

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: **CAREER TRAJECTORIES AND INCORPORATION STRATEGIES IN THE LIFE HISTORIES OF FOREIGN-BORN FACULTY IN THE U.S.**

Amy M. Carattini, Doctor of Philosophy, 2015

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Judith Noemí Freidenberg
Department of Anthropology

The primary aim of this study is to understand the factors that influence and affect high-skilled immigrant social practices and adjustment within an occupational unit located in the U.S. The secondary aim is to contribute to the body of knowledge in the process of transforming public perceptions from that of classifying immigrants almost exclusively in low skilled sectors to acknowledging the diversity of skill among the foreign-born.

Through research with foreign-born faculty, located at a research university, this study focuses on career trajectories with special attention to domains of connection. Research findings indicate that their visibility as foreign-born is complex. Foreign-born faculty are no longer counted in university data when they have naturalized; however, many are recognized and counted as adding to minority quotas (such as Black, Latin@, and Asian).

Foreign-born faculty who participated in this study, referred to as study collaborators for their engagement in the research process, often described who they were and what they did in relation to their occupation rather than their countries of birth and/or settlement—expressing a range of social connection(s) and incorporation strategies. The

guiding question for this research is: “What variables influence domains of connection for foreign-born faculty?” In order to answer this question, 48 life history interviews were used to understand how foreign-born faculty constructed their career paths from early educational experiences to selecting teaching and/or research positions in their chosen field—both of which are connected to their subsequent/on-going immigration decisions.

Research findings indicate two major career trajectories as they intersect with immigration, 1) being trained and professionally developed in the U.S. or 2) securing employment in the U.S. after being trained and professionally developed abroad. Three domains of connection are identified: political, lifestyle, and professional.

This study contributes to anthropology of immigration and recent trends in scholarship by following skilled immigrant incorporation into the labor market to understand their social practices and concludes with suggestions for applied and policy contributions.

Career Trajectories and Incorporation Strategies in the Life Histories of Foreign-Born Faculty in the U.S.

by Amy M. Carattini

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Anthropology
2014

Advisory Committee:

Judith Freidenberg, Dissertation Advisor, Dept. of Anthropology
John Caughey, Dept. of American Studies
Laurie Frederik Meer, School of Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies
Michael Paolisso, Department of Anthropology
Nancy Struna, Dean's Representative, Dept. of American Studies

© Copyright by

Amy M. Carattini

2014

Dedication

To my grandmother Marie, who inspired my academic journey;

To my parents, Darryl and Kathy, who believe in me, who continue to support and encourage me, and who have read and commented on countless iterations and drafts;

To my partner John, who has provided research assistance,

opportunities to dialogue about ideas,

and lots and lots of love;

&

To my mentor, advisor, and friend Judith, who has modeled by example, inspired my research, and helped me become a better version of myself.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Judith Freidenberg for her vital role in helping me to complete this dissertation. She has been my advisor for the last five years and has continually encouraged me to identify and disseminate universals that connect humans to each other. She has also accompanied me on my academic journey as a mentor and friend, giving of her time and listening to research concerns as well as interpersonal struggles. She has taught me so much about being a professional and about maturing as a woman in my field of study. I consider myself blessed to have her guidance and friendship.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee for their feedback and refinement of my work. Through them, I have learned how to take my ideas from their inception and keep working on them through interaction with others.

And, this dissertation would not have been possible without the invaluable assistance of my parents, Darryl and Kathy Carattini, who dedicated long hours to reading, editing and discussing numerous drafts with me and contributed valuable insight.

I want to acknowledge too the unconditional support of my partner, John Maniha, who provided research assistance in the early stages and who allowed me to concentrate on my dissertation while lending a supportive ear. And, a thank you to my in-laws, Ken and Barbara Maniha, who read drafts and who also added, through their careful reflections, another dimension to the work.

Finally, I would like to give particular thanks to the many foreign-born faculty who have inspired this dissertation and to those who graciously allowed me to interview

them. A special thanks to those who took the time to comment and give feedback throughout the life of the project.

Table of Contents

Prologue: Who is an Immigrant? _____	1-2
Introduction: Juxtaposing Institutional and Government Categories with Immigrant Perspectives to Understand High-Skilled Immigration _____	3-15
I. Background	
II. Purpose of Study	
III. Problem Statement	
IV. Guiding Question	
V. Conceptual Framework	
VI. Research Site	
Chapter 1: Anthropology of Immigration Theory _____	16-40
I. How do Immigrants Change Over Time and What Changes Them	
II. Foreign-Born Faculty & Anthropology of Immigration Theory	
Chapter 2: High-Skilled Immigration Theory _____	41-55
I. Brain Drain/Gain/Circulation	
II. Self-Initiated Expatriation	
III. Foreign-Born Faculty & Selection as High-Skilled Immigrants	
Chapter 3: Using Ethnography to Understand Career Trajectories _____	56-78
I. Ethnography as a Research Tool	
II. Human Ethics	
III. Data Collection	
IV. Analysis	
V. Interpretation	
Chapter 4: Childhood & Formative Years _____	79-106
I. Date of Birth and Region of Birth	
II. Family History with Immigration	
III. Parents' Occupation and Educational Achievement	
IV. Elementary and High school Educational Experiences	
V. Undergraduate Education	
VI. Summary of Findings	
Chapter 5: Young Adulthood & Becoming Professors _____	107-148
I. Reasons for Going Abroad	
II. Reasons for Coming to the U.S.	

III.	Decade of Arrival in the U.S.	
IV.	Selecting a Graduate School	
V.	Work Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate	
VI.	Social Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate	
VII.	Assessing the U.S. in the Student or Post-Doctoral Stage	
VIII.	Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate	
IX.	Summary of Findings	
Chapter 6: Adulthood & Being Professors_____		149-193
I.	Choosing to Make a Career at the University	
II.	Reason for Leaving the U.S.	
III.	Choosing to Stay in the U.S.	
IV.	Work Life as a Professional/Professor	
V.	Social Life as a Professional/Professor	
VI.	Assessing the U.S. as a Professional/Professor	
VII.	Learning the U.S. as a Professional/Professor	
VIII.	Personal Identity	
IX.	Summary of Findings	
Conclusion:		
Major Findings & Recommendations for Further Scholarship_____		194-211
I.	Career Trajectories	
II.	Domains of Connection	
Epilogue: Anthropological Recommendations for Policy _____		210-213
Appendices_____		214-234
Works Cited_____		235-273

List of Tables

Table 1: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Post Secondary Teachers at Colleges & Universities	page 7
Table 2: National Center for Education Statistics, Foreign Faculty as Part of the Total Faculty Population at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor Levels	page 62
Table 3: Distribution of the Foreign-Born Faculty at the University by Rank, Gender, Regional Origin and Discipline	page 64
Table 4: Number of Foreign-Born Faculty with Recruitment Variables	page 65
Table 5: Distribution of Study Collaborators at the University by Rank, Gender, and Regional Origin	pages 67-68
Table 6: Temporal and Spatial Variables Tracking across 48 Interviews	page 71
Table 7: First Round of Analysis Using Atlas.ti: Initial Marking for Life History Stages and Accompanying Motivations	page 73
Table 8: Study Collaborators & Themes for Delineating Career Trajectories Across the Life Course	page 74
Table 9: Example of Primary Themes (Career Trajectory Points Across the Life Course) with Related Topics (Experiences and Transitions across the Life Course)	pages 74-75
Table 10: Social Matrix and Work Life as a Professional/Professor	page 76
Table 11: Social Matrix and Assessing the U.S. as a Professional/Professor	page 76
Table 12: Date of Birth for Study Collaborators	page 79
Table 13: Region of Birth for Study Collaborators	page 80
Table 14: Decade of Birth with Region of Birth for Study Collaborators	page 80
Table 15: Motivations for Study Collaborators Coming to the U.S. from a Holistic Perspective	pages 113-114
Table 16: Study Collaborators & Decade of Arrival	page 117
Table 17: Study Collaborators & Age at Arrival in the U.S.	pages 119-120
Table 18: Study Collaborators and Career Status Upon Arrival	page 121

Table 19: Study Collaborators and First Geographic Location Upon Arrival in the U.S.	pages 125
Table 20: Study Collaborators and Marital Status	page 168
Table 21: Study Collaborators and Children	page 169
Table 22: Study Collaborators and Legal Status at Time of Interview	page 171
Table 23: Study Collaborators and Citizenship(s)	page 172
Table 24: Study Collaborators and Years in the U.S. at Time of Interview	page 175
Table 25: Study Collaborators and Number of Moves within the U.S.	page 175
Table 26: Study Collaborators and Age at Interview	page 186

Prologue: Who is an Immigrant?

This dissertation emerges from my interest in international migration coming from my own family history with migration, my role teaching immigrants at a community college, and through personal friends, professors and mentors that led me to conduct research and familiarize myself with the literature. I realized through all of these experiences that I often ceased to think of people as immigrants when they inhabited my own social circle. In fact, when I thought of the word *immigrant*, I tended to think of those who were from other countries who struggled in construction, domestic, and service jobs—working hard to approximate the *American Dream*.

I never thought of the highly educated from other countries in this way. I think because this group shares similarities to my own educational and lifestyle choices, I have ceased, in many ways, to think of them as “traditional immigrants.” But, of course, this realization highlighted important distinctions for me. Who is an immigrant? Do you have to become a citizen or plan to stay in the U.S. permanently in order to be designated as such? One December morning in 2013, I decided to visit the immigration office at the federal state building in Baltimore, Maryland, and ask for clarification. I thought if nothing else I would be given a definition that I could use to compare with inside perspectives/voices of those who had “immigrated.”

When I walked up to the counter, the immigration officer asked if I was there for “immigration reasons?” I responded that I was a researcher interested in understanding and clarifying definitions of immigration—that I wanted to know their official definition of an *immigrant*. The officer retreated to a back room for about five minutes, returning

with a several hundred-page book titled the *U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Policy Manual*, which I was given and told I could peruse while sitting in the waiting room.

I ascertained the following from this handbook—that there are several terms that define an immigrant residing in the U.S. depending on different legal statuses such as a *non-resident alien* as well as various visa related terms. One definition put it this way, “The term ‘immigrant’ means every alien except an alien who is within one of the following classes of nonimmigrant aliens” (*Immigration and Nationality Act (INA)* 101(a)(15)(K). The definition then went on for several pages describing people who were the exceptions such as ambassadors, career diplomats, those visiting temporarily, people passing through as crew on airlines and ships, to name a few. In general, the trend for using the word *immigrant* appeared to indicate a desire for and progress towards long-term legal status in the U.S. But how could one really know if someone is positioned to stay here long term? I thought of my family. Did they know when my great grandfathers came to the U.S. at the turn of the twentieth century that we would all be here—a legacy of their desire to indicate long-term settlement?

And, so my research quest began by looking around where I spent most of my time when choosing a dissertation topic—a university. This reflection has led me to my current research topic—foreign-born faculty, an understudied population. I was eager to capture their stories, so instead of consulting policy guidelines I inquired into their lives to understand how they saw themselves. The inside perspective was the basis for this research. It is my feeling that in documenting their stories, I am capturing a story of *us*, which, by default, is one of the university and the academic career path of which we are all part—fellow travelers.

Introduction: Juxtaposing Institutional and Government Categories with Immigrant Perspectives to Understand High-Skilled Immigration

I. Background

Currently, in the U.S. there are approximately 41 million foreign-born persons, comprising a little more than 13% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census, 2013).¹ The distinction between the place of birth for this group and the rest of the population often frames anthropological research on immigrant adjustment and incorporation² to U.S. society (Glick Schiller, 2013; Vertovec, 2011; Wimmer, 2009). There are several reasons for this trend. First, immigration analyses are anchored in the nation-state, despite ongoing debates concerning the possible lack of relevance of geopolitical boundaries for identity formation (Brettell & Hollifield, 2013; Kearney, 2004). Transnational theories have framed the debate, describing how immigrants make nation-state boundaries more diffuse through the social, economic, and political relationships they engage in, which help link countries of birth with countries of settlement (Glick Schiller, 2013; Levitt & Jaworsky, 2007). While transnational theory challenges older models of immigrant incorporation and assimilation by showing that immigrants can have multiple identities, the emphasis, however, remains focused on immigrant activities that promote government interests such as their labor and their remittances (Amelina and Faist, 2012; Levitt, 2011; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002).

¹ This number does not account for undocumented persons.

² I use the term incorporation here to refer to something other than cultural assimilation—to define an experience that requires the acceptance of a country's laws and codes of human rights, such as freedom of speech, but does not require the eradication of all cultural differences or group-identities (Chen, 2012: 11; Barkan, 2006; Portes and Borocz, 1989).

Second, a large number of empirical studies in the field of immigration studies have been conducted on immigrant groups in low-skilled sectors of the economy—often focusing on the structural aspects that shape incorporation, such as access to resources and labor market niches (Chavez, 2008; Freidenberg, 2006; Portes, 2003). A growing body of literature on transnational citizenship among professional or highly-skilled populations emphasizes civic and social responsibility, framed in terms of place of birth. Ong (2000), for example, explores concepts such as *flexible citizenship* among Chinese businessmen invested in the global economy; Raj (2003) explores the complexities of multiculturalism and cultural change through middle-class South Asian families living in London; and Brettell (2011) explores how skilled Indian immigrant civic and political engagement in Dallas-Fort Worth helps position the city globally. While anthropologists often describe the nuances of inter and intra group interactions in their ethnographic research, the juxtaposition of *immigrant* with *country of birth* limits the comprehensive analyses and depiction of immigrant incorporation (Amelina and Faist, 2012; Glick Schiller, Çağlar and Guldbrandsen, 2006; Wimmer, 2009). The result is that immigrants are often understood as either en route to becoming aligned with government goals and agendas or are in opposition to them.

Thirdly, U.S. immigration legislation has occupied recent government administrations seeking to maximize benefits to the nation-state and minimize detractions such as unauthorized immigration. The overarching assumption in both scholarly and policy arenas is that immigrants eventually integrate into the nation-state and culturally transform into hybrid or homogeneous social identities (Rumbaut, 2005). Missing in these characterizations, however, is what happens in areas where mainstream ideas about

immigration are not in sync with actual events such as when immigrants relate to the variety of choices available within U.S. society such as embracing city life or choosing to live in a more suburban setting or aligning with conservative values versus more liberal ones. The consequence of thinking about immigrants in terms of country of birth and country of settlement is that, in the public domain, certain immigrant groups are pathologized and perceived as damaging or threatening to the majority as it relates to an *American mainstream*—forgetting the diversity of ideas and opinions about the U.S. that exist even within the country’s own borders among the host population. Plus, there is little reflection on the influence both U.S.-born and immigrants have on the other and on how their necessary coexistence reveals national ethos.

For example, mainstream notions about diversity and inclusion in the U.S. tend to focus on race and ethnicity; however, thoughts and ideologies are also forms of diversity (Goodman, Moses and Jones, 2012). To look more critically at the variables that comprise notions of diversity is to look more specifically at how individuals shaped by variables such as privilege and oppression, in addition to race and ethnicity, interact with the world and how the world interacts with them (Pieterse et al., 2013).

II. Purpose of the Study

The first aim of my study is to understand the factors that influence and affect high-skilled immigrant social practices and adjustment within an occupational unit located in the U.S. As such, the emphasis is on how immigrants identify with their chosen career and associated way of life. As of 2012, foreign-born workers represented approximately 16% of the U.S. labor force (about 25 million) with approximately 5%

working in management, professional, and related occupations (about 7 million) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013: Foreign-Born Workers). My study of skilled immigrants contributes to the anthropology of immigration and recent trends in scholarship by following their incorporation into the labor market. Rather than taking a country of origin approach, however, my study takes an institutional one, and by focusing on occupational geography, the emphasis is on transcending national borders to explore immigrant lifestyle conditions and social practices. Scholars have devoted little attention to how these everyday experiences facilitate incorporation beyond that of and in conjunction with political, racial, and ethnic variables (Morawska, 2013). Greater attention should be given to the diversity of ways in which immigrants construct their realities and the many variables that impact these configurations—without ultimately questioning the boundaries between them (Boccagni, 2012). Some examples include assuming that immigrants themselves identify as being primarily from India or China or being a naturalized citizen versus remaining a citizen of their sending country, or being an immigrant, a professor, or merely a human being. I wanted to capture alternative scenarios by being open to interpersonal ambivalence as well as how immigrants describe finding points of intersection within their new networks (Narayan, 1993).

I focus on one segment of the professional, skilled population—foreign-born university faculty, who are positioned to train and influence the next generation of potentially globalized citizens and, in so doing, often become instrumental in globalizing the work of the university itself. Additionally, they 1) represent the highest level of education when compared to the heavily studied immigrants in the low and un-skilled sectors and 2) represent my own aspiring skill level as a PhD candidate working towards

a career, providing a fertile opportunity to both de-exoticize the ethnographic endeavor in favor of seeing the familiar in unfamiliar ways.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of 2013 the number of post-secondary teachers in the U.S. was approximately 1.5 million with the following categorical breakdown:³

Table 1: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Post Secondary Teachers at Colleges & Universities

Business	85,220
Math and Computer	89,740
Engineering and Architecture	42,210
Life Sciences	62,500
Physical Sciences	50,650
Social Sciences	119,940
Health	220,120
Education and Library Science	67,860
Law, Criminal Justice, & Social Work	41,240
Arts and Communications, & Humanities	275,820
Miscellaneous	455,970

Within the approximate 41 million foreign-born persons currently residing in the U.S., approximately 5 million have a graduate or professional degree (U.S. Census, 2013). And, more specifically, about 800,000 are employed in education, labor, and training occupations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013: Foreign-Born Workers). While there is no categorical breakdown in the Bureau of Labor Statistics for foreign-born post-secondary teachers, The National Center for Education Statistics showed that as of 2011, foreign faculty at degree granting institutions in the United States comprised approximately 4% (33, 413) of the total faculty population.⁴ However, this number does not account for

³ This number, 1.5 million, does not indicate what professional levels are accounted for (instructor, lecturer, adjunct, assistant, associate, or full).

⁴ Faculty at the National Center for Education Statistics, accounted for here, being defined as instructor, lecturer, assistant, associate, and full professor and other faculty.

those who have naturalized or become permanent residents—only those on a F-1, J-1, or H1-B visa status.⁵

Foreign-born faculty are not be so different from other immigrants who also carry pieces of their past and integrate those into their social, cultural, and professional lives in the U.S. However, foreign-born faculty in most cases have access to social and cultural capital to varying degrees so they can facilitate both their transition across borders into new geographic locations and their associated lifestyle choices. Their stories are unique in their motivations, how they balance the available social/cultural capital to achieve their goals and how they evaluate their success in doing so. In sum, not all skilled immigrants are the same. Like any human being, they have diverse experiences. For example, studies show that “when the same language is spoken in the source and destination countries, immigrants are more likely to exploit their talents and skills in the destination country” (Bodvarsson and Berg, 2013: 206). This finding reflects the importance of social capital on an immigrant’s economic success. It also suggests that nationality and ethnicity alone are not accurate predictors of incorporation experiences—that they must be analyzed in conjunction with other variables, some being social class, education and language experiences.

