in low-income neighborhoods in Philadelphia outside of the gentrified city centre, and by restoring houses, immigrant entrepreneurs and merchants contributed to the redevelopment of these neighborhoods and raised real-estate prices (Schiller and Caglar 2009:192).

*Down-Scale*: It neither includes receiving countries support nor help of migrant professionals to sustain ethnic community. Basically here small migrant entrepreneurs are observed to contribute. For Example, Schiller and Caglar (2009) have shown the changing nature of Manchester with the help of small migrant’s entrepreneurs willing investment (Pp. 193-194).

**Conclusion:**

Finally, it is identified that immigrant integration in different cities over the world depends on both the process of cultural armature and city scale. In cultural armature, contextual factors and dominant set of values of cities play vital role in shaping immigrant incorporation though different governmental and global process. In addition to this, four cultural armatures of USA –history and geography, urban self expression, cultural responses to demography and multiple responses- demonstrate the various scopes of integration of immigrant in different times. Moreover, city scale has dominant force of immigrant integration a field of power. Four scales of Schiller and Caglar show both how immigrants got privileges from city leaders and how immigrants themselves contributed to make city global value to be integrated.
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**Q. 4. What state is responsible for social protection of the migrants? Answer this question using at least 2 readings from the syllabus.**

**Answer**

**Introduction:**

“Migration has… become a private means of coping with the global wage gap, and the costs of migration are mainly counted as private costs. But, when enough people – adults and children alike – become part of a private problem, it becomes a public issue to which we need thoughtful public answers” (Isaksen et al., 2008: 408). Social protection is linked with the subject of incorporation of immigrants. It is the responsibility of state to maintain social protection of migrants to ascertain their surviving. In regard of sufferings of immigrant populations Vonk and Walsum (2006) discovered weaker socio-economic position, in terms of low levels of education, higher unemployment rates, low incomes, language barriers, etc. The integration of disadvantaged immigrant groups has become a major political objective of many Western governments. Also here social security plays a role, be it in a somewhat contradictory way. At present, immigration and integration policies often presuppose that migrants should become full members of their new countries of residence (Vonk and Walsum 2006).

**Description:**

Social protection for migrants is necessary for their sustaining especially in receiving countries. It promotes not only the well being of migrants but also the receiving states enjoy economic benefit from their production. Sabates-Wheeler et al. in 2011 identified four components social protection for migrants. These are as follows:

(i) Access to formal social protection – that is, social security and social services – in host and origin countries;

(ii) Portability of vested social security rights between host and origin countries;

(iii) Labor market conditions for migrants in host countries and the recruitment process for migrants in the origin country; and

(iv) Access to informal networks to support migrants and their family members.

The issues of social protection arise when migrants in host country do not enjoy the equal rights and opportunities. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries in the Middle East are very much reluctant to grant social protection to the immigrants. Migrants in Middle East suffer from numerous problems and continue their work with these constraints. So to mitigate these constraints migrants with the responsibility to provide for certain benefits like old-age or disability pensions on his or her own (Sabates-Wheeler et al. 2011).

Basically receiving should be responsible to provide social protection for migrants in larger extent. According to Sabates-Wheeler et al. (2011), when migrants reach to abroad, their home countries are able to contribute to their protection by negotiating bilateral agreements with receiving countries (Pp. 109-110). For example, the agreement between Spain and Ecuador, this incorporates guarantees of social protection and access to benefits. Moreover, there is also emphasized on the consular services to the migrant workers. It is significantly explored the responsibilities of receiving countries such as effective provision and monitoring of migrants’ access to rights and services, and labors standards. The key path for provision include resource centers for migrant, and managing help lines and information in the migrants’ native languages (Sabates-Wheeler et al. 2011).

The condition of social protection of receiving countries is not always expected. So, origin countries take responsibility to manage social protection though it is not significant. Though the protection from origin countries is low as they are basically less developed, some countries like Srilanka is continuing to provide social protection in their own to their emigrants. “The country responded to the fact that migration for work often leaves migrants and their families cut off from origin-country insurance systems by setting up an Overseas Workers Welfare Fund to provide social insurance for migrants and families left behind” (ILO, 2008). The fund covers payments to migrants and their families in the case of death, disability or a need to cover travel expenses.

Besides receiving and origin countries, the responsibility of social protection is observed at multilateral level. Its ‘Multilateral Framework on Labor Migration’ provides guidelines on the equal treatment of migrants in temporary worker schemes, focused on establishing and enforcing international standards (ILO, 2006). For example, such social security agreements are arranged on the multilateral level as shown by the EU, CARICOM and so on.

Social protect has now turned as gender issue. Migrant women do not enjoy proper social protection even during their pregnancy time from their receiving countires. About this Rezavi (2007) observed that migrant women perceive themselves (and typically are) less as “needy beneficiaries” than “productive members of society” (p. 4). But it is needed to mitigate ensuring social protection. Highlighting the unfair and exhausting overburden of obligations, Boccagni (2010) said that responsibilities and expectations associated to transnational care workers and givers – and exploring the potential for public action to meet their needs – may mark some progress, with a view to making “transnational welfare” something more than a buzzword in the latest migration-development jargon (P.13).

There are some theoretical contributions those suggest to ensure responsibility of state for social protection of migrants. Vonk and Walsum in 2006 discovered the following three approaches:

*First,* human rights: Here is proposed that states should allow minimum care obligations in case of vulnerability and need on the basis of its discretionary powers.

 *Second,* extraterritorial responsibility: This approach invites international government to take more extraterritorial responsibility for immigrants and emigrants. Here also suggest to origin countries to create funds to protect their own overseas workers.

*Third*, call for a new generation of EU return agreements: This approach emphasize on both controlling obstacles for readmission and handling the responsibility of irregular immigrants between the host state and the country of origin and with the funding of financial support for the returnees.

**Conclusion**:

Social protection is essential for migrants to be ensured. It includes accommodation, health management, wage, security and so on necessary to survive with honor. Though receiving and origin states both take social protection of migrants, receiving state is more responsible. The responsibility also goes to multilateral ways through connection different countries and organizations. Migrant women’s protection is not only a gender issue but also reproductive right. The approaches of Vonk and Walsum show the new way of direction to state party to ensure social protection.
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