On a broader level, the second aim of this study is to therefore contribute to the body of knowledge in the process of transforming public perceptions from that of classifying immigrants almost exclusively in low skilled sectors to acknowledging the diversity of skill among the foreign-born. In so doing, the goal is to cultivate a general

⁵ The HB-1 visa program does keep track of post-secondary teaching status. As of 2011, according to researchers at the Brookings Institute (Ruiz, Wilson, & Choudhury, 2012: 11), there were almost 8,000; however, this number does not account for other visa statuses such as F-1, J-1 or for those who have naturalized or become permanent residents.

public recognition of the existence of these skilled professionals and their cultural and economic impact.

Lives are lived in specific historical times and places, and studies of them necessarily call attention to changing cultures, populations, and institutional contexts (Elder, 2003). However, when historical times and places change, people respond by adapting their lifestyles accordingly.

This is a study of the structure and culture of the U.S. university, which is a product of the many social, cultural, and historical forces that have made it what it is today. The introduction of foreign-born faculty into the mix means that they bring their own unique perspectives—having spent their childhood and early adulthood years outside the U.S.—as they encounter and interact with the structure and culture of the university. The overall purpose of this research study is to understand what foreign-born faculty bring to these encounters as they highlight and illuminate U.S. universities.

III. Problem Statement

Political and media sources often circulate the notion that culture is homogeneous and static, and subsequently, immigration needs policing (Glick Schiller, 2013; Fassin, 2011). However, in studying immigration, a dynamic notion of culture is imperative, and anthropologists ground their understanding(s) in the notion that culture is fluid—meaning values and beliefs from different groups intermingle and create new sites of inclusion and exclusion (Reed-Danahay and Brettell, 2008; Nieswand, 2006; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). This perception has certainly circumscribed transnational theory, which focuses on the extreme fluidity that structures both physical and cognitive spaces among

immigrants. Yet, transnational theorists, especially those concerned with public policy, have responded to the larger, public narrative in order to counteract the negative social implications.

Cohen and Chavez (2013), for example, have researched Latin@s⁶ moving to the Midwest, away from U.S. borders, and how these immigrants often experienced similar social boundaries that had demarcated their lives living in border states; sheriffs and other officials having introduced legislation aimed at detection of undocumented workers, copied from those in Arizona. For these new arrivals to the Midwest, “the frontier is [still] all around [them]...” (qtd. from Fassin, 2011: 215). Another example of emphasizing borders includes the focus on the “vulnerable geopolitical position of many peripheral sending states” and their increased poverty in “the wake of structural adjustment policies and the racial barriers migrants encounter” (Levitt and Glick-Schiller, 2007: 1019). In an attempt to alleviate this negative, public response, scholars provide evidence of how extending citizenship to undocumented immigrants benefits both governments: of the sending and receiving countries.

The public view of the undocumented foreign-born population in the U.S. tends to stereotype them as single, Mexican men who probably snuck across the border and are seeking construction or farm work. However, to the best available estimates, 50-60 percent of unauthorized immigrants appear to have crossed into the U.S. illegally (Clark, 2013: paragraph 6). According to the Center for Immigration Studies, they came into the U.S. legally. They are simply “Tourists, guest workers, and foreign students, to name a few, that didn't go home when the terms of their visa expired” (Clark, 2013: paragraph 7).

⁶ Symbol to represent both Latinos and Latinas.

In general, scholars are responding to the contemporary focus on the negative impacts of immigration—which profiles immigrants by dehumanizing them (Glick-Schiller, 2010: 109). Consequently, they provide evidence of long-term trends towards incorporation, and in so doing, they accept national borders as the necessary unit for citizenship, democratic rights, and social welfare (Glick-Schiller, 2010; Alba and Nee, 2003; Esser, 2001). They display what Wimmer and Glick-Schiller (2002) have called a “methodological nationalist” perspective by assuring the greater public that immigrants with more than one national loyalty can and will incorporate into national societies (Brettell & Hollifield, 2013; Glick-Schiller, 2010; Morawska 2002; Portes 1999).

In my research with foreign-born faculty in a middle class sector of the economy, identified by profession rather than country of birth, I have found that binary classification cannot account for all of the complexity and diversity found within this population. My study collaborators,⁷ for example, often described who they are and what they do in relation to their occupation rather than their countries of birth and/or settlement, and they often expressed a range of social connection(s) and incorporation responses to U.S. society and culture. In this framework, national identification is described as one factor in their immigration experiences among an array of other factors, which I will discuss below.

IV. Guiding Question

⁷ I choose the term *collaborators* to refer to my study population to emphasize that collaboration is inherent to all fieldwork practice and that I specifically involved informants as active collaborators in the process of knowledge production by 1) sending their transcripts back to them for review, 2) incorporating feedback from them during the writing-up of research and the presenting on it at different conferences and research forums, and in inviting them to the dissertation defense to hear and respond to research findings.

The guiding question for my research is: “What variables influence domains of connection for foreign-born faculty?” Research shows that factors such as group size, proximity, and initiation experiences, to name a few factors, influence group cohesiveness (Johns and Saks, 2005), but how do immigrants experience this reality since they bring with them potentially differing cultural traditions along with their occupational experiences (Caughey, 2006)? This distinction provides an opportunity to understand and untangle how individuals understand incorporation as they blend into institutional categories and the notions of diversity that structure those experiences (Wei, 2008). To capture this reality, I used life history interviews to understand how foreign-born faculty constructed their career paths from early educational experiences to selecting teaching and/or research positions in their chosen field—both of which are connected to their subsequent immigration decisions. Additionally, life history interviews uncovered cultural, historical, political, and social events that structure an individual’s life—including pathways to making career connections. Putting together structures of career opportunities with individual biographies, then, this study explores how larger structures intersect with individual choices, perceptions, and connections.

V. Conceptual Framework

My study population, in general, reported more satisfaction with their occupational choices than other populations studied by immigration scholars. As part of the high-skilled, my study collaborators often entered the U.S. with the traditional hallmarks of assimilation (language, education, and occupation). Rather than changing into something else, however, they spoke about constructing a lifestyle between the many

places they have lived and travelled, continually integrating past and present lived experiences. In this framework, I have found that career trajectories are more useful for analysis than binaries, such as native/foreign, citizen/alien, and majority/minority. With the focus on their careers, I understand cultural change as a “dimension” of immigrant incorporation rather than as an end product (Levitt, 2011: 22). More specifically, the process of moving, of human mobility, is part of the human condition and has been so since the beginning of the human record. As such, there are many factors that describe and define a life. The process of immigrating, of incorporating into distinct nation-states, is relatively a new invention—about 250 years old (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002) and refers to the apparatuses of the state (government, military, political parties, etc.) used to secure physical borders and manage them. To understand immigration experiences, I focused on both categories of inclusion and exclusion and the voices of the foreign-born and how my study collaborators described constructing a professional life and, in the process, how their decisions impacted and informed other aspects of their lives.

VI. Research Site

The geographic location for the study is a major research one university that is a member of The Association of American Universities (AAU), which represents large research campuses in the United States and Canada. For the identity protection of my study collaborators, the site will be referred to simply as the university. The Association reported that there is an increasing presence of foreign-born leadership in their member universities and that 11 of its 61 members currently have foreign-born presidents

(Foderaro, 2011). The university, where my study takes place, is one of those 11. Although many colleges have networks and collaborations abroad, having a foreign-born president has the potential to extend that reach, augmenting the notion that a university educates and trains students to be world citizens (Foderaro, 2011). In addition, the university's mission statement highlights this global objective by planning to actively seek international collaborations and that, in so doing, strengthen its visibility as a globally engaged university (Mission Statement, 2011).

The university ranks high among U.S. colleges and universities in its large international population—meaning that overall, it has a significant amount of foreign-born faculty and students (Open Doors, 2012). According to the university's international office, the campus is among the top 35 in the U.S. serving international students. Currently, almost 11% of the students (approximately 4,000) who are enrolled at the university are foreign-born. In addition to this number, approximately 15% (1,400) of the faculty, scholars, and graduate assistants are foreign-born.⁸ Altogether, these two international populations, students and faculty, represent approximately 140 different countries (International Office, 2013).

Another way in which the international population is accounted for, however, is in categories assigned to diversity and inclusion on campus. According to the study university's Strategic Plan for Diversity, 43% of faculty and staff are members of ethnic minority groups (African American, Asian American, and Hispanic American Latino/a, to name a few). However, what is unknown is how many of those counted in these categories were born in countries other than the U.S.

⁸ This number could amount to many more as there was no indication if the count only included people on visa statuses or if it included permanent residents and those who have naturalized.

Ultimately, this study seeks to identify the variables that structure foreign-born faculty's experience within their *occupational* unit by bringing together inside perspectives of career and accompanying immigration experiences along with government and institutional depictions.

Chapter 1: Anthropology of Immigration Theory

I. How do Immigrants Change Over Time and What Changes Them?

Discussion of General Theories

American anthropology has a long history with representing and studying immigrant populations. The founding father of American anthropology Franz Boas (1858-1942), foreign-born himself, measured heads of immigrants and their children over several years in an effort to challenge the physical basis for human racial categorization (American Anthropological Association Website, 2014). Anthropologists tended to be focused on “elucidating patterns of social and cultural order that underpinned societies [abroad], rather than with unraveling processes of social and cultural change [at home] (which migration represents in many ways)” (Vertovec, 2007c: 962). The anthropological study of immigration as a socio-cultural and historical process developed in the mid-twentieth century and was influenced by early social science research.

In general, when anthropologists entered the fore of immigration studies, they did so adding to a research agenda that had already begun—one that sought to understand immigrants in relation to the social, cultural, and political interests of the nation-state (Pratt-Ewing, 2004). Conceptually, there was *us*, the natives or nationals, and there was *them*, the “aliens,” “strangers” or “foreigners” (Anderson, 2013). Early studies conducted at the Chicago School were directed towards an understanding of how immigrants changed over time and when and what influenced this change. Over the years, this focus has underscored immigration studies, albeit with variations and different typologies as I will discuss below. My goal in outlining these different eras in the anthropology of immigration scholarship is to place my study in context—to understand how high-skilled

immigration intersects or potentially intersects with the scholarship in the discipline. In the following chapter, I will then review the literature on high-skilled immigration—that has more predominantly originated in the economic and development literature (Adams, 1968; Baldwin, 1970).

Classic Assimilation Theory: Host/Dominant Society Changes Immigrants

In the U.S. in the 1920s, primarily sociologists, based at the University of Chicago, dominated the field of immigration studies. Theoretical frameworks posited that eventually ethnic and national boundaries would blur and immigrants would assimilate—meaning they would become more like native-born, accepting the cultural norms and mores of a society enmeshed in notions of western progression (Park and Burgess 1921; Thomas and Zanecki, 1918; Wirth 1928). Assimilation was understood as the rejection of “Old World” traditions and the adoption of “New World” modernity. The analytic focus, from this vantage point, was ethnocentric—focusing on the impact to the receiving country—in this case the U.S. (Vertovec, 2011: 243). Park and Burgess (1921), for example, examined social forces and institutions that facilitated immigrant assimilation processes—encouraging an economic and socially aligned outcome.

Out of this tradition, the metaphor of the “melting pot” arose—a metaphor that depicted immigrant groups as following a “straight-line” convergence into the host culture and becoming increasingly like the native population (Brown and Bean, 2006: par. 25). In this framework, the overarching public concerns or sentiments revolved around the potential threat that immigration posed to the “American way of life” (Vertovec, 2011; Salomone, 2010). And, the political discourse that followed framed

immigrants in terms of difference—foreign languages, customs, and persistent “national traits” (Salomone, 2010: 39).

When anthropologists became more involved in the mid-twentieth century, they were experiencing the aftermath of the cultural evolution tradition—a tradition that had tied static notions of biology and the environment to that of culture, which was codified in stages of progression from savagery to barbarism to civilization (Silverstein, 2005; Lewis-Morgan, 1877; Burnett-Tylor, 1871). While the physical basis for cultural difference fell out of favor during the early 20th century, the emphasis on cultural difference and notions of modern progression still lingered (Silverstein, 2005: 366). Redfield (1947), for example, had researched small communities in the Yucatan and described their “folk society” as being derived of common peasant-like traits. These traits were then juxtaposed with Western society, which Redfield described at the opposite end of the continuum, the urban pole.

Redfield soon became the first and, for many years, the leading anthropologist to direct attention to the processes of social and cultural change that characterized the relationships between folk and urban societies. Redfield and soon other anthropologists became interested in how the foreign-born fared when in other countries. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, immigration became an increasingly high-priority area for anthropologists, for example, May (1961) wrote *Townsmen or Tribesmen*, and Mangin (1970) wrote *Peasants in Cities*, to name a few. Anthropologists recognized the high-rate of rural-to-urban immigration, and they traditionally brought with them their overseas study of foreign populations as culturally and geographically bounded by place (Kearney, 1995). They were consequently influential in exploring concepts of social and cultural

change, observed through immigration processes (Vertovec, 2011; Horevitz, 2009; Brettell, 2000).

My study, however, is grounded in a robust literature that demonstrates that immigrant experiences are not sufficiently encapsulated in the classic assimilation model (Findlay, 1995). Many of my study collaborators, for example, were highly-educated before coming to the U.S., often starting their American experience as doctoral students, having won competitive educational spots at the highest level in U.S. universities. As such, they contradict the classical image of the struggling, poor immigrant who has yet to achieve social and economic status.

Modernization Theory: Urban/Industrial Centers Change Immigrants

Modernization theory emerged in the 1960s, building on earlier classic assimilation frameworks. However, anthropologists began to question the theory's unidirectionality—that immigrants eventually cut ties with their rural, places of birth as they became part of an industrial and technologically advanced society (Horevitz, 2009; Brettell, 2000: 102). Lewis (1952), for example, questioned Redfield's "folk-urban" continuum, suggesting that immigrants were not becoming alienated and culturally separated from their "folk societies." Rather, they were maintaining social, economic, and political ties with successive generations of immigrants and with people in their originating communities—sometimes creating hometown associations as a forum to gather, share ideas, and work towards a common interest (Little, 1965; Smock, 1970). How they maintained their ethnic identities, even as they became part of their host society, became an increasing focus of anthropological studies on immigration (Kearney, 1986: 336). In this framework, anthropologists were interested in how immigrants

changed their sending communities. The foreign-born were investing themselves in modern society, but they were also maintaining their old ties.

Several members of the Manchester school, for example, pointed to the importance of networks of family and friends in immigrants' new settlements. Watson (1958), who studied the immigration and mobility of the Mambwe people of Northern Rhodesia, argued that the Mambwe's social structures did not disintegrate in response to immigration but rather survived and were even sustained by modernization—western money influencing the economy. Likewise, Van Velsen (1961), who studied the Tonga of Nyasaland (present day Malawi) in Central Africa, argued that members who migrated into the city continued to take an active interest in what goes on at home because sooner or later they intended to return. They consciously worked to maintain their positions in their originating societies, and they never intended to become permanent urban dwellers; however, through their labor abroad, they sent money back home and attracted others from their country of birth to join them as they provided an increasingly stable base for one another.

Anthropologists, in many ways, were moving beyond the era's dominant theoretical framework, focusing on how immigration influenced and affected immigrant lives as well as impacted the places they came from (Kearney, 1986: 336-337). Analysis focused on how immigrants incorporated into the industrial world—sustaining their societies back home as a result. Like classic assimilation theories, however, this framework for understanding immigrant change over time assumed that most immigrants come from rural and less modern and/or tribal societies and have not been educated in the western tradition—that they are at the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of cultural

difference (Hercog, 2008). But, what happens when those who immigrate come from other urban, industrial centers and have amassed human capital in terms of education and societal status? This theoretical framework does not fully account for this type of immigrant—one who is representative of my study collaborators.

*Dependency and World Systems Theory:
Capitalism & Capitalistic Systems Change Immigrants*

The 1960s and 1970s were pivotal decades in United States immigration history. A significant shift in policy changed the nature/composition of immigrants from European to Latin American, Asian and African. Additionally, the struggle for civil rights was another page in a long story concerning how both native born populations and foreign-born populations internalized and responded to concepts and policies surrounding diversity. Eventually, ideologies of cultural pluralism and difference permeated these social sentiments (Glick Schiller, 1977; Glazer and Moynihan, 1963). Glazer and Moynihan (1963) in *Beyond the Melting Pot*, argued, for example, that ethnicity may constitute a resource instead of a burden for achieving economic mobility.

In the 1970s, in response to these historical changes in society and the limitations of modernization theory for explaining different types of immigrant experiences, anthropologists began to look elsewhere for explanatory models for how immigrant groups changed as they settled in new contexts (Horevitz, 2009; Kearney, 1986: 338). Barth (1969) described an emerging concept of ethnic identity and cultural difference in his book *The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Barth defined ethnic identity as a feature of social organization. From this perspective, ethnic groups were seen as situational, not fixed or bounded in place; that is, they were a creation of particular interactional, historical, economical and political circumstances.

Along with this shift in thought, from ethnic groups being geographically bounded to situationally-based, the analytic emphasis of reference became the capitalist system and its subsequent complicity in determining ethnic realities—through “inequities between labor-exporting, low-wage countries and labor-importing, high wage countries” (Brettell, 2000:103). Dependency theory, the new theoretical paradigm, focused anthropologists on macroeconomics and macrostructures for understanding how national and international forces engaged with and influenced immigration (Horevitz, 2009).

Frank (1967), for example, contended that the capitalistic system in the Western world was responsible for generating underdevelopment in areas peripheral to its metropolitan centers (27). Using Chile as a case study, he examined the expropriation and the appropriation of economic surplus. Likewise, Lomnitz (1977) analyzed the interconnections between urban immigration, shantytown growth, urban poverty, and marginality in Latin America. She argued that these interconnections are the result of both the national and international political economies working in concert. These economies caused poverty in the countryside and pushed people into the city where they relied on exchange networks to survive underemployment.

In the late 1970s, world systems theory emerged and is generally attributed to Wallerstein (1974) who analyzed economic history through exchanges of power arguing that there is no such thing as a “third world.” Rather, he found that there was only one world that was filled with a complex network of economic exchange relationships: “[a world-system] is a unit with a single division of labor and multiple cultural systems” (page 390).

This theoretical framework positioned immigrants as being acted upon and having less “choice” in their immigration decision(s)—the resulting product of a forced extraction by the global capitalist market system. Nash (1979), for example, studied Bolivian tin miners, and the ethnographic account that resulted took anthropologists beyond the bounded, idyllic community setting to that of one that has undergone incredible pressures as a result of national and international political and economic upheavals (Leckie, 1993: 503).

In its focus on the effects of power relationships, dependency and world system theories focused anthropologists on documenting what is lost when these two different ways of life are brought into contact. This social context helped facilitate the emergence of a new social discourse surrounding immigration—that of ethnic minorities and the “politics of recognition” (Alba, 1999; Taylor, 1992). However, dependency theory, in its emphasis on capitalism, sometimes essentialized the interplay of a complexity of variables that factor into immigrant experiences (Kearney, 1986: 339). In his essay *Inventing Society*, Wolf (1988) emphasized individuals and their role in “maximizing, strategizing, plotting or creating, inventing, and altering the inherited circumstances of life” (pg. 760). This “plotting” allowed for more than one political, social and economic system to operate and, further, to coexist with one another.

Anthropologists conducted several studies on low-skilled workers from less developed countries in order to document the processes “by which surplus is drained from the periphery to the core areas within or between countries” (Wood, 1982: 304). This process was eventually applied to high-skilled immigration; however, as my review of skilled immigration in the next chapter indicates, this research took place more

prominently from the perspective of economics and development, with its focus on brain drain and talent moving from developing countries to more developed ones (Giannocolo, 2004; Portes, 1978). While sociologists, geographers, and anthropologists have, in more recent years, written increasingly about form(s) of brain drain and circulation to problematize the notion that the immigration of skilled professionals can only be experienced as a net loss and/or gain (Conradson and Latham, 2005; de Haas, 2005; Pries, 2001), the dependency and world systems paradigms do offer a potential starting point for understanding and positing immigration motives (de Haas, 2008: 7; Kearney, 1986: 340-341).

Articulation Theory: Labor Markets Change Immigrants

In the 1980s, articulation theory developed as an alternative to both dependency and world systems theories. Articulation theory rejected the notion of a single world capitalist system, and once again, the main unit of analysis shifted, this time to the household. At this level, anthropologists explored how domestic units were *articulated* with distant labor markets via immigration (Kearney, 2004; Palerm and Urquiola, 1993). Ultimately, anthropologists saw articulation theory as more relevant to the field of anthropology by allowing them to link the social and cultural with larger macro-structures (Kearney, 1986: 344).

Complementing these structures and placing immigrants under an increasingly different scope was the emphasis on cultural difference within a moral dimension—resulting in a multicultural recognition where ideologically immigrants were encouraged to fully participate in national societies as cultural minorities (Faist, 2009; Vertovec, 2007a). This development is significant in that it shifted the focus away from cultural

differences as representing a diversity of ethnic cultures to accepting their equal worth as “minority cultures” (Alba, 1999).

Meillassoux (1981), for example, was inspired by the “squalid and overcrowded dormitories of Paris suburbs where the very same men that [he had] met in their [African] places as proud peasants were converted into anonymous proletarians” (page x). As a result, he followed their lives and explored different modes of production in capitalist economies—analyzing the function of the “domestic community” (in Africa) in the transition to capitalism where third world immigrants become part of developed European countries. He explored how certain groups struggled to fully “articulate” capitalism in the wake of colonialism, creating their own distinct forms as a result.

Earlier manifestations of articulation theory were criticized because they “posited a primeval state of autonomy (usually labeled pre-capitalist), which is then violated by global capitalism” (Gupta and Ferguson 1998, in Brettell 2000:106). Consequently, the emphasis is on how this tribal culture adapts. However, with regards to the high-skilled, such as my study collaborators, they do become implicated in the global market place, but they are not often understood as a cultural minority when they immigrate. It is generally assumed that skilled immigrants are able to move in and out of the broad current of immigration flows, without causing the disruptive ripples that generate nation-state/media attention—that they incorporate seamlessly (Freidenberg, 2011a; Favell, Feldblum, & Smith, 2006).

*Globalization and Transnationalism:
Social Networks & Networks of Exchange Change Immigrants*

In the 1990s, two interrelated conceptual frameworks dominated theoretical positioning for immigration studies within anthropology: globalization and its counterpart

transnationalism. Distinguishing between these two frameworks, however, helps to understand and differentiate between processes connected to how people construct their social fields (transnationalism) and processes connected to how people experience exchanges of power and economics (globalization).

Globalization has referred to macro processes such as market flows that take place in nation-states but also transcend them and are part of a larger, de-centered system of political, social, and economic forces. In other words, according to Giddens (1990), it is “the intensification of world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (64). In this framework, binaries such as “the center” and the “periphery”, central concepts in dependency theory, are collapsed together (Kearney, 1995: 548).

Wilson (2004), for example, explored the experience of immigrant English teachers in Guadalajara, Mexico, analyzing the connections between immigrant lives and global, historical processes. He argued that, “Globalization implies more abstract, less institutionalized, and less intentional processes occurring without references to nations” and that globalization is really more about the elites and their “personal power networks across the globe” (58).

Transnationalism is another theoretical model that developed in the 1990s; but whereas, globalization focused on processes that are largely decentered from specific national territories and take place in global space, transnational processes anchored the immigrant in transcending one or more nation-states (Basch, Glick-Schiller, Szanton-Blanc, 1994; Kearney, 1986). This “new” paradigm for understanding immigration built on the notion that globalization might have made “borders” conceptually obsolete

(Horevitz, 2009) since immigrants “maintain strong, enduring ties to their home-lands even as they are incorporated into countries of resettlement [and] called into question conventional assumptions about the direction and impacts of international migration” (Levitt, DeWind, & Vertovec, 2003: 565). This theory provided empirical evidence to prove that the “new” immigrant is embedded in social fields connected to the circulation of information through emergent technologies, remittances, and other flows of communication and travel that have less to do with national borders and more to do with spheres of interaction (Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton, 1992).

Glick-Schiller (2005), for example, explored the relationship between transnational social fields and imperialistic power. She used ethnographic research with fundamentalist Christian and Haitian long-distance nationalists to examine this relationship and how immigrants become attached to alternative systems of meaning that extend beyond ethnic and national ones. Likewise, Lubkemann (2005) described changes in cultural identities, using the concept of the "socially diverted immigrants" to refer to those individuals who may have intended to return home at the time of their original departure but who instead have become firmly settled in the country of immigration. They continued, however, to maintain ties to and invest in their home communities and, consequently, their material remittances affect their symbolic positioning of self in their country of birth.

Many other anthropology scholars of immigration have become engaged in studying this transnational phenomenon—Grasmuck and Pessar (1991), Foner (1997), Vertovec (1999, 2001), and Chavez (2008), to name a few. Although most everyone who has studied immigration acknowledges that these connections between sending and host

societies have always been present in the movements of people (Vertovec, 2002: 4), transnationalism, as a theoretical and explanatory framework, focuses on the “everyday networks and patterns of social relationships that emerge in and around [nation, international, and global] structures” (Portes, 1997: 3).

In terms of the high-skilled, these theoretical frameworks, globalization and transnationalism, have much to offer. With regards to globalization, skilled immigrants often represent an increasingly mobile population, and yet, there hasn't been a lot of research geared towards the lifestyles associated with the “everyday reality of [their] ‘global mobility’ ” (Favell, Feldblum, & Smith, 2006: 3). Researchers who have focused in this vein include Taylor (2004) who has explored multinational corporations and intra-company flows, Sassen (2007) who has written about the ways that international immigration flows restructure space and place,⁹ and Castles (2010) who also has examined the links between social transformation and human mobility. My study collaborators described being part of a larger, international university network and travelling for conferences, research, and career opportunities, the result being that they have several alternatives for movement and travel—which are guided by their lives at the university.

With regards to transnationalism, high-skilled professionals also bring with them social networks that impact their spheres of interaction (Vertovec, 2002). Documenting these connections and understanding how they operate brings a greater knowledge of the diversity of immigrant experiences and the range as well as how these skilled

⁹ Sassen has not written so much about skilled immigrants themselves; rather the focus has been on the structures that ease their flows.

professionals invest in their sending societies and host societies, often helping to position both on a larger, global scale (Vertovec, 2002: 7-8; Glick-Schiller and Caglar, 2011).

Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity Changes Immigrants

One of the critiques of transnationalism theory is whether it points to something new. Some scholars argue that transnational ties have always been present but have been increasingly scrutinized in contemporary times as researches have moved away from “container models of society” (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2002: 317; Levitt, 2004).

While transnationalism has continued to challenge older models of immigrant incorporation and assimilation, describing immigrants who can have multiple identities, the emphasis, however, often remains focused on the national activities that circumscribe immigrant experiences—a major emphasis being the promotion of national interests through labor and remittances (Amelina and Faist, 2012; Levitt, 2011; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002).

In this framework, cultural difference is reconstituted as what Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002), among others, have suggested as methodological nationalism, a critique of the assumption that the nation-state is the natural, social, cultural, and political form. Amelina and Faist (2012), Glick Schiller (2013), and Levitt (2011), among others, suggest a corrective to transnationalism, returning to a focus on “simultaneous experience”—to understand under what conditions immigrants maintain a multiplicity of connections and identifications across national borders. A second corrective would be to assume that power structures determine whether immigrants are able to connect or not (Horevitz, 2009). Thirdly, Levitt (2011) suggests a return to culture in immigration studies—meaning that instead of focusing on how immigrants integrate into social

categories, the focus should be on how the immigrants themselves conceptualize and organize difference and what kinds of cultural products appear (6).

Two approaches that have been gaining prominence in recent years for capturing the “simultaneous experience(s)” of immigrants and their resulting incorporation choices (“cultural products”) from their perspective are that of cosmopolitanism (Hannerz, 1990 and 2004; Beck and Sznaider, 2006; and Glick-Schiller, Darieva, and Gruner-Domic, 2011; Hannerz, 2014) and super-diversity (Vertovec, 2007a; Berg and Sigona, 2013; Hall, 2013; Wessendorf, 2014).

The cosmopolitan approach emphasizes social relationships and what factors facilitate our connection as human beings and the appreciation of the diverse qualities that circumscribe the human condition—more than in identifying what differentiates one set of people from another:

On the one hand, there is a concern with humanity as a whole and its condition—a moral and at times political engagement with community, society, and citizenship at a more or less global level. On the other hand, cosmopolitanism involves an awareness, and often an appreciation, of diversity in meanings and meaningful forms (Hannerz 2010: 545).

The ambivalence of multiple identities is the starting point for this perspective (Amelina and Faist, 2012, Vertovec and Cohen 2002; Beck and Sznaider 2006). The cosmopolitan approach acknowledges that under global conditions individuals hold several memberships in different social spheres to which they affiliate themselves that are multiple and simultaneous and include ethnic, national and/or religious belongings, to name a few (Amelina and Faist, 2012). In this framework, binaries became less significant and the analytic drive is to capture “both/and” (Glick-Schiller, Darieva & Gruner-Domic, 2011; Appiah, 2006). The result is a look at the kinds of relationships and multiple identities that are used in the “making of contemporary social structures”

(Hannerz, 1996: 95). Cultural difference is supplanted for a view of immigrants as ultimately globally interconnected to a number of different affiliations in a “culturally diverse world” (Hannerz, 2006: 6).

Hannerz (2004), for example, explored the journalistic information-gathering of foreign-correspondents who were in what he calls “a transnational contact zone” in which they report, represent, translate, and interpret what they have seen and heard. In this sense, they focus on what is shared between them and others in order to translate that information to an international audience. Hannerz described reporting first and foremost as a form of “knowledge production” that shapes larger understanding (Moore, 2007: 234). His data were selections from conversations with seventy correspondents and with foreign editors. Hannerz classified the reporters in terms of the length of their stay in any one place. Some were *parachutists*, who arrived suddenly on the scene of a crisis and left as quickly. These interested him less than the *spiralists*, who had lengthy postings but were shifted every few years, and the *long-timers*, who were durably settled in one place. Hannerz noted that, for all of them, events tended to be reported within a coherent overarching theme dominant in the region in which they were writing—meaning they acted within a kind of cosmopolitan framework “to be at home in the world” and “to make the vicarious experience of the world through the media a richer, more varied one” (4).

Cosmopolitanism as an analytic approach has been criticized, however, for being the paradigm of a privileged, socio-economic class (Robbins, 1998: 247-248; Glick-Schiller, Darieva, and Gruner-Domic, 2011: 407; and Werbner, 2012: 155-156). Yet, some scholars have started to apply this theoretical framework to a mix of socio-

economic positions. Anderson (2011), for example, has applied the cosmopolitan approach to public space. He describes the *cosmopolitan canopy* as a local setting within cities where people from a variety of social and economic backgrounds feel comfortable enough to relax their guard. Consequently, they tend to acknowledge one another's existence in some measure through talking, laughing, or sharing a story (36). Anderson has analyzed these settings where people can engage in "folk ethnography" on others as encouraging a cosmopolitan perspective (xv and 11).

Likewise, Glick-Schiller and Caglar (2011)¹⁰ in their edited collection use ethnographic case studies to show that immigrants have contributed in various ways to the repositioning and restructuring of their adopted cities. They have referred to immigrants in this position as "scale makers": "Immigrants become scale makers as they labor, produce wealth, raise families, and create and reproduce social institutions, thereby contributing to the economic, social, cultural, and political life of their cities" (12). Glick-Schiller and Caglar then outline several ways in which this scale making occurs—some of these being through labor, contributing to or contesting the changing status and positioning of neighborhoods and cities, and through offering alternative social visions. In this way, immigrants become part of a cosmopolitan sociability, using "forms of competence and communication skills that are based on the human capacity to create social relations of inclusiveness and openness to the world" (Glick Schiller et. al., 2011).

It is a new and changing world. Technology has shrunk borders to the extent that any person can no longer be defined by external characteristics and current geographic

¹⁰ Rather than emphasize the nation-state as the unit of analysis, these authors, as well as editors of the collection of essays, emphasize the cities that immigrants settle in as a central unit of analysis—a unit that has attracted many anthropologists, creating a subfield known as *Urban Anthropology*. See Setha M. Low (1999) *Theorizing the City: The New Urban Anthropology Reader* published by Rutgers University Press.

location. I believe the conceptualization of a person as defined by an interconnection of categories such as family ties/relationships, job skills, labor category, etc. suits the life experiences of many immigrants who have a cosmopolitan view of the world in general, demonstrated by their being morally and politically engaged with community, society, and citizenship at a global level. Social media has played a role in shaping this perspective. Couldry (2006), Chouliaraki (2006), and Silverstone (2007), among others, describe how this communicative platform can foster a cosmopolitan disposition, or even the opposite, block its growth, since social media is often the primary vehicle through which some come into contact with others on a daily basis. Images of strangers, mediated by television, computers, mobile phones, radio, and the like, largely inform our understanding of “others” and their landscapes (Hull, Stornaiuolo, and Sahni, 2010: 333).

This cosmopolitan view, however, as its critics have mentioned, has not fully accounted for when these types of connections fail to occur and when people choose to remain attached to their perceptions of cultural differences, creating boundaries and borders within their domestic and/or work spheres (Roudometof, 2005; Beck, 2002). While the cosmopolitan approach has shifted the focus from the nation state to that of being more at “home in the world,” some scholars have maintained that it does have the potential to reify a categorical appreciation of diversity as a kind of end point—not fully accounting for or predicting when it separates people more than connects them and what variables are involved (Glick-Schiller, Darieva, and Gruner-Domic, 2011). In fact, immigrants are still often portrayed in the non-social media as poor, undocumented, and a social problem. In response, new conceptual models are being forged to create dialogue and discussion around such issues. Lamphere (1992) points out, “. . .interrelations are not

just a matter of race, ethnicity, or immigrant status but can be influenced by the organization of a workplace, apartment complex, or school” (2). Such modes of organization have “inherently and often unconsciously shaped and constrained interrelations” (Vertovec, 2007b: 25).

In studying a high-skilled immigrant population and using their career trajectories as the focal point, I am interested in identifying the factors that account for change brought about by careers located within a university system and the social networks that animate its structure. In this context, immigration is but one factor in an array of factors that have shaped my study collaborators’¹¹ incorporation strategies and their disposition towards cultural diversity. Rather than assume “race, ethnicity, or immigrant status” are the important variables, this study examines the different types of experiences within an occupational unit that influence simultaneous social and cultural affiliations, identifications, and connections.

*Super-Diversity:
Simultaneous Social Connections & Affiliations Change Immigrants*

The theory of super-diversity is one conceptual model that has the potential to account for what kinds of variables would be involved in creating different types of relationships and corresponding social and cultural identities—and, in the process, give an accounting of potential power differentials. Vertovec (2007a) coined the term super-diversity in his article “Super-Diversity and Its Implications” to explain increasingly complex social formations of immigrants marked by dynamic interplays of variables, including: country of origin, immigration niches, legal status, human capital, access to employment, locality, and responses by local authorities, services providers and local

¹¹ I introduced the term *study collaborators* on page 17, but I will formally introduce them as a group in chapter 3 where I discuss my methods and research design.

residents (page 1049).

Super-diversity [is] a notion intended to underline a level and kind of complexity surpassing anything the country has previously experienced. Such a condition is distinguished by a dynamic of interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants [...] (page 1024).

Earlier, Vertovec (2006) had started to contextualize and operationalize this concept. He found that realities of diversity in Britain were not what they used to be in the past and that government policies, social service practices and public perceptions had been framed by a particular understanding of immigration and multicultural diversity as characterized by large African-Caribbean and South Asian communities, some originally from Commonwealth countries or formerly colonial territories. According to Vertovec, “Policy frameworks and public understanding – and, indeed, many areas of social science – have not caught up with recently emergent demographic and social patterns” (1). Such complexity is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables—a few being multiple-origin, transnational connections, socio-economically differentiations and legal stratifications. These changes in patterns pose significant challenges for both policy and research. Most immigrant service providers, for example, do not address the diverse needs of those they serve. An awareness of the new super-diversity has suggested that policy-makers and practitioners recognize the multiple identifications and axes of differentiation, only some of which concern ethnicity. One way to capture this reality is to document under what conditions people make social connections and under which they do not.

Wessendorf (2013) used the approach of super-diversity in her ethnographic study of a London neighborhood—the London Borough of Hackney, which is characterized by a multiplicity of immigrant groups and long-term residents, who differ in terms of variables

such as immigration histories, religions, and educational and economic backgrounds. Wessendorf attempted to describe attitudes towards diversity in such a “super-diverse” context. She found that neighborhood residents expected and were often “open” to ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity. In other words, this “commonplace diversity” was often accompanied by positive attitudes. However, this orientation rarely translated into private space, and despite regular interactions in public space, residents often established a balance between acceptable social divisions and unacceptable ones located in private space. The result is that people acknowledge each other in public but self-segregate in private.

II. Foreign-Born Faculty & Anthropology of Immigration Theory

My research with foreign-born faculty at a U.S. research one university intersects with the current discourse circumscribing the anthropology of immigration by: 1) choosing an occupational unit to explore its intersections with ethnicity and other factors; 2) choosing to follow a career trajectory within an institutional structure rather than looking at cross-sectional pictures that focus more specifically on national or local policies structuring immigration experiences; (3) eliciting an array of potential factors that trigger change from the faculty members themselves in order to explore under what circumstances one type of incorporation strategy is more likely to emerge vis-à-vis another; 4) using a structural analysis to correlate types, patterns, and variables; and 5) offering these analyses to scholars and policy makers, particularly in higher education.

Occupational Unit

As several scholars have indicated, more specifically from the 1990s onward, ethnic categories are no longer recognized as the sole realm of cultural difference. In a world that is increasingly socially connected, in technology and economics, how do we understand “the other” or those we propose to study? By circumscribing attention to an occupational unit, ethnic and national considerations still play a role, but they need not be the primary filter. Other variables such as education, family background, and access to resources also interact with ethnic and national ones to produce a multi-dimensional experience. By describing these dimensions, a portrait of U.S. academia comes to the fore, that seeks to understand what accounts for career advancement in the context of international mobility.

Career Trajectories

Factors that explain this approach to understanding multiple career trajectories move the story of immigration from *them* to *us*—a noted change in perspective from earlier models imbued in multiculturalism and the “politics of recognition” and cultural difference. By focusing on *we*, reifying cultural distinctions become less important. One variable for understanding a type of immigration that influences the international transfer of individuals, networks, and countries is that of human capital. Since this study is situated within an institutional structure, it specifically highlights how immigration impacts university globalizing interests. Through its foreign-born faculty, the university becomes part of the globalized production that projects it out to the world as a unified *us* (e.g. those who have careers in academia). In some ways, this study may be reminiscent of a straight-line theory of assimilation where immigrants were eventually “mainstreamed” into American society; however, the nuance of contribution here is

significant and important to detail. Without this recognition, an appreciation of what foreign-born faculty's diverse perspective(s) bring to the university would be lost. Only by first recognizing difference can *we* then interact with it and become interconnected as an established profession within a university that is part of a larger network of universities worldwide—representing the career of academia.

Secondly, my study collaborators are part of an institutional structure that has local and global implications—placing research connections in the context of larger structures associated with historical and political events as well as social and economic interests. While individual narratives drive my analysis, they do not exist in a vacuum. Year of birth, country and locality of childhood, year of arrival, years in the U.S. and more have implications for what choices were available to individuals and how they found their career niche. Using articulation theory, I seek to understand how the larger structures at play intersect with individual choices, perceptions, and connections.

Incorporation Strategies

This study will: 1) generate incorporation strategies and 2) identify types and patterns in career trajectories. Anthropologists who study immigration already know how hyper-mobile the world has become and that it is increasingly shrinking and coming to our own doorsteps—in a matter of speaking. Culturally isolated communities are inexistent and people are moving, not always settling in one geographic location or one country for the rest of their lives. What do all these choices and potential for simultaneous interaction create?

Types and Patterns

With a focus on explicating different types of immigration experiences and resulting changes and incorporation strategies, the goal is to give the reader some types or models that predict which variables facilitate these experiences. In so doing, the implication is that these types or models will not only advance anthropological concepts of immigration but also have implication for practitioners and for exploring the situations where foreign-born faculty more easily connect and interact and where they become culturally different or sometimes even invisible to that recognition. In the not so distant past, Haines and Baxter (1998) argued for research that can have positive, “practical consequences”:

Contemporary migration provides fertile ground for the consideration of how human beings construct their worlds through practical strategy and creative metaphor. However, the scope of migration...reaffirms the importance of action toward events that have practical consequences.

However, to affect practical change, Haines and Baxter find that anthropologists must first attune themselves to the “stories that people construct” (1998). Through them, they can get a sense for how immigrants create their space and their basic social networks. Through this understanding, anthropologists can then help establish a “perduring commitment to inclusion--that all people and all peoples have the right to exist and to be ‘part of the record’ of human experience” (1998).

Nation-States and ideologies of nationalism are undergoing change in response to immigration. Anthropology, although one discipline among many that studies human movement, has much to offer in terms of its methodology to these changes. Listening to the stories that people construct to position their lives, their identities, has implications for understanding larger structures and forces at work. While the ultimate perception of a “world without borders” may never be a reality (Castles, de Haas, and Miller, 2014),

research that focuses attention on the politics of diversity in response to human movement has the potential for influencing the world in this direction.

Scholars & Policy Makers

This leads me to a final point of reflection, which contemplates the term *international*. I found that most terminology used at the university focuses on this term rather than its counterpart of *foreign*. Special lectures, for example, all highlight keynote speakers that are touted as *international* (*Field Notes*, 2012). Further, the advertising for such events also speaks to this emphasis. I believe the nomenclature of *international* reflects a purposeful decision, which shows a collective desire to move beyond country of origin to that of something more encompassing and inclusive.

Stromquist (2007) highlighted the term's importance when she argued that at the university level, "globalization is manifested by what is termed by insiders as 'internationalization,' a subtle response that not only affects academic programs, faculty, and students, but also creates new administrative structures and privileges" (81). But, what do terms such as globalization and internationalization mean at the university? Stromquist offers ideas about an institution's economic and political presence on the world market versus ideas about plurality and cooperation and communal interests. What we do not yet know is how foreign-born faculty are implicated in these processes. This study offers applied implications to scholars and policy makers, particularly in higher education, as my analysis connects to this body of research.

Chapter 2: High-Skilled Immigration Theory

Definitions

Definitions concerning high-skilled immigration are not uniform. Worldwide, the most common definition tends to be restricted to persons with tertiary education, typically adults who have completed a formal two-year college education or more (Istaiteyeh, 2011: 12; IOM, 2008: 52; Gürüz, 2008: 19). Since this variable is often the most readily available international statistic, it has, by default, become the most widely studied measure of high-skilled mobility (Lowell, 2008: 52; Batalova & Lowell, 2006: 87; Dumont & George, 2004). When possible to obtain, however, additional information regarding academic or professional degrees and types of employment add other dimensions to this basic definition. Currently, the U.S. government has defined highly skilled immigrants not in terms of either degree or employment but in terms of both educational attainment and occupational positions. The United States' specialty worker H-1B visa, for example, started in the 1990s, is based on a list of specialty occupations and a minimum academic requirement of a Bachelor's degree (U.S. Citizen & Immigration Services, 2014; Ruiz, Wilson, & Choudhury, 2012).¹²

I. Brain Drain/Gain/Circulation

High-skilled immigrants have been coming to the U.S. since the inception of the nation. The New England colonists were the most urban and educated of all the colonists,

¹² In order to qualify as a specialty occupation, the occupation needs to utilize a theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. See United States Government Accountability Office (2011), "H-1B Visa Program: Reforms Are Needed to Minimize the Risks and Costs of Current Program."

and they started the first college in the U.S., Harvard University, in 1635 to train their ministers (US Citizenship, Naturalization Regulation & Procedures Handbook, 2013). Additionally, in the 18th century, many French aristocrats came to the U.S. seeking security and a “better life” in the aftermath of the French Revolution. However, it has only been within the last fifty years that high-skilled migration has become a topic of concentrated research interest—starting in the mid-1960s and stimulated by fears that the British economy and many others were suffering a scientific “brain drain,” largely to other developed countries. In fact, the British Royal Society first coined the expression “brain drain” to describe the outflow of scientists and technologists to the United States and Canada in the 1950s and early 1960s (Cervantes & Guellec, 2002).

During the 1970s, this research agenda continued to evolve—mainly concerned with the implications for developing countries and the emigration of their most educated citizens (Baruch, Budhwar & Khatri, 2007; Koser & Salt, 1997). Underlying this conceptual framework, however, is an assumption that skill alone is enough for undertaking international immigration—not always accounting for capital accumulation and policies facilitating and/or constraining movement (Ariss & Syed, 2011).

Some scholars have critiqued this brain drain/gain framework more recently, however, because typically the poorest nations have not been the major sources of professional immigration; rather, mid-income countries have been the majority source (Portes & Rumbaut 2014: 49-50; Docquier & Rapoport, 2007: 10). Additionally, there are great variations in the motivations for movement, pointing to something more than economic considerations. For example, career standards and choices as well as economic remunerations that create a “decent lifestyle in their own countries” have both become

key indicators of high-skilled immigration (Oliver, 2011; Wickham, 2009; Benson & O'Reilly, 2009; Portes, 2007: 27). Also contradicting the brain drain/gain paradigm is that regardless of home country conditions, most professionals do not leave (Portes, 2007: 26; Portes & Rumbaut 2014: 51).

A final critique of this body of literature on the high-skilled is that it has tended to focus on the effect to the sending countries while paying much less attention to the recruitment strategies by receiving nations and the competition to get “brains” (Ariss & Syed, 2011: 288; Brücker et. al., 2012: 18). One of the main problems has been that “the idea of networks is drawn too narrowly, excluding the role of the state and employers in stimulating recruitment that fosters large-scale migration” (Bach, 2007: 386 paraphrasing Krissman, 2005).

Once professionals immigrate, however, one of the central issues concerning whether they return is the anticipation of work conditions and opportunities for self-development in their countries of birth (Portes, 2007: 27; Glennie & Chappell, 2010; Portes & Rumbaut, 2014: 36). Engineers and physicians, for example, who are trained abroad in the latest and most scientific ways of practicing their profession face the reality that the technology to practice their skills may be scarce in their countries of birth or having access to continued professional training and development.

In the 1980s, immigration associated with the corporate sector increased with economic globalization and the emergence of transnational corporations (TNCs) (Beaverstock & Boardwell, 2000). Such companies recruited the high-skilled to direct and manage operations and to provide technical expertise at different sites worldwide. In the 1990s, however, political upheaval in places like Eastern Europe and Africa brought

the concept of “brain waste” to the fore as highly skilled people took unskilled or low-skilled jobs in the West (Mattoo, Neagu, & Özden, 2005). Examples have included Nigerian doctors or Ghanaian educators driving taxi-cabs for a living. Currently, the Migration Policy Institute reported that there are 1.6 million college-educated immigrants in the U.S. who are underemployed or unemployed, often taking jobs such as taxi-driving because of the immense bureaucratic barriers for immigrants seeking work (McHugh, Batalova, & Morawski, 2014: par. 3).

In anthropology and other disciplines, the focus on transnationalism has somewhat modified the brain drain/gain conceptual framework into an emerging notion of brain circulation (Vertovec, 2002; Favell, Feldblum, & Smith, 2006; Levitt & Glick-Schiller, 2007; Clemens, 2013). In an increasingly globalized system, innovations in transportation and communications technologies have greatly facilitated contact across international borders—making movement and connections more fluid, especially among professionals whose economic and other resources are often significant compared to low-skilled or unskilled immigration (Hugo, 2005: 3; Portes, 2007: 28). In this context, some social theorists have suggested that the relationship between place, people, and social and cultural relations may be thought of in terms of routes (Clifford, 1997; Gilroy, 1993; Hall, 1995). Rather than focusing on the local anchorage of peoples, this concept points toward their mobility, their movements, encounters, exchanges, and mixtures. This mobility may take many different forms: permanent or temporary migration, travel, tourism, transfer or exchange of capital, and so forth (Gustafson, 2001).

Ong (2000), for example, in her book *Flexible Citizenship* described one possible scenario. She followed Hong Kong business leaders who, facing the political uncertainty

of the city-state's imminent return to the People's Republic of China in 1997, began to accumulate foreign passports: "Many Hong Kongers opted to work in China while seeking citizenship elsewhere. Caught between...declining economic power in Britain and surging capitalism in Asia, they sought a flexible position among the myriad possibilities (and problems) found in the global economy" (123). In this paradigm, they conducted their business in both places, along a route and as a type of business circulation—a product of the practices of the transnational Chinese business elite—imagined by themselves and by Southeast Asian states.

Likewise, Brettell (2011) explored how skilled immigrant labor in Dallas-Fort Worth positions the city globally. Companies like Texas Instruments and large health care facilities support Indian ethnic organizations in order to recruit professional workers from India and from among U.S.-educated Indian immigrants. Brettell then depicted transnational immigrant organizations as having two major strengths for the corporate owners: 1) they make possible a supply of technical talent both from the U.S. and abroad, 2) and they also help to globally position the city in which the corporations are located—creating a space where their products and services transcend the nation-state.

II. Self-Initiated Immigration

In addition to brain drain/gain/waste/circulation frameworks, another body of literature that has attempted to account for high-skilled immigration is that of self-initiated immigration. This group is defined as immigrants that are not sent by their companies but rather travel on their own initiative (Jokinen, Brewster & Suutari, 2008; Cerdin & Le Pargneux, 2010; Ariss & Syed, 2011: 288). They are employees, who are

not assigned, but who choose to migrate to another country and secure a job of their own volition. Skilled faculty would also fit under this definition. In this conceptual framework, the focus is on what motivates this group to become permanent immigrant workers (Ariss & Özbilgin, 2010). This body of literature is also mainly concerned with high-skilled immigrants coming from developed countries (Doherty and Dickmann, 2008; Inkson and Myers, 2003).

This literature suffers from a similar gap as the brain drain/gain framework in that most research assumes that skill and human capital is enough to facilitate the mobility of high-skilled professionals (such as CEOs, technical experts, and professors, to name a few). How they accumulate and deploy other kinds of resources in order to move and settle are less explored (Ariss & Syed, 2011; Andresen, Biemann, & Wilson-Pattie, 2012). Instead, the focus tends towards motivators that encourage people to move, some of which have been linked to economic, cultural, family and career factors (Carr, Inkson and Thorn, 2005; Cao, Hirschi, & Deller, 2012). For example, learning about other people and places and building new social contacts and networks are often described as significant motives (Myers and Pringle, 2005). Other cited reasons include the desire for adventure and new vistas—having new experiences (Richardson and McKenna, 2003; Ariss & Syed, 2011).

As a result of this focus on motivations for movement, self-initiated immigrants are perceived as free agents who cross organizational and national borders, often unobstructed by barriers that constrain their career choices (Inkson et al., 1997). This generalizes the role of organizational and larger social structures that circumscribe high-skilled immigrant experiences (Ariss & Syed, 2011). Visa issues are an example of

challenges that are linked to their contextual settings. For example, Richardson (2009) shows that countries and organizations are willing to recruit an international workforce but are sometimes unwilling to adjust their policies so as to fully use their human capital. Likewise, drawing on interviews with 50 New Zealanders, Inkson and Myers (2003) found that, when self-initiated immigrants did not get appropriate visas and work permits, they worked in jobs that did not suit their qualifications.

While not as widely studied within the discipline of anthropology, threads of this type of self-initiated immigration conceptual framework are apparent. Hannerz (1990) wrote about “expatriates,” in the general sense, as being well-positioned to develop into “cosmopolitans” although he acknowledged that it is not a given—meaning that not everyone is ready to be flexible and open to different kinds of diversity. He described potential motivations for moving as seeking a lifestyle that embodied cultural openness and mutually dependent relationships with “locals” (page 250). More recently, ethnographers Benson and O’Reilly (2009) have put together an edited collection of research done on lifestyle immigration, that is middle-class individuals who have chosen to live outside of their countries of birth in search of a better “quality of life”—often a slower, more idyllic, and community-centered lifestyle that is in contrast with a more urban and materialistic lifestyle (page 123).

However, there is evidence that some anthropologists are addressing the gaps identified—such as what types of human capital the high-skilled use in their mobility experiences. Freidenberg (2011a), for example, described her findings with U.S. nationals living abroad in Buenos Aires. Rather than focus solely on motivations for movement, she addressed how they communicated with one another and shared

resources—one prominent place being the Internet: “Expats not only used the Internet to communicate about coping with daily life by circulating information about goods, services, and jobs, but also informed each other about social networking opportunities” (page 265). Another finding was that these professionals tended towards homogeneity of class, forming social connections to others who were also living abroad in a similar manner, regardless of national origin, giving them access to a network of people that could help them secure employment and navigate host-country policies.

Likewise, Fetcher (2007) conducted fieldwork with high skilled immigrants living in the city of Jakarta, Indonesia. She studied how the city, with its rich contrasts, such as rich and poor or modern and old, structured the experience of immigrants (page 12). Ultimately, however, Fetcher wanted to understand how this group interacted with these dichotomies and if they chose to become part of them. She argued that “elite” immigrants, such as her study group, do not always experience fluid identities but rather they become involved in the maintenance of boundaries - of body, race and gender.

III. Foreign-Born Faculty & Selection as High-Skilled Immigrants

In her 1969 essay titled “Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up,” Nader (1972), called for anthropologists’ to “study [the experiences] of the colonizers rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty” (page 5). She also admitted, however, that there were challenges inherent in this kind of research. These included the prevailing attitude of disdain then towards those who did fieldwork at home as well as problems of access (pages 5 & 18). Since the 1960's, the prevailing attitudes

within the profession have shifted to a large degree so that it is now increasingly permissible to do even one's first fieldwork at home. However, as Marcus and Fisher (1986) pointed out, and later Gusterson (1997), there are still problems connected to funding and nation-state agendas as well as reproducing the kinds of repatriated ethnographies that have already been written:

[in many cases] anthropology's traditional taste for the marginal and exotic [which] has not so much been transgressed as imported and transposed upon American society, leaving us with more studies of scientologists and crack dealers than of federal bureaucrats and corporate executives” (Gusterson, 1997: 114).

Fetcher (2007) is very specific about whom she is studying. She says that she is —studying-up, focusing on “expatriates” who had initially been posted abroad through multinational corporations but then made decisions about long-term settlement. This approach sometimes created problems for Fetcher because she felt that she had a difficult time being accepted due to her desire to willingly go to Indonesia and because of her lower income status. While these studies and others like them have continued to emerge in recent years, the frequency is still relatively small when compared to studies on low-skilled or unskilled immigrants. Other scholars speak to this paucity (Chavez, 2008; Freidenberg, 2006; Iredale, 2003; Portes, 2003). In addition to anthropology’s tradition of studying primitive, rural, low-skilled, or unskilled populations, one possible reason for the difficulty inherent in “studying up” is, as some ethnographers have noted, resistance to being “studied” along with the loss of ethnographic authority (Gusterson, 1997: 117; Taylor and Kearney, 2005).

In addition to these concerns, corporate structures have also changed in recent years. The relocation of high-skilled business personnel has become more frequent with

the increasing global relations and partnerships in business firms. In this environment, individuals choose and pursue career opportunities within their skill sets, as opposed to being assigned employment locations. This change in the structure of opportunities has consequently attracted increasing research attention (Findlay and Li, 1997; Regets, 2001: 9; Nagel, 2005). Another emerging issue is the internationalization of higher education and its consequences for the immigration of students (Iredale, 2001; Vincent-Lancrin, 2008; Cerna, 2014)—of which this study contributes. Finally, skilled immigrants emigrating from poorer, developing countries are generally more likely to stay in the host country than immigrants from advanced countries (Cervantes & Guellec, 2002; Scott et. al, 2004; Moran, Nancarrow, & Butle, 2005; Counihan, 2008: 131). The reality is that only a handful of countries have been successful in luring their talented emigrés back home. The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) estimated in 2002 that some 300,000 professionals from the African continent lived and worked in Europe and North America (Cervantes & Guellec, 2002: par. 12).

In “studying up,” I have chosen foreign-born faculty for my ethnographic study because they 1) represent the highest level of education when compared to the heavily studied immigrants in the low and un-skilled sectors. And, in terms of the H1-B temporary skilled visa program, in 2012, they represented one of the top 3 groups of skilled workers in the U.S.—part of the population employed in *College and University Education* (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Report to Congress, 2013). Additionally, foreign-born faculty, as educators, 2) train students and are part of the globalization of the next generation, having far-reaching impacts for the students who

learn from their perspective. And, in so doing, they often become instrumental in globalizing the university itself.

My study contributes to the literature on the high-skilled by exploring the career trajectories of foreign-born faculty. I seek to understand how they experience change from initial motivations for movement to how they accumulate the capital to move to their receiving processes (e.g. visas and institutional structures), to the “circulation” of their knowledge within and across borders. This study will describe motivations for movement, processes of incorporation, and factors influencing decision-making to stay or go. In this way, the population of foreign-born faculty and the approach of following career trajectories are utilized here to contribute to the discourse on immigration and the high skilled.

To date, most studies of foreign-born faculty have been located in the discipline of education and have focused on retention. My study contributes to these findings as well in focusing on decisions concerning length of stay. Wei (2008), for example, investigated foreign-born faculty's organizational attachment to their employing institution and explored institutional and individual factors that affected their attachment by looking into how they made meaning of their work experiences at a U.S. research university. Findings revealed their attachments to the university were often influenced by their attitudes towards diversity: “A large proportion of the literature on diversity in higher education focuses on underrepresented faculty groups such as minorities and women” (Wei, 2008: page 3). Foreign-born faculty often felt invisible in this social milieu.

Likewise, Ambrose et. al. (2005) investigated why some faculty members leave universities in the U.S. and why others stay by illuminating the complexities of individual experiences through semi-structured interviews at a research one university. Findings suggested the faculty's primary reasons for satisfaction or dissatisfaction were salaries, collegiality, mentoring, the reappointment, promotion and tenure process, and department heads; however there were also unforeseeable issues that strongly influenced satisfaction and decisions to stay or leave, such as geographic location of a university and the university's interdisciplinary focus.

Business and economic fields also have brought their perspective. Sabharwal (2008), for example, examined job satisfaction patterns, with a specific focus on foreign-born faculty employed in four-year institutions in science and engineering disciplines. She used descriptive and inferential statistics to study the differences in job satisfaction based on country of birth and citizenship. Her results indicated foreign-born scientists and engineers are less satisfied at all levels of citizenship (naturalized, permanent, and temporary residents) than their native counterparts despite high productivity rates. At the institutional level, some factors for satisfaction included: salary, opportunities for advancement and promotion, and collegiality.

Gupta (2004) studied return migration of foreign-born faculty in order to explore their time-to-return to their country of birth. Findings demonstrated that personal values, work-related considerations, and formal and personal ties factored into the return choice. Ultimately, he found, however, that the career paths of the foreign-born PhDs had been distinctly shaped by whether they had been working primarily in the U.S. or outside the U.S. In addition, the foreign-born PhDs who had left the U.S. were likely to be

significantly more satisfied with their jobs than their peers who had stayed, and this result was especially true for those working in academic jobs.

In the behavioral and social sciences, the emphasis has been on the interplay between individuals and institutional structures. Collins (2008), in the discipline of geography, used survey analysis, for example, to report key issues foreign-born faculty identified while working at U.S. institutions—issues regarding cultural differences, including relations with students, feelings of loneliness and the difficult process of obtaining permanent residency rights. Collins then gave recommendations that could ease faculty's transition into U.S. society and help them adapt to the changes they experience—recommendations such as mentoring, networking and training opportunities.

In cultural anthropology, Bönisch-Brednich (2013) looked at how the global marketplace impacts higher education by exploring the differences between faculty who immigrate but remain inside the English speaking tertiary education system versus those who immigrate outside of that system and have to teach and publish in a different language. She then described different perceptions (Continental European versus British influenced education system) of what the university is and what it should be—concluding that the shift towards seeing higher education as a tradable commodity is an international phenomena, but the actual processes of re-structuring are going on at very different paces. Therefore foreign-born faculty do not just change countries and campuses but also enter new version(s) of the university, depending on where they go.

Kirpitchenko (2014), in the discipline of sociology, explored academic mobility from the perspective of cosmopolitanism and intercultural encounters. She identified empirical evidence of three defining features of cosmopolitanism according to Beck

(2002): globality, plurality and civility and then presented an argument that 1) cosmopolitan values and dispositions tended to create mutually beneficial conditions for intercultural inclusion and that 2) academic mobility provides a fertile ground for these conditions to flourish.

Also from sociology, Mayuzumi (2011), conducted in-depth interviews with nine Asian women faculty members in Canadian universities concerning their motivations, desires, contradictions, struggles, and coping strategies within their academic lives. Four major themes organized her analysis: 1) what impact the socially constructed discourse of Canadian citizenry had in these women's everyday lives and how "Asian-woman-ness" operated in their academic contexts; 2) what technical difficulties and social barriers emerged with spoken and written English language; 3) what "cultural logics" they utilized in order to survive/thrive in their social locations as Asian women in the Canadian academy; and 4) how they created their own legitimate space.

My overarching finding in this literature review was that anthropologists tended to integrate their work as part of interdisciplinary, edited collections with editors located in disciplines other than anthropology.¹³ Altogether, my search for anthropological studies with foreign-born faculty turned up few studies,¹⁴ indicating there is still much to contribute as a discipline, particularly by emphasizing the inside perspective in relation to structural factors that other researchers have already identified as influencing this group's experiences in the U.S (diversity, collegiality, and citizenship, to name a few). This focus

¹³ See editors Mason (business) and Rawlings-Sanaei (education and sociology) (2013), *Academic Migration*, and editor Hutchison (education) (2014), *Experiences of Immigrant Professors* as examples.

¹⁴ I attempted several key word searches, using related terms: international scholars, foreign scholars, academic migrants, foreign-born faculty, and international faculty.

on the inside perspective shows that anthropology, as a discipline, still has much to contribute to the interdisciplinary field of immigration studies.

My study specifically contributes to the current literature on foreign-born faculty and to the anthropology of immigration, in particular, by adding to the ethnographic database—adding a case study—and by entering the dialogue surrounding how this high-skilled group experiences social and cultural changes as part of larger structures such as the university system. As discussed in the previous chapter on the anthropology of immigration, theories have tended to emphasize a) how immigrants become more like the native/host population (assimilation) or b) how they impact each other and blend together, both immigrants and native-born (transnationalism and cosmopolitanism). My study looks at these models and reformulates them into incorporation processes at a university level workplace—in a nation. In this framework, social behavior is related to structures of career opportunity as well as individual circumstances, which I elicit through my study collaborators' biographies. Through 48 life history interviews, focused on career trajectories, my study explores the factors that influence and affect this group's social practices and adjustment within an occupational unit.

Chapter 3: Using Ethnography to Understand Incorporation Strategies

This study assumes that foreign-born faculty, like all individuals, are an amalgamation of many life experiences and that the lifestyles they have constructed reflect their own strategies for coping with and adapting to social and cultural shifts over time and through space. As such, this study seeks to elicit the factors in the life course that account for career trajectories and social incorporation strategies of my study collaborators.

I am specifically choosing to use ethnography because this approach allows me to explore my study collaborators' social systems from a holistic perspective (Angrosino, 2004: 16; Fetterman, 2010: 18-19): in this case putting together their individual life histories with their routines and practices and with their specific environment(s). In so doing, the purpose is to identify and describe what changes over time. Additionally, the analytic emphasis of ethnography is on the inside, subjective perspective and what that brings to an understanding of larger structures (Agar, 1986: 44-45; Wolcott, 1999: 156-159; Fetterman, 2010: 201-21): in this case, the inside perspective is that of foreign-born faculty and some of the larger structures are that of the university and surrounding, local neighborhoods.

I. Ethnography as a Research Tool

LeCompte and Schensul (1999) have described ethnography as generative, that it builds theories of cultures through interpretative processes that are produced and (re)produced over time: "Ethnography generates or builds theories of cultures—or explanations of how people think, believe, and behave—that are situated in local time

and space...” (8). My theoretical or conceptual approach to ethnography is built from this broadly defined view with an emphasis on human relationships. Freidenberg (2011b), has said it very eloquently:

I contend, like many others, that fieldwork is only tangentially related to a space and that it is better understood as a human relationship. Like all relationships, it is socially constructed and is subjected to frequent transformations as the actors in the relationship assume different ‘lines,’ to quote Goffman” (Discussant notes: AAA).

Keeping this focus in mind, I come from the position that anthropology is relevant to address major social issues in today’s contemporary and global contexts because our fieldwork experiences elicit an understanding about others that also leads to a deeper understanding about ourselves. I also place myself in a continuum where knowledge production and use is the ultimate concern. In support of the first aim of my study—to understand the social practices that animate my study collaborators adjustment within an occupational unit—I seek then to not only describe the structures that weave together social and cultural aspects for my study collaborators but also to a greater degree critically anticipate how these structures direct our own interactions with them and ultimately help determine their value.

In the case of foreign-born faculty, I have found that they give insight into the social *construct* and political *landscape* of U.S. society as they experience its realities. Put another way, in telling me their stories, they also are giving me a glimpse into our collective story – of life in academia in the U.S. One study collaborator, for example, described a system where social relations are regulated to the degree that one knows when, where, and for how long a given social interaction will last (*Nicolas Interview*). Does this point to a society that is perhaps more invested in production than in

communication? Another study collaborator spoke about her increasing awareness of the shrinking middle class in the U.S. and the distance between those who have power and resources and those who do not (*Caroline Interview*). What could her experiences, living between Europe and the U.S., yield in terms of insight to this widening disparity? Both Nicolas and Camille with their cumulative, international immigration experiences, which are intertwined in their lifestyles, are telling me about myself – about what it means to live in the U.S. and work in academia.

Anthropologist Myerhoff (1978) has described this experience when she contrasted her earlier work with the Huichol of Northern Mexico with her work among elderly, Jewish people in an urban ghetto in California. She noted that in the first case, doing anthropology was “an act of imagination, a means for discovering what one is not and will never be” (page 18). In the second case, fieldwork was a glimpse into her possible future, as she knew that someday she would be a “little old Jewish lady” (page 19). From this vantage point, in this case as student in academia, I too am influenced and learn from my study population, people who have made careers in academia—turning them from research informants, people who relate information for me to interpret, into study collaborators, people who work together with me in the knowledge production process itself, for example, in asking me questions and giving me feedback (Marcus & Fischer, 1986: xvii; Wolcott, 1999: 90; Lassiter, 2001). Additionally, in asking my study collaborators about how they connect with the various places they have lived, I am asking them to make sense of the many frameworks that have circumscribed their lives—culminating in their understanding of who they are as permanent stakeholders in forming

and shaping U.S. society and culture as it strives to be more integrated into the global community—another point of partnership and collaboration.

Second, as my ethnographic approach centers on human relationships, it is continually entangled in the communication process itself. For example, Agar (1994) suggests that "culture is not something people *have*, it is something that fills the spaces *between* them" (page 226). These *between* spaces are dynamic, and by their very nature, they invite construction and interaction. Agar describes these spaces as filled with "rich points" and nuances. Turner (1974), known for his work with ritual and rites of passage, would probably call these spaces a form of liminality. Rather than describe society in terms of "being," Turner argues that the social world is in a constant state of "becoming" (24). It is in flux or negotiation between what has been and what will be. He describes this existence as a state of inhabiting the "betwixt and between" (1967: 93-111). In a similar fashion, I think Agar is suggesting that culture can be found in this always present and potentially transformative state.

In order to capture and document these changes and transformations, I use life history interviews as an elicitation technique. Caughey (2006) argues that collecting life stories is one way for the ethnographer to listen and identify individual "negotiations" between "multiple cultures" (page 6). He details this ethnographic approach as a "person-centered life history" where the ethnographer collects the narrated, overall picture of a person's life.¹⁵ The purpose of the interview is to be able to describe what it is like to be

¹⁵ Caughey uses the term "research participant" to identify his interviewees. Like Caughey, I too am focusing on partnership in the knowledge production process, but with my study population, I chose "study collaborators" to represent them as a way to emphasize their ability and interest in reading, discussing, and hearing my research interpretations and giving feedback.

this particular person, that is, the one being interviewed, and the ability of the interviewer/ethnographer to elicit that world through interaction:

All the individuals involved here—the interviewers as well as the interviewees—are entangled in multiple and complex systems of meaning that require them to negotiate their way through diverse beliefs and values (95).

Caughey understands life histories as being full of points that communicate his interviewees’ “own vocabulary and beliefs” and their “own set of rules” for acting in the world” (14). It is the ethnographer’s job to identify and communicate these points and to recognize where her own values, vocabulary, and views intersect and interact with these points. In a similar vein, my study does not assume that foreign-born faculty are merely remnants of their culture(s) of origin. Rather, this ethnographic study assumes that foreign-born faculty are an amalgamation of many life experiences and that the lifestyles they have constructed reflect their own strategies for coping with and adapting to social and cultural shifts over time and through space.

Finally, the next part of the ethnographic process, for me, has been to analyze and interpret how my data relates to and interacts with larger, socio-cultural contexts. I use my study collaborators’ life history interviews to unravel social and cultural systems of meaning on a larger scale. To what extent, for example, do they perceive remaining separate, connected, coerced, etc.? (Caughey, 2006; Levy and Hollan, 1998: 333). And, how are their cultural frames shifting, as Agar says, “to start building new ones [cultural frames] to get you from where you started to where you want to be” (1986: 232). In this approach, both context and behavior are needed to fully understand what kind of shift is occurring.

Geertz (1973) refers to his interpretive work as “thick description” – asserting that the purpose of such contextual explication is to have meaningful conversation – “...so

that we can, in some extended sense of the term, converse with them [people in our studies and with others]” (24). Similarly, as part of the second aim of my study, I want to cultivate potential conversations with others by expanding public perception from that of classifying immigrants almost exclusively in low skilled sectors to acknowledging the diversity of skill among the foreign-born and, in so doing, making visible my study collaborators’ cultural and economic impact(s).

In order to start my research, then, the first two steps were to 1) attend to research ethics and become accountable to the university’s institutional review board where together we would conduct a risk-benefit analysis to determine whether the research should be done or not and 2) find a way to identify my study population in order to solicit study collaborators for life history interviews.

II. Human Ethics

In Fall 2012, I wrote a proposal for the university’s Institutional Review Board and gained the necessary approvals to conduct life history interviews (see appendix a). Risks to study collaborators included possible embarrassment or discomfort with the experiences shared during the interview. However, they were given the opportunity to stop participating at any time, and after reviewing their transcript from the interview, were given the opportunity to indicate information they would prefer keeping confidential (i.e. not published).

Additionally, I created pseudonyms to protect the privacy of study collaborators and to maintain the confidentiality of identifiable data at each segment of the research: 1)

in taking notes during the interviews, 2) in storing data on my computer, and 3) in writing and publishing statements from the interviews.

Finally, I decided to omit the university name where I did the study and instead publish from my dissertation work as foreign-born faculty at a *research one university*. The reason for this decision was to further protect the identity of my study collaborators.

III. Data

Collection: Online Sampling

I used online sampling to identify my study population. Contrary to popular belief, numbers are not always "just numbers." The National Center for Education Statistics shows the following data on foreign-born faculty at colleges and universities in the U.S. as of 2011:

Table 2: National Center for Education Statistics, Foreign Faculty as Part of the Total Faculty Population at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor Levels

Year: 2011	Total Faculty Population	Non-Resident Alien
Full Professors	181,508	1,384
Associate Professor	155,200	2,704
Assistant Professor	174,045	11,117
	=510,753	=15,205 3% of the total faculty population

The category used to ascertain foreign-born status, *non-resident alien*, however, is limited to visa status, excluding those faculty who have obtained their permanent residency or naturalized. When I went to the university's institutional research office, I encountered a similar problem. As of spring 2012, official institutional research data categorized 3% of the university's faculty as foreign-born at the assistant, associate, and professor ranks (43 faculty out of 1,495 total faculty). While university data did not use the term *non-resident alien*, the term they used—*foreign*—also did not include faculty

who were under government categorizations as long-term residents. Like the National Center for Education Statistics, the university's institutional research office only accounted for those on student and scholar visas.

At this point, I realized I had my first finding of the study—that my study population was somewhat hidden from a broader investigation. The problem was how to identify them and get a more accurate depiction of who they were at the university. Singer (1999) defined hidden populations as methodologically the opposite of “captive populations,” such as prison inmates and clinical and hospital patients (132). With captive populations, group boundaries are identifiable, and institutional records exist on the individuals who are members of the group (129).

By contrast, hidden populations are generally “neither well defined nor available for enumeration” (Braunstein, 1993: p. 132). I realized that to capture the more relevant numbers I needed to search for those faculty born abroad regardless of visa or naturalized status and that if government and institutional categories of foreign-born faculty were based on visa status, then policies at the government and institutional levels were influencing how foreign-born faculty might identify themselves. I used Singer's approach as a model for the technique I developed to find them. He related collecting data among a semi-hidden population, the upper-class, by employing strategies such as “analyzing lists or other public or semi-public notifications used by the wealthy to both communicate their place among the elite and to enhance opportunities for interaction (and their children's interaction) with other “ ‘worthy individuals’ ” (134).

Following Singer's lead, I examined faculty profiles, biographies, and curriculum vitas, uploaded in departmental websites in order to ascertain who at the University was

born abroad, regardless of current US residence status. The result was that I identified a possible foreign-born population through recruitment variables such as self-identification, educational credentials, and positions held at other universities. Altogether, I identified 496 possible *foreign-born* faculty out of 1,495 total faculty, or 34% of the total faculty population, and documented information regarding, gender, rank, and department.

Table 3: Distribution of the Foreign-Born Faculty at the University by Rank, Gender, Regional Origin and Discipline

Rank	Gender	Origin	Discipline
Assistant: 133 <i>(27% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Male: 384 <i>(77% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Europe: 175 <i>(35% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Arts & Humanities: 80 <i>(16% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
Associate: 124 <i>(25% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Female: 112 <i>(23% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Asia: 221 <i>(45% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Architecture: 6 <i>(1% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
Professor: 204 <i>(41% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>		North America: 50 <i>(10% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Agriculture & Natural Resources: 35 <i>(7% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
Emeritus: 35 <i>(7% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>		Africa: 13 <i>(3% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Social Sciences: 46 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
		Oceania: 11 <i>(2% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Computer, Mathematical and Natural Sciences: 140 <i>(28% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
		Central and South America: 26 <i>(5% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>	Business: 58 <i>(12% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
			Education: 13 <i>(3% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
			Engineering: 103 <i>(21% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
			Journalism: 1 <i>(.2% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>
			Public Health: 14 <i>(3% of the total foreign-born faculty identified)</i>

Broader Social System

Online sampling also served as a starting point to access a broader social system

as I sorted out what foreign-born faculty were signifying through their online representations (Madison, 2005; Geertz, 1973) and what these signals said about departmental versus individual decisions (Mertz, 2007; Crapanzano 1993). Put another way, foreign-born faculty were making choices about how they aligned themselves within a broader social system and through online analysis, I was able to identify some of these choices. Their descriptions of their academic careers provided me with background knowledge on their achievements and on how they chose to present themselves publicly. For example, only 61 gave a direct statement as to their country of birth, and even fewer, only 15, made accompanying statements about their residency and/or citizenship status. The great majority, some 435, I inferred through their educational credentials, sometimes in conjunction with positions held at other Universities.

Table 4: Number of Foreign-Born Faculty with Recruitment Variables

Number of foreign-born faculty	Recruitment variables
61	Stated their country of birth
15	Made statements about their residency and/or citizenship status
435	I inferred through their educational credentials, sometimes in conjunction with positions held at other universities

This omission has led me to reflect on why most foreign-born faculty did not indicate their status. One possibility is that it simply doesn't factor into their professional skill set, which they have spent years developing. While country of birth and background plays a role in how they develop, both personally and professionally, these factors do not determine their ability to conduct important research or contribute to the body of knowledge.

In examining the institution's representation of foreign-born faculty vis-à-vis the university's website, it elucidated the ambivalence between what is represented and what

is not. Through this disjuncture, I could then take that knowledge to my interview sessions and critically listen to my study collaborators and how they were representing themselves to me: in their word choices and through their narrated life events.

Collection: Partial Life History Interviews

I used the life history method to identify individual reactions and prioritizations and to understand how foreign-born faculty interpreted their career processes and choices (See Appendix B for Interview Schedule). My interview schedule was developed to elicit my study collaborators decisions regarding their career choices from childhood to adulthood to life now. Additionally, I asked about their mobility over their life courses and how it allowed them or didn't allow them to operate within their chosen career fields. Finally, I asked them to talk about their perceptions of incorporation into their environments, worded as "attachment and belonging" in the interview process, and how those perceptions influenced their mobility decisions. I used the interview schedule as a guide, choosing from groups of questions as the interview progressed but not necessarily asking each question on the schedule or following a certain order. I let my study collaborators guide the interview process, and I asked questions to elicit more or clarify my understanding.

As an analytical construct, the life course is a powerful organizing framework which recognizes that immigration is part of a person's biography and becomes part of one's interpretation of the past as well as one's anticipation of the future. The life history method – a tool in the life course analytic framework – is not just a chronological account of the events making up a person's life, but rather, it is an intimate story used to construct an identity against the backdrop of the human condition (Jackson & Russell, 2010;

Freidenberg & Thakur, 2009). It is used to reveal the tensions between individuals and the cultural and social frameworks within which they make sense of their lives (Benson & O'Reilly, 2009; Caughey, 2006; Gardner, 2002; Findlay & Stockdale, 2003).

In December of 2012, I sent a recruitment email to all 496 faculty from the list I created through my online sampling, and 63 people responded. I then conducted 48 semi-structured, partial life history interviews with these study collaborators, representing 10% of the foreign-born population identified through online sampling and adding to more than 60 hours of audio-tape. I call them partial life history interviews because study collaborators focused most heavily on their work. Although the result was a convenience sample, a non-probable approach, I did attain some representativeness: interviews that would represent equal proportions of rank, gender, regional origin, and discipline. The result was near equivalent proportions in rank and gender and close proportions in regional origin and discipline.

Table 5: Distribution of Study Collaborators at the University by Rank, Gender, and Regional Origin

	Study Collaborators (48)	Total Foreign-Born Faculty (496)
Rank	Emeritus: 4 <i>(11% of total foreign-born in this category)</i> Professor: 21 <i>(10% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Associate: 11 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Assistant: 12 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i>	Emeritus: 35 Professor: 204 Associate: 124 Assistant: 133
Gender	Women: 10 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Men: 38 <i>(10% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i>	Women: 112 Men: 384
Regional Origin	Europe: 21 <i>(12% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Asia: 14 <i>(7% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> North America: 3 <i>(6% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Africa: 2 <i>(15% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i>	Europe: 175 Asia: 215 North America: 50 Africa: 13 Oceania: 11 Central and South America: 24

	Oceania: 1 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Central and South America: 7 <i>(29% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i>	
Discipline	Arts & Humanities: 11 <i>(14% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Architecture: 2 <i>(33% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Agricultural & Natural Resources: 3 <i>(9% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Social Sciences: 7 <i>(15% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Comp., Math, & Natural Sciences: 14 <i>(10% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Business: 1 <i>(2% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Education: 0 <i>(0% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Engineering: 10 <i>(10% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Journalism: 0 <i>(0% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i> Public Health: 0 <i>(0% of the total foreign-born in this category)</i>	Arts & Humanities: 80 Architecture: 6 Agricultural & Natural Resources: 35 Social Sciences: 46 Computer, Math, and Natural Sciences: 140 Business: 58 Education: 13 Engineering: 103 Journalism: 1 Public Health: 14

Interviews took place in faculty offices or over coffee in local cafés near campus. The choice was given to study collaborators, as the goal was to have them share their life histories in a setting that would give them the comfort of their professional lives. This approach allowed us to share our common space—the campus.

Additionally, I sought to emphasize the common characteristic of the university as a shared field of interest between my study collaborators and myself. Caughey (2006) stated the importance of finding someone to interview with a background different from oneself. However, if that person has a totally different background than the researcher, problems could arise in analysis and interpretation. Also problematic is if the person being interviewed is too much like the researcher herself; it would be difficult “to discern what there was to learn because of the lack of contrast” (25). Caughey found that “the best interview relationship is one with some common cultural ground and many cultural

contrasts” (25).

Ethnographic data is collected within a partnering relationship established for the purpose of producing knowledge on a poorly understood topic. In this way, collecting data is about a partnering in the resulting knowledge that is produced and understood. Study collaborators, for example, shared a common academic experience with me in that we have all studied and worked within institutions of higher learning; however, the differences among us derived from country of origin and other sites of geographic, lived experience provide many points of cultural contrast. Caughey argued that a life history is generated as an interaction between individuals and brings heightened awareness to both parties, showing a processes of exchange taking place through which some form of knowledge, practices, and beliefs, etc. are imparted, shared, and often synthesized into new forms.

III. Analysis

Transcription

For each research participant, a digital file with the transcribed interview was created. In four cases, field notes were taken because the study collaborator preferred not to be audio-taped and/or there were technical difficulties. After transcribing, I did what Reissman (1993) suggested as a process of going back to the interviewees for verification and/or further interaction. She called this process *correspondence* (65-68). In my study, the first step of analysis was to see if there was “correspondence” between what I understood the narrative to be and my study collaborators’ understanding of it. With 19 study collaborators, there was little response, other than a “thank you” for the transcribed

product. With 10 study collaborators, I was asked to take out sensitive portions of the narrative or to reword sentences that did not communicate what they “ideally” intended to communicate. In 3 cases, I was even given extra material to consider, such as the first chapter of a professor’s biography, articles written, and other descriptive material explaining service to a particular organization. Pink (2009) described this interaction as a kind of reciprocity between the ethnographer and her study group as they engage in clarification with one another as a vehicle of continued knowledge production (33-34).

Thematic Groupings

I eventually grouped the interview transcriptions into categories of narration, connecting them with groups of study collaborators who created similar models for adaptation. This process involved listening, reading, and re-reading study collaborators’ interview narratives and, then, thinking about each interview in its entirety—from a holistic perspective. I found that my study collaborators showed differences in: 1) cultural and educational experiences filtered through historical events and 2) motivations for out-migration.

To capture these findings, I followed Luttrell (2005) in looking for “...an overall point, the gist of...[an interviewee’s] life story” and taking “note of recurring images, words, phrases, and metaphors” (page 250). I eventually marked two responses for each professor—a primary reason for coming to the U.S. and a secondary and/or overlapping one. Overall, I identified five types of responses: Experience, Exploration, Escape, Innovation, and Influence. Forty study collaborators described coming to the U.S. to gain professional experience, either as a primary or secondary/overlapping reason. While other reasons were also part of the consideration, often associated with inner fulfillment and

purpose, a major stimulus for immigration remained the same—professional development, training, and access to career options. The results of this analysis are expanded on and discussed further in chapter 7 in the section titled *Reasons for Coming to the U.S.*

Tracking Time and Space Factors/Variables

As I read and re-read study collaborators’ interview narratives, I developed a list of temporal and spatial factors or variables—demographic information from their narrative accounts—to contextualize their biographies within larger contexts. Altogether, I kept track of 20 factors/variables for all 48 interviews.

Table 6: Temporal and Spatial Variables Tracking across 48 Interviews

Temporal and Spatial Factors/Variables	Example of Tracking Factors/Variables¹⁶
1. Gender	Male
2. Rank	Associate Professor
3. Department	Cell Biology
4. College/School	Computer, Mathematical, & Natural Sciences
5. Year of Birth	1976
6. Country of Birth	China
7. Locality of Childhood	Beijing
8. Type of Locality	Urban, Capital City
9. International Moves Before Coming to U.S.	1 (United Kingdom)
10. Year of Arrival	2005
11. Age at Arrival	29
12. First Settlement	Boston, MA
13. Entry Status	Post-Doctoral Position
14. Other Settlements within the U.S. before Moving to Current Settlement	None
15. Years in the U.S. at Time of Interview	7
16. Age at Time of Interview	36
17. Multiple Citizenship(s)	No
18. Marital Status	Married
19. Children	1
20. Residence Status	Permanent Resident (Green Card)

In developing this list, I found that it complemented my later analysis since these factors/variables enabled me to gain entry points into the social, historical, and political

¹⁶ In order to protect the identity of my study collaborators, I created a fictive person as an example for descriptive purposes.

experiences that shaped immigration for each of my study collaborators — giving me a “clearer understanding of the relationship between the ideal and the actual, as well as of the idealization of the past” (Brettell, 1998: 531-532). I could better understand the immigration climate and professional opportunities shaping entry points for my study collaborators. For example, 3 study collaborators came to the U.S. prior to the 1965 changes in immigration policy. Their contexts of reception were different than those who came after the dramatic change in policy; however, they also entered academia in the U.S. at a time when careers at universities were not as competitive as they have become—when there are less available opportunities for tenure-track positions and more people are competing for the ones that are available (Weir, 2009: 18).

Additionally, juxtaposing this list of factors/variables across life history interviews gave me “access to different voices and different interpretations” of the same event(s), adding to a more complete documentation (Brettell, 1998: 528). For example, several of my study collaborators were impacted by a political revolution in their shared country of birth. Depending on the year they were born and their locality of childhood, however, they expressed different kinds of impacts and career trajectories. Having kept track of the list of factors that I developed through reading and re-reading interview narratives, I was able to make greater analytic and interpretive sense of what my study collaborators expressed.

Atlas.ti

For each research participant, a file with the transcribed interview was uploaded into Atlas.ti—a qualitative software program with tools to help researchers uncover and

systematically analyze complex phenomena hidden in unstructured data—in this case life history interviews. Using this program, I completed two rounds of analysis. In the first, I marked interviews for life history stages, motivations for movement, and adaptation and incorporation experiences. Here is an example of the kind of noting and marking I did:

Table 7: First Round of Analysis Using Atlas.ti: Initial Marking for Life History Stages and Accompanying Motivations

Life History Stage	Motivations
Choosing a Career in the University	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gaining a Breadth of Knowledge 2. Doing Research 3. Always Wanted to be a Professor 4. Able to Support a Family While Doing What One Loves--Research
Choosing to Move to the U.S.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Networks & Training 2. Job market more lucrative 3. Too much competition elsewhere 4. Holding one position to support themselves versus having many elsewhere 5. Focus is generally on their skill set not social class, race or ethnicity
Evaluating Work Life after Living in the U.S. for Several Years	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main focus (70-90 hrs.) 2. Academic Community teaches them about U.S. Society and Culture 3. University serves as a mechanism for attracting international talent 4. Drive to Progress 5. Independence

At this point, I realized that I needed to be make some choices in my analysis and decided do what Bogdan and Biklen (2007) suggest—which is to go through the data a second time (page 165). In so doing, I began choosing and sometimes rewording or collapsing together themes from my first round of analysis—themes that became my primary ones and that delineated career trajectories across the life course. Altogether, I chose 19 themes and divided them by three stages of maturity (Childhood, Young Adulthood, and Adulthood).

Table 8: Study Collaborators & Themes for Delineating Career Trajectories Across the Life Course

Childhood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Family History with Immigration 2. Parents' Occupation & Educational Achievement 3. Elementary and High School Educational Experiences 4. Undergraduate Education
Young Adulthood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Reasons for Going Abroad 6. Reasons for Coming to the U.S. 7. Selecting a Graduate School 8. Work as a Student or Post-Doctorate 9. Social Life as a Student Post-Doctorate 10. Assessing the U.S. in the Student or Post-Doctoral Stage 11. Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate
Adulthood	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. Choosing to Make a Career at the University 13. Reasons for Leaving the U.S. 14. Choosing to Stay in the U.S. 15. Work as a Professional/Professor 16. Social Life as a Professional/Professor 17. Assessing the U.S. as a Professional/Professor 18. Learning the U.S. as a Professional/Professor 19. Personal Identifications

In directing my second round of analysis towards these specific themes in my study collaborators' interview narratives, I then sought to uncover experiences or transitions along their career paths that helped me understand their social practices, geographic location preferences, and incorporation choices. From these experiences and transitions, I developed a list of 83 topics that were related to one or more of my 19 primary themes. Here is an example of some of those topics with 2 of my primary themes.

Table 9: Example of Primary Themes (Career Trajectory Points Across the Life Course) with Related Topics (Experiences and Transitions across the Life Course)

Themes (Career Trajectories Across the Life Course)	Topics (Experiences and Transitions Across the Life Course)
--	--

<p>Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Learning different registers and places</u> (academic, place, linguistic, temperamental) (countries, regions, cities, towns) • <u>Learning about universities</u> (rankings, networks, research areas, application process) • <u>Learning about their discipline</u> (questions to ask, write-up research results, norms and practices, how other disciplines interact with yours) • <u>Learning about research</u> (scholars, research directions, experimental projects)
<p>Choosing to Make a Career at the University</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Professional Opportunities</u> (a more open job market, opportunities for funding and applying for grants, access to resources and academic specialties, development of professional networks, opportunities for professional training, and the possibility of getting tenure) • <u>Family and Children</u> (Children are in the U.S.-born here, moved here, acculturated here-, In a relationship wit U.S.-born, Parents passed away, Both spouses have career opportunities) • <u>Lifestyle and Values in U.S. society</u> (Independence, an “American Dimension,” Diversity, Self-Expression, Gender relations, Education for all) • <u>State Politics</u> (separatist movement, secession, solidarity movement crushed) • <u>Ability to Support</u> themselves and others through holding one position versus several positions • <u>A Good Work Location</u> where many layers of individual experience operate at an optimal level: spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional

(See Appendix C for a complete list of these topics as they link to my primary themes).

Creation of Social Matrix Charts

Finally, based on identified topics relating to primary themes, a third stage of analysis occurred—manually (without Atlas.ti). Nineteen social matrixes of career trajectory and transition points, common to all interviews or groups of interviews, were created: where I collapsed number of responses marked in Atlas.ti with the number of study collaborators who expressed the response(s). Additionally, I represented the

proportion/percentage of the total number of study collaborators who responded in a certain way in relation to my group of study collaborators as a whole. These social matrixes were used to interpret the data and elicit the factors in the life course that account for career trajectories and social incorporation choices of my study collaborators.

Here are two examples:

Table 10: Social Matrix and Work Life as a Professional/Professor

Work Performances	
15 study collaborators <i>(31% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Work as a way of life</u> —consuming—and more than a career— accompanying sense of esteem
6 study collaborators <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Other characteristics of work environment</u> (experience both solitude and engaging with diversity)
Institutional Environments	
6 study collaborators <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Negotiation</u> —meaning having to maneuver through administrative politics, disciplinary boundaries, and perceptions about scholarship, motives and research agendas
3 study collaborators <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Importance of colleagues</u> (explaining system, introducing different social networks, and becoming friends)

Table 11: Social Matrix and Assessing the U.S. as a Professional/Professor

13 study collaborators <i>(27% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Lifestyle preferences and values</u> (drive to progress, work ethic, professional relationships, support for innovation, all voices need to be heard, public versus private, reasons for marriage, gun control, health insurance as a human right, materialism, age to maturity, work-life balance, student-professor relationship/expectations, religion, pluralism, travelling)
10 study collaborators <i>(21% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Geographic locations of universities</u> (economics, weather, towns, populations, size, regional personality/identity, architecture)
7 study collaborators <i>(15% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>University Standards and Expectations</u> (professional development and training and different types of positions at Universities)
13 study collaborators <i>(27% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Cultural personalities and habits</u> (English self-deprecation, American directness, American identification with work, handshakes, eye contact, automatic habits, American Independence, politeness, New Zealand relaxed attitude, social interactions)
12 study collaborators <i>(25% of the interview sample)</i>	<u>Political actions of the state--services</u> (health insurance, public transportation, safety monitoring); regulations policies geared towards race, class, and gender; different meanings of citizenship

(See appendix D for all 19 social matrix charts).

With these social matrix charts and the others, however, the totals do not necessarily reflect the total number of study collaborators. In marking responses (quotations), some study collaborator responses were interpreted by the anthropologist/ethnographer to fill more than one topic within a social matrix chart. Additionally, not all study collaborators commented on a primary theme. Therefore, the number of study collaborators represented in each social matrix chart do not necessarily equal the number of overall study collaborators interviewed because 1) a study collaborator's response might be used to fulfill two or more topics within a single, social matrix chart and/or 2) because not all study collaborators may have commented on that social matrix chart's primary theme.

IV. Interpretation

Interpretation must elicit why my study collaborators tell stories: "Respondents narrativize particular experiences in their lives, often where there has been a breach between ideal and real, between self and society" (3). In one sense, understanding this "breach" is about effective communication between the researcher and the researched (Reissman, 1993). In this sense, I chose to interpret my data through these breaches, juxtaposing the framework of temporal and spatial factors/variables with individual biographies: "lived experience and intentionality take their shape and change along a continuum of time, sometimes in surprising ways, the past and the future always a part of the configuration of the present" (Agar, 2013: 97). In the next chapters, as I interpret my findings, I put together factors/variables with social matrix charts to go back and forth between larger social, institutional, and political structures and individual experiences.

The purpose is to investigate what domains and relationships go into the making of academic careers for this group. I have organized chapters according to the life course, *Childhood: Formative Years, Early Adulthood: Becoming Professors, and Adulthood: Being Professors*. Within each chapter, sections are then organized according to the 19 primary themes I developed through analysis and which represent career trajectories. Finally, I will move between the specific life histories of 4 different study collaborators to the voices of the general group in order to illustrate my interpretive findings more clearly—specifically focusing on 3 different types of career trajectories as they intersect with immigration: those study collaborators who come to the U.S. as graduate and doctorate students, those who come to the U.S. in post-doctoral positions, and those who come to the U.S. as already established professionals.

With a focus on explicating different types of immigration experiences and resulting changes and incorporation strategies, my research will give the reader some types or models that predict which variables facilitate these experiences. In so doing, the implication is that these types or models will not only advance anthropological concepts of immigration but also have implications for practitioners and for exploring where foreign-born faculty more easily connect and interact and where they become culturally different or sometimes even invisible to that recognition.

Chapter 4: Childhood & The Formative Years

Introduction

In this chapter, I explore how my study collaborators described their early life experiences as they respond to historical life changes during their move through time and space. I will especially highlight educational influences, which are the basis for their chosen professional vocation. This chapter covers the early formative years. In capturing their narrated career choices over their life courses, the goal is to highlight similarities and differences among them—what remains the same and what does not. As I move on to further examine their early adulthood and seasoned professional life years in chapters 5 & 6, I will begin to piece together the building blocks needed to identify and understand what connects my study collaborators, regardless of country of origin, and what variations exist based on their different historical and socio-spatial contexts.

I. Date of Birth and Region of Birth

In my interview sample (N=48), dates of birth range from 1928 to 1980 with almost half, 23 study collaborators (or 48% of the interview sample) being born between the decades of the 1950s and the 1960s.

Table 12: Date of Birth for Study Collaborators

1920-1949	11 study collaborators (23% of the interview sample)
1950-1969	23 study collaborators (48% of the interview sample)
1970-1980	14 study collaborators (29% of the interview sample)

Additionally, European and Asian countries were among the most represented in the interview sample, with 18 study collaborators each, for a total of 36 study collaborators (or 76% of the interview sample).

Table 13: Region of Birth for Study Collaborators

Europe	18 study collaborators (38% of the interview sample)
Asia	18 study collaborators (38% of the interview sample)
Central & South America	6 study collaborators (13% of the interview sample)
North America	3 study collaborators (6% of the interview sample)
Africa	2 study collaborators (4% of the interview sample)
Oceania	1 study collaborator (2% of the interview sample)

However, in the last birth decade (1970-1980), Asian countries took the lead in becoming the most representative (see table below). This trend is reflective of the demographic descriptive data, discussed earlier, with all foreign-born faculty at the university.

Table 14: Decade of Birth with Region of Birth for Study Collaborators

1928-1949	11 study collaborators (23% of the interview sample)	Europe (5) & Asia (3) Africa (1), North America (1) Central and South America (1)
1950-1969	23 study collaborators (48% of the interview sample)	Europe (9) & Asia (9) Central and South America (3) Africa (1), North America (1)
1970-1980	14 study collaborators (29% of the interview sample)	Europe (4) & Asia (6) Central and South America (2) North America (1), Oceania (1)

Asian countries comprise the largest proportion of foreign-born faculty at the University in 2013 (estimated 43% according to the online analysis discussed earlier). However, looking at how region of birth structures experience alone would not explain the diversity and complexity within the interview sample. These study collaborators also come from different regions within specific countries, often different culturally, and have

lived through a vast array of historical events that have shaped their experiences. In this analysis, I explore these temporal and socio-spatial aspects together with region of birth to investigate what domains and relationships explain the “culture” of this group.

Throughout the analysis, I will move between the specific stories of 4 different study collaborators whom I will refer to as my core sample to the voices of the general group in order to illustrate this point more clearly. I have chosen the four study collaborators below because of their representation of time (one each born in the 40s, 50s, 60s, and 70s), of space (two born in Europe,¹⁷ one in South America, & one in Asia), and their career pathways (two coming to the U.S. as PhD students, one in a post-doctoral position, and one as an already established career professional).

Luca (1940s): Europe

Luca, a professor from Europe, was born in the late 1940s in a small town going through a time of transition between the “problems and the losses of the second world war.” He remembered when electricity was first installed in his childhood home, when he had to use an ice box for refrigeration, and when he had to walk nearly everyday to the market for fresh food: “What can I say? It was a very simple life and it was nice.”

However, his parents struggled to find work and decided to immigrate as a strategy to improve their circumstances: “I was living with my grandparents at one point because my parents had gone to Switzerland to find jobs.” Eventually, Luca’s parents found the kind of work they were seeking in North America, and Luca would spend the majority of his childhood living there.

¹⁷ I chose two from Europe because they helped me tell the story of the diverse career pathways. In terms of space, it would have been more proportional to have two study collaborators from Asia, but I did not have one that was representative of coming to the U.S. as an already established professional or as a post-doctorate. My study collaborators from China all came to the U.S. as PhD students.

Camille (1950s): Europe

Camille, an associate professor from Europe, was born in the mid 1950s in London, a place that her mother had moved to with the hopes of exploring new vistas, and, in the process, found a life partner. By age three, Camille's family had moved to Monaco and then to several places within a third European country: "... because of my father's work, we moved every two or three years to various places...until we settled next to...[my childhood capital city] in the suburbs when I was ten." She arrived in these suburbs in the mid 60s, in the midst of a specific political context when the country was mobilizing towards an image of national independence. Camille remembered an environment that sought to expand educational access to everyone under the umbrella of a centralized government.

Nicolas (1960s): South America

Nicolas, an assistant professor from South America, was born in the late 1960s in the biggest urban center in his country with over one and a half million people. However, *he* grew up in the aftermath of an urban guerrilla movement. In 1968, the armed forces closed the Congress and established a civilian-military regime: "... the '70s were politically turbulent times... [we] went through some guerilla fighting issues and then there was military war...." As a result, Nicolas's parents sent him to private school where, even to this day, he has maintained friendships with the small group of people that went through both primary and secondary education with him. Unlike Luca and Camille, there is no story of out migration in Nicolas's childhood.

Yun (1970s): Asia

Yun, a professor from Asia, was born in the early 1970s—also in an urban center. She grew up in the aftermath of the country’s revolution: “I don’t really remember much of that; certainly my parents had undergone that.... [but] in the new republic, educational resources were kind of limited.” In this political environment, the country sought to rebuild its economy and employment opportunities. At preschool age, Yun was sent to live in a boarding school, so her parents could work long days. She recounted intense learning experiences. Like Nicolas, there is no story of out migration in her childhood.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences between Study Collaborators

Like all persons, the people in my core sample are part of a historical context that shapes their experiences with different countries and regions. However, they had these experiences first outside the U.S. and then in the U.S. In 3 of the 4 cases described above, people in my core sample grew up in the aftermath or midst of a major military event (war, guerilla fighting, and revolution). And, while Camille did not reference this kind of experience, her childhood country was organizing its political clout to counteract the effects of World War II that had weakened it both economically and militarily. Her focus on education, in her narrative, is an individualized choice that also defers to the larger system, directly speaking to the political moment of the time. These similar experiences speak to a common theme among these 4 cases in my core sample—that they all experienced significant political moments in their countries of birth and experienced the accompanying social moods and sentiments—some more intensely than others.

In general, these types of political experiences, in the 4 selected life histories of my core sample, have also shaped the lives of most of my study collaborators. From the colonial impacts and the effects of World War I of the early 20th century to the global

impact of World War II in the 1940s, these generations were affected by these political events either through direct contact or through their worldwide reverberations. By the end of the 1950s, the world had largely recovered from World War II, but the Cold War, which had its impetus in the late 1940s, embodied the competition between communism and capitalism that would continue for several decades. In the 1960s and 1970s, new nations emerged around the world, insurgent movements sought to overthrow existing governments, established countries grew to become economic powerhouses, and economic relationships came to predominate in a world that increasingly recognized that military might could not be the only means of growth and expansion (Conte and Karr, 2001).

While political distress and sometimes upheaval unites many narratives, early differences between study collaborators are present in the choices available to their families. For example, Luca's parents chose out migration as a strategy because of limited work opportunities in their country of birth. Camille's parents, however, chose to do so as a strategy because they wanted to experience other places and lifestyles. Their professional vocations facilitated their movement, giving them the opportunity to experience these places, but eventually, they chose to settle in a familiar one. By contrast, Nicolas' and Yun's parents focused their resources on giving their children a better than average education as a response to the political circumstance in their countries. While Nicolas was able to attend private school and enjoy close relationships with friends and family, Yun, however, had a more austere upbringing due to the country's emerging educational system that emphasized hard work, competition, and independence at an early age.

II. Family History with Immigration

Crossing National Borders

Eighteen study collaborators (38% of the interview sample) described a family history where immigration involved crossing national borders; however, their construction of coming from elsewhere or moving to elsewhere can be grouped into a typology. I will use the voices from the general group to explain this typology and then return to the narratives of the 4 cases in my core sample to continue the analysis in greater depth.

One type of immigration involved movement between two or more countries throughout several generations. William, for example, has ancestral connections to the United Kingdom, Germany, and America: “My father was actually born in London although his mother...came from Berlin; she was German or Jewish extraction. Her father actually had worked in America; he was actually an American citizen who fought...[in] the Civil War....” Another variation of crossing national borders included contemporary generational movement. Matías described his grandparents moving from Europe to South America; then, his parents being born and living in South America; and finally, his sister and him leaving South America to reside in North America: “So my grandparents emigrated from Europe to Argentina. My parents were born in Argentina, and then, you know, we [my sister and I] left Argentina for here [the U.S.]”

A second type of immigration involved back and forth migration between two countries. Ivan related his family history with moving and marrying between two countries: “My grandfather lived in...[the U.S.]; they were customs brokers, so they had

an office in...[the U.S]. My father grew up ...[across the border], but he spent a lot of time in...[the U.S.].” Ivan’s childhood mirrored his father’s as he too grew up between two countries, continuing the family tradition. A third type involved a circular immigration—such as leaving the US for a temporary relocation to then return. Charlotte was born to American parents in Europe but then the family moved permanently to the United States when she was a teenager: “As I have gotten older, I realized that not everybody feels this way, but to me, it always seemed as though it was normal in the course of your life to live in multiple countries.”

Internal Migration Within Country of birth

Thirteen study collaborators (or 27% of the interview sample) described family histories moving within their country of birth. Often regional differences within a country are vast and require adjustment efforts similar to those generated by crossing national borders.¹⁸ For example, although his parents both moved within their country of birth, Dani found they were “immigrants” to the city they eventually settled in, meaning that in this city people often viewed themselves as inhabiting a different social identity from the rest of the country. Study collaborators also described constructions of coming from elsewhere through city and town life: “My father is from...[the city], and my mother is from a small town...” (Bruno).

Additionally, some narratives emphasized the fact that country lines have changed within a professor’s lifetime. Intrinsic to the concept of the nation is the idea of social cohesion, which is often conflated with the concept of national boundaries (the nation-state). However, the first references to the concept of the modern nation-state, with its

¹⁸ The same can be said of the U.S. Moving from North to South or East to West within the U.S. is often the subject of descriptive accounts of “culture shock.”

accompanying legal-political dimensions, is approximately 250 years old (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002) and refers to the apparatuses of the state (government, military, political parties, etc.) used to secure physical borders and manage them. Yet, these physical borders are not always synonymous with cultural affiliations (Eller, 2002; Geertz, 1963). Within his narrative, Arjun, for example, talked about the regions his family came from, and how they are now separate national entities. These changing boundaries invite the question, then, what does it mean to be Indian, German, American, etc. and how do those identifications interact with personal and regional identifications?

I refer back to my core sample for more insight through a descriptive exploration of these types of family immigration histories.

Luca: Crossing National borders

Luca described his family history with moving as crossing national borders. His grandfather had owned a flour mill, only a short distance away from the town where Luca was born. However, when Luca came along, the whole area was quickly moving from an agrarian to an industrial economy. Luca's father became a tool and die maker. Later, Luca's parents would move to Switzerland, only to move again, this time with the whole family, to a North American country. In this context, they would live in an international city—quite different from the region that comprised Luca's early childhood years and which would give him new and diverse educational experiences.

Camille: Crossing National Borders

Camille described parents as coming from families who had not moved for several generations; she called them “really rooted” families. Her father was born and raised in London. Although, one branch of the family had come from Russia and Poland,

for generations, the family had found stability in one geographic location. As for Camille's mother, she was born and raised in a small city in a European country. Camille found that it was her mother who was eager for adventure: "My father was definitely not ready to move out of London. As for my mother...she was the one who really didn't want to stay...[in her home country] and moved to London to explore something different." Eventually, the whole family would return permanently to her mother's country of birth where Camille would feel most "rooted" during her childhood years, living near a capital city.

Nicolas: Crossing National Borders

Nicolas described an ancestral history with immigration as well as a contemporary one. While his mother was born in Europe and came to South America, his father had been born in South America but had ancestral connection to Europe:

My father's side, I guess just per chance, my father's parents were both born...[in South America].... Their family has got a history of going back and forth the Atlantic.... But as most of America, family lines are young...so it hasn't been many generations of people.

Nicolas would eventually move from South America to North America, adding another layer to the family history. With each move, however, he has continued to search for the city environment that shaped his formative years, often missing the shorter distances and longer, more informal interactions that demarcated his life there.

Yun: Moving within Country of birth

Yun's narrative described situations of displacement due to the revolution in her country. Although she grew up in a capital city, her family moved from a working class neighborhood to a neighborhood associated more closely with professional careers: "I

think when I got close to school age, we moved mostly back to the apartment that they [my parents] had.” Yun described how government money was allocated in certain housing areas for the well-educated: “In those areas, we have not high rise but short rise buildings... so the built environment there versus where my grandparents lived was flat. So there [in this new area] the interactions with your neighbors was not as strong.” Yun felt that changing from a building with several levels to that of one with fewer floors created situations where there was less interaction with others unless people went out of their way to connect with one another. Although she did not cross national borders, Yun felt the difference in social class interactions—almost a new cultural experience in and of itself.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences between Study Collaborators

The migratory shifts discussed above often account for family understandings of what it means to encapsulate regional, national, and global identities and their impact on study collaborators’ lives. Luca, for example, moved from a rural, emerging factory town to a worldwide international city. And, Camille eventually settled into a capital city that gave her more of a regional sense of social identity than that of national one. Most study collaborators, 37 study collaborators (or 77% of the interview sample), either came from families who were rooted in cities or they had experiences with moving, at a young age, to more urban environments.

I interpret that the effects of this type of environment often produced strong lifestyle preferences; “I’m really a city type” (Alex). This preference included a desire for certain resources such as public transportation, “What I loved was public transportation—wonderful” (Saheed); educational facilities, “There are good educational institutions [in

my city of birth” (Palash); technological advancements, “I really liked the speed of the internet” (Chen); and/or for certain experiences such as socio-cultural diversity, aesthetics, and the fine arts, “[I like] The principle of unity and diversity...unfortunately, in certain countries, they don’t know how to handle this” (Anthony). As will be described below, study collaborators continuously narrated seeking similar landscapes over their life courses. Nicolas, for example, has continued to look for a city landscape that embodies his childhood in South America. By contrast, Yun is aware of the gap between social classes in the city she grew up in, narrating the loss of the social interaction she experienced when she lived in a more socially diverse neighborhood.

III. Parents’ Occupation and Educational Achievement

In my study, I focused on occupation and educational achievement. If study collaborators mentioned their parents’ level of education, I took that into account when interpreting parents’ work status, and if they sometimes described a scenario where one parent worked and another stayed at home, I then looked at levels of education and jobs held previously or the job/career of the working partner to ascertain white-collar or blue-collar standing.¹⁹ From this framework, I found the following results.

Thirty-five study collaborators (or 73% of the interview sample) described growing up in a white-collar household with the highest levels of education and careers

¹⁹ I’m using the term white and blue collar as sociologist C. Wright Mills (1916-1962) used them to argue that the lives of white collar workers were qualitatively different from those of their fellow blue-collar workers—in occupational pursuits and to differentiate between individual social circumstances and macro-economic conditions. See Mills (1951) *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

being those of professors, lawyers, physicians, and psychologists. Other professions included engineers, architects, a speech language pathologist, an aircraft pilot, accountants, and elementary and secondary teachers. A final tier of white-collar workers included insurance sales agents, entrepreneurs, financial managers and analysts, and officers in the armed forces. Ten study collaborators described parents who were blue-collar workers such as in factory settings, in rail-track laying and maintenance, in personal services (barber and tailor), in door-to-door sales, and in construction.

Luca: blue collar

Luca's father was a tool and die maker, and over the years, he made toys, subway cars, and tools: "...[my father made] the forms that were then used by machines to form metal, and their shapes. The dyes." Luca's mother had little formal education, only finishing up to the third grade, and then working in her parent's store: "They sold things. Her father would buy things at the market, and he would sell them at the store." Later, Luca's mother would mainly stay at home, sometimes working as a seamstress. Overall, Luca remembered that his family was frugal and that his parents worked hard: "...they did very well. We never lacked anything."

Camille: white collar

Camille's father was in the banking business, auditing banks that belonged to the same network. As a result, the family moved quite a bit during Camille's early childhood, also because Camille's mother wanted to travel. Camille's mother had been a homemaker, but when Camille was twelve, her mother too started working in the financial business. Camille described a family that had the resources to travel often, and she recounted first coming to the U.S. as a teenager on a family vacation.

Nicolas: white collar

Nicolas' father was an engineer. He worked in the city government. He also taught in the high school and in the university: "...[this dual teaching] may be very unusual for the U.S., but...[in my country] people teaching in high school...[could] also teach in university." Nicolas' mother worked at the university hospital in administration. By the time the country's government became unstable, Nicolas' parents were able to send both he and his sister to private school—both for their protection and in order to develop their skills and abilities within a stable educational system.

Yun: white collar

Yun's father was a government researcher, and her mother was an engineer who worked for the city government. They both were afforded the benefits associated with a more elite, educated and professional class. As a result, they were able to live in a neighborhood that would give Yun the chance to attend one of the few elite, experimental schools in the country. So, after living in a boarding school during her preschool years, Yun then lived with her parents during her primary and secondary educational years and became part of an elite, educated class herself: "...[it] was kind of like an honors class in America, or kind of a gifted talented program."

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Thirty-five study collaborators (or 73% of the interview sample) had highly educated and fiscally successful parents. As a result, I interpret that in their childhoods, these study collaborators observed their parents in generally "good" work situations, often more corporate or managerial. Additionally, they observed parents who were often positive and confident in their work lives, experiencing achievement and career mobility

and believing that they could do so again—inciting their children to follow in their footsteps.

Even those coming from blue-collar families often had a stable income source. However, it is worth noting that not all come from privilege; 3 came from poor households. One in particular stood out in her narrative as she remembered sometimes going to bed hungry and living without resources that she saw were available to other children:

Oh, there were some periods before she [my Mother] landed that job where we didn't have enough to eat. My brother had stayed with my father and then went off on his own and travelled; he is ten years older than me. Yes, there were some very lean years in there, indeed (Ruby).

Other structural circumstances also influenced my study collaborators' growing up experiences. For example, war and political oppression in their countries of birth had an impact on their lifestyle choices and the pathways they had available in order to get an education and have opportunities. Isaac, whose father was an aircraft pilot, experienced this reality when war broke out in his country:

One day, I mean, we were kids, and we don't understand any of this. But one day...[my country] is a lovely, beautiful place, and then suddenly, the whole country is in flames.... so they kept us in school for two days until it calmed down, and they could take us back to our homes.

Isaac was thirteen when this event happened, and, after two months of no schooling, his family made the decision to temporarily relocate to a European country where they lived until he finished high school. In general, however, the majority of study collaborators, even if they lived through difficult political moments in their countries of birth, had access to resources not always available to the rest of the population because of their parents' social standing.

In the next section, I will explore the early educational experiences of study collaborators and how family contexts shaped them.

IV. Elementary and High school Educational Experiences

School Performance

Study Collaborators described either liking school or excelling in school, or both. Even when school systems did not meet their expectations, study collaborators focused on other aspects of learning, such as reading. Nine study collaborators (or 19% of the interview sample) mentioned that they liked school from an early age, and many described themselves as voracious readers who enjoyed books. Mandisa, for example, describes herself as a “bookworm” and that she was always “very keen” on her education, even at a young age. By contrast, Dani didn’t love to go to school at a young age, but he always loved to read: “I wasn’t a very committed student. I loved to read -- that is the thing that kept me connected to intellectual life just loved reading whatever I wanted, not whatever they told me to.”

Eight study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) spoke about aspects of being gifted and talented or excelling in school, meaning they accelerated at a faster rate: “So I got my 10th grade done when I was 13” (Ashok); were quick to learn and/or had a photographic memory, “I had a very good memory, so I could memorize everything that the teacher said in the class” (Saeed); or were high achievers, Harry, for example, was the equivalent of valedictorian in his school system. Finally, 4 study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described being a hard worker—devoting many hours to homework and study. I found that these opinions, liking learning, excelling, and working

hard, continually circumscribed study collaborators' narratives as they described progressing through career and educational transitions.

Educational Contexts

Study Collaborators talked about their experiences with primary and secondary education. Thirteen study collaborators (or 27% of the interview sample) spoke about their experiences with a public school system, or a system that was funded by the State, Luca and Camille being two examples. I soon learned, however, that public school means different things in different countries. In parts of Europe, for example, certain public schools are treated more like private schools and are often competitive to attend, though once a position is secured, the state funds the education for the student. William talked about the competition he experienced to get into a specific public school with a good reputation.

Positive attributes my study collaborators associated with public schools included consistency in teaching methods, competition, and long days of instruction. Additionally, study collaborators sometimes experienced interacting with a diverse group of people. They also noted some of the more negative public school experiences including mediocre teaching, colonial influences, and a lack of resources. Bolin talked about growing up in a post-colonial country and his struggle to get an adequate education: “And so...my father was suddenly advised that the children were not learning anything—that they could speak English, but they had no idea how to construct a sentence because nobody had ever taught them....” Bolin’s experience also included teachers who often corrected students by hitting them with a ruler.

Eight study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) talked about their experiences with elite institutions and/or private schools, meaning schools that were required tuition payments, Nicolas and Yun being two examples. They recounted positive attributes that included intensive teaching, challenging and experimental courses, resources, opportunities, safety, and often an elite social class environment that encouraged learning. Liam, for example, talked about his change in status when his father was promoted and he switched school systems along with neighborhoods. He suddenly found himself in an “elite and well-resourced private school” that changed the course of his life: “You can trace that [change in my life] back to the moment when I was eleven when we moved to that house.”

Six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) specifically described their early educational experiences, noting international exposure, such as meeting people from other countries, living abroad, and learning new languages, and engaging with diverse people in terms of social class, race, and religion. And, six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) talked about parental influences that either encouraged their pursuit of a certain discipline or influenced their belief on education as leading to a satisfying lifestyle. Jonathan, for example, described how he was constantly surrounded by architecture and, consequently, that he always knew he wanted to be an architect. His architect father would attend his soccer game on Saturdays and then take him to his office for a few hours afterwards where there were always drawings and legos and books with buildings and structures. Other families encouraged rituals associated with learning. Isaac describes how his parents sat with him and his siblings every night until their homework was complete.

Finally, five study collaborators (or 10% of the interview sample) talked about having to choose early in their teenage years what tract or specialty they wanted to pursue as they applied for entrance into college. William had to drop his interest in geography to specialize in the sciences, and Palash, in choosing a science tract, had to leave behind studies of commerce and the humanities.

Luca: Poor Public System

Luca's schooling system, in a North American country, was divided into three public school systems that were separated by religious affiliation (Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic). Luca went through the Catholic system. While he did well, even skipping a grade, the system itself was lacking in resources. And, while he is a professor in the natural sciences today, he did not excel in this subject area during his early formative years. He described these educational experiences as lacking:

I am Catholic; I went to Catholic school -- that was the poorest system. In high school, we went to a school that was condemned. I did okay with education, except for biology, interestingly enough. They didn't have a lot of facilities; there was a lot of math, a lot of physics. [But it was] More theory than practice.

Luca felt that he was really introduced to his now area of focus during his college years.

Camille: Stable Public System

Camille also went to public school but experienced a very stable and centralized school system wherever she was in the country: "The nice thing about the...[country's] system, for me, is that it is the same education, the same program, the same assessment... wherever you are in...[the country]... whether I was here or there." She described liking to learn although the school featured long days of instruction, 8:30am to 4:30pm, with few extra curricular activities. As a result of this intense process, at age sixteen, she started to specialize, choosing a career direction in language and literature.

Nicolas: Private School

Nicolas attended private school due to the political upheaval in his country of birth. He attended the same school through elementary and high school and had fond memories of the small group of students he was educated with from 4 years old to 17 years old: “I still have...[these] people that I have known since they were 4 years old.” However, he began to have technical interests in engineering during his formative years when the country was going through a reorganization period and needed those kinds of skills: “So being a physician wouldn’t have been practical. But...the clearest path was engineering.” Nicolas found that he liked school, but it took him a while to find his area of interest because he was encouraged, from a young age, to pursue an educational route that would give him a fiscally successful career rather than to pursue his natural intellectual curiosities.

Yun: Experimental Public System

Yun talked about the opportunities that she had to attend an elite school that had experimental courses and how this school set her on a course for excellence and gaining acceptance into a notable university. However, these early courses were geared towards math and science, leading her, at a young age, towards this career direction. Yun described the competition: “If you want to get to the really good college, you need to go to a really good high school, and you need to really make your way through that entrance exam after your middle school years to get to that high school.” Finally, she emphasized the influence her parents had on her education—how they advocated for excellence. Because of her academic standing, Yun was interviewed by a reporter who idealized her in the article as part of the country’s post-revolution, emerging academic system.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Regardless of these differing educational contexts, from their interviews, it becomes evident that the majority of study collaborators experienced at least one source of support in their learning—either through school, parents and family friends, or extra curricular activities (58% of the interview sample). Over the life course, this support is often the impetus for a lifelong mindset where education becomes increasingly valued. Among study collaborators, this mindset eventually developed into a shared social belief where education is viewed as important and carrying an underlying sense of purpose that is externalized through their descriptions of successful evaluations, excellent scholastic performances, and intellectual curiosities and passions.

In the next section, I explore how my study collaborators further develop through formal learning in their undergraduate studies and informally through activities and experiences that teach them about employment and help them develop social skills.

V. Undergraduate Education

Meaning of Undergraduate Education

Of the 48 study collaborators, only 2 received their undergraduate degrees in the U.S. The rest completed their undergraduate degrees abroad. One major theme among them was that of discovery; 17 study collaborators (or 35% of the interview sample) said that their undergraduate experiences introduced them to new vistas, ideas, practices, and skills. For example, they talked about the disciplines and sub-disciplines that interested them. Chen says that he was set to pursue engineering, but new technologies wooed him into the business world: “I was in engineering school but then I got really interested in

technology... [and] then during that period... what happened was another big wave of change that was the Internet and the Web, so I was just so crazy about that. I still remember that exciting period.”

In the process, study collaborators discovered scholars in their areas of interest and projects that were driven by these people. Jonathan talked about the architect Piano who led an experimental program at his university, and Sean talked about the group of astronomy scholars, who he was working for and who discovered the very first Exoplanets. Study collaborators also talked about this education phase as one of inner discovery. Charlotte described travelling to Japan as an undergraduate exchange student and finding liberation in the fact that there was “absolutely no chance of fitting in,” that she was free to fail socially and discover what really motivated her as an individual. Others too described, that I interpret to be much like U.S.-born college students, their revelatory sense of freedom and independence during these undergraduate years.

Seven study collaborators (or 15% of the interview sample) also described a process of evaluation, exploring and determining which profession(s) would give them more chances of gaining employment after they completed their studies. Bruno highlighted that while he loved music, his father did not think he could support himself with this it, so he pursued a “respectable degree”: “I went to engineering school... I liked it; I just figured I like to study, so I became a nerd when I went off to college.”

Learning Environments

Nicolas and Yun spoke about their undergraduate experiences through the lens of what their countries’ governments and social institutions were encouraging as necessary

for economic recovery and expansion. In this context, national resources were allocated towards specific disciplines, which were extremely competitive. Sixteen study collaborators (or 33% of the interview sample) described their undergraduate training as tied to competition and limited resources. Andreas talked about his first day at a European university where he was told that the seatmates on either side of him would probably not finish “statistically speaking.” The university was built for 10,000 students and was, at the time of Andreas’ enrollment, accommodating approximately 28,000 students.

Study collaborators also talked about exams and how they often served as winnowing tools. Saheed, from an Asian university, found that the GRE exam in the U.S, for example, was “nothing” compared to his earlier experiences with entrance exams as an undergraduate. Palash, from another Asian university, found that even if you get into college, based on your ranking, you may not get the major of your choice. As a result of this kind of ranking and competition, study collaborators spoke about parallel courses of action, not so different from that of student life in the U.S.: pursuing a degree while simultaneously keeping other possible career and educational avenues open—usually in akin disciplines or related areas of interest. Luca, for example, kept a foot in both biology and chemistry for a while, and Camille, decided to finish her undergraduate education in language and literature before pursuing her intellectual interests in film studies.

Finally, 3 study collaborators, or 6% of the interview sample, described their social life as undergraduates ranging from the realities of dorm life to finding a community to sometimes experiencing harassment from peers.

Luca: Discovering Intellectual Passion

Luca attended college in his childhood country and described discovering the natural sciences and their “ramifications” during this time period. While he was first set on a course to study chemistry, he ended up taking courses in zoology, physiology, genetics and anatomy, and he found that “...it was just wonderful.” He soon became interested in molecules, which would become his lifelong passion and intellectual pursuit: “There’s no comparison what molecules can do, and I’m still studying at the molecular level. Proteins and lipids and membranes and so on. That was all my interest and to understand how everything works, especially at the molecular level. I was just intrigued by all of that.”

Camille: Discovering Different Social Structures

Social unrest prevailed when Camille was ready to enter college that culminated in students revolting against government policies and initiating a national strike. In this political milieu, Camille had visited the U.S. for the first time on a family vacation and knew one day she would return:

I knew that I would go back [to my country of birth], so I [went back and] finished all my college studies. I went through the whole scope of the...system. I decided then it would be time for me to pursue my studies in an American university, but at a graduate level.

Camille liked what she saw and experienced in the U.S. and wanted to learn more.

Nicolas: Evaluating Career Employment and Discovering Intellectual Passion

Initially, Nicolas decided to pursue engineering, while a student in his country of birth, because of its viability as career where he could gain employment: “Well, at that time, you had to take an entrance exam to get in the university, and engineering was a lucrative profession that you could probably get employment.” However, while he was pursuing this degree, he talked to people in a specific science department and found an

intellectual direction that really animated him: “So I went to the school of sciences.... And I found where they had...[this specific] department, and I talked to people in there. There were many of the [same] subjects.... So I just started to do both things at the same time.”

Yun: Evaluating Career Employment

Like Nicolas, Yun evaluated areas of study in terms of career viability after graduation. She acknowledged that had she chosen a different path, she would have been inclined to study law: “...if I was going to choose along more social science or art, I would have been a lawyer, but this is something that perhaps would not have been the best choice, not a very neutral choice, in... [my country’s] environment.” Although she doesn’t say if engineering really excited her intellectual curiosities, Yun chose this route and concluded that it was an area where she was “strong” and could expect to lead to employment.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Overall, study collaborators described their undergraduate education as either introducing them to new areas of interest and/or reinforcing ones that were already there—through formal and informal learning experiences. While these same experiences can also be applied to students in the U.S., I interpret, from the perspective of my study collaborators, that several saw difference(s) in the nature of their competitive entrance into these educational systems and in their accompanying choices for career pathways; however, determining the reality of these perceptions is beyond the scope of this study.

Study collaborators also described long-term impacts of their undergraduate decision(s) through a range of reflections on their intellectual curiosities/interests—again

similar to U.S. students but sometimes, I interpret, different in motivation because of their countries' social and political circumstances. For example, Nicolas and Yun felt more constrained by their countries' pathways available for educational and employment opportunities and, consequently, they thought specifically about where their strengths and areas of interest could relate to those larger systems. By contrast, Luca described pursuing what he was interested in, leading to more intellectual curiosity, and eventually developing into an intellectual passion for molecular biology. He did not express, that as an undergraduate, he evaluated where that deep interest would take him in terms of a career.

This type of range was apparent throughout my study collaborators' narratives as they reflected on what they were "good at" (career pragmatism) and what they "loved" (intellectual passion/deep interest). Saheed, for example, has a deep interest in astrophysics and quantum mechanics, and finds himself reading about these topics late into the evening. However, he described himself as being good at applying a statistical analysis to research questions: "During the day I do statistics or whatever gets me by." Yet, overall, he described himself as satisfied with his research career.

VI. Summary of Findings

Major Similarities Between Study Collaborators

- (48%) The largest majority of study collaborators were born between the 1950s and the 1960s.
- (76%) Most hail from European and Asian regions with an equal 38% percent coming from each.

- (73%) Most have white collar social backgrounds and described having access to resources because of their parents' social standing and to examples of positive and confident work lives.
- (77%) Most have ties to an urban environment—often producing, as described by them, strong lifestyle preferences.
- (58%) The majority described having a positive source of support during elementary and/or high school years—either through school, parents and family friends, or extra curricular activities.

Major Differences Between Study Collaborators

- One major variation or difference is that of political circumstance. More Asian and South America countries, for example, struggled with the effects of war and revolution than European and North American ones at the time of the study collaborators' immigration. The result is that these regions often become more insular, limiting the choices available in educational and career pursuits as political interests dictate. Consequently, finding one's intellectual interest or passion often becomes compartmentalized over the life course, not always readily acknowledged during the undergraduate years, sometimes found later, and sometimes pursued "after hours." The impact of these challenging historical contexts are described in later chapters as these professors narrate their recognition and success in publication and research but not always their inner satisfaction with their chosen discipline—recognizing that if social circumstances had been different they may have chosen differently.

- Although there is commonality among study collaborators in the fact that their families have experienced immigration, the circumstances and cultural influences can be and are quite different. I identified 3 distinct experiences involving migration: 1) Historical/Generational Movement (Movement embedded in family culture having a history of international migration) (2) Multiple Movements (Between primary fixed geographic locations/countries) 3) Circular Migration (Leaving the country of birth and returning after a time.) Each type of movement has a different set of expectations and subsequent integration challenges.

Chapter 5: Early Adulthood & Becoming Professors

In Chapter 5, I have continued to explore the experiences of my interview sample as their life courses move through what I label as their “Early Adulthood.” For the purposes of this study, early adulthood usually encompasses the years spent just prior to graduate studies and includes masters, PhD work, and post-doctoral positions, concluding shortly after entering into a career in academia as a professor or another professional sector. Early adulthood is a period when most individuals begin to make more complex life choices that can have major impacts on the direction the rest of their lives take. Consequently, along with variables such as decade, age and legal status upon arrival and first geographic locations in the United States, my analysis of the 48 interviews also attempts to interpret correspondingly more intangible life experiences, including: reasons for going abroad; reasons for coming to the United States, selecting a graduate school, work life as a student or post-doctorate; social life as a student or post-doctorate; and assessing the U.S. and learning the U.S. as a student or post-doctorate. The analysis that follows builds upon similarities and differences found among my study collaborators.

I. Reasons for Going Abroad

Twenty study collaborators (or 42% of my interview sample) had lived other places abroad before coming to the U.S. while 28 study collaborators (or 58% of my interview sample) lived abroad for the first time when they came to the U.S. In considering other geographic location preferences, 4 study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) stated that national policies and politics concerning immigration in countries they were considering moving to influenced their geographic location choices.

For example, Connor from a country in Oceania said he considered moving and living within the same continental region because national policies in that region would not have required him to obtain a work visa, making transit and settlement across borders less cumbersome. By contrast, Saheed's regional situation limited his immigration choices. He found that immigration to the U.S. was more easily achieved by first going through a European country: "So, I had to go to a third country to get a [an American] visa."

Reasons for movement elsewhere instead of the U.S. also included education and work opportunities, of which 7 study collaborators (or 15% of the interview sample) commented. Anthony, for example, moved from an Asian country to a European one to pursue a degree in English literature: "Of course, once you do English literature, the doors are open to all European culture and civilization." Finally, 1 study collaborator (or 2% of the interview sample) stated she moved abroad because of a relationship. Mandisa, from an African country, married someone who was moving to a European country to pursue a graduate degree. She came with him and, in the process, obtained a PhD herself.

Luca: Educational Opportunities

Luca's parents came to North America in the late 1950s because they were unable to naturalize as citizens in Switzerland, and they were looking for a long-term settlement option where their work would remain stable enough to support a family. After World War II, there weren't many options for employment in their country of birth, so they went to Switzerland for two years where they were accepted as temporary immigrants, but they could never become permanent members of Switzerland's society. They applied elsewhere. The U.S. had too long of a waiting list, so they chose yet another North American country.

Luca completed his secondary, undergraduate, and graduate studies in his new country of settlement, only deciding to move to the U.S. in the 1970s when a postdoctoral opportunity presented itself: “I had a great advisor, and she suggested that I should do a post-doc [in the U.S. with a fellow colleague of hers]....”

Camille: Social and Cultural Frameworks

When Camille came to the U.S. in 1980, she was a young adult in her mid twenties, seeking new experiences and evaluating whether they would give her the framework she sought. Camille eventually attended film school in Los Angeles, California, and during this time, she found social and cultural aspects of U.S. society that resonated with her: “I really liked what I found here... the society and the professional training and the university system.”

Nicolas: Intellectually Stimulating Career Choices

In 1984, civilian rule returned to Nicolas’ country of birth. The first political administration implemented economic reforms and consolidated democracy. These events structured the career opportunities available for Nicolas who was considering a profession in engineering:

... the prospects for engineering were to be employed probably in a state industry.... a lot of the companies are owned by the state.... So being an engineer you have a risk ... — that you end up being an administrator.... that wasn’t tremendously appealing intellectually.

As a result, Nicolas began to explore other career options abroad and ended up coming to the U.S. in the 1990s.

Yun: Best Place for Technology

In a similar vein as Nicolas, Yun began considering moving abroad when she realized that career options were limited in her country of birth. She found that, in her field of interest, she did not have access to the latest technology: “The best [technology] is here in the U.S. I was also considering Japan.... The uncertainty was how I could fund my studies....” Additionally, Yun found that her country of birth discouraged study abroad, wanting to enlist its educated class to energize the country’s rebuilding efforts and viewing study abroad as potential brain drain: “[The university in my country of birth] very closely follows the directions of the central government or the mainstream—making it not so good to pursue studies abroad.” Consequently, when Yun decided to publicly pursue higher education abroad in the late 1990s, her undergraduate university made it difficult to obtain an honors distinction on her transcripts, an honor she had earned.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Regardless of where study collaborators settle, I interpreted, from these responses, that they chose migration as a strategy to obtain something that they are unable to access in their current geographic locations: specific educational opportunities, different social and cultural frameworks, certain career niches, and better technological advancements, to name a few. Variations among study collaborators are related to personal transitions in the life course and opportunities offered them in other countries. While study collaborators consistently described the U.S. as a place that has a reputation for excellence in higher education, it is not, however, always the first choice for migration, and is, in fact, often one possibility among an array of choices, when evaluating the many circumstances that circumscribe their personal and professional lives.

II. Reason for Coming to the U.S.

Consistently, study collaborators described coming to the U.S. as a means for gaining some type of professional experience. Twenty-six study collaborators (or 54% of the interview sample) described having connections to scholars in their area of interest, securing additional training by going to graduate school, and completing an internship, to name a few reasons for coming to the U.S. Sean, for example, a professor from North America, would have made a professional life in his country of birth, but access to certain job opportunities and professional networks were limited. He encountered difficulty in obtaining a position in his academic area as well as in gaining further professional training. During this time, he met scholars from the U.S. who were able to offer him a post doctoral position as he worked with them in creating a code—a code that he continues to use in his current research. For Sean, coming to the U.S. was narrated as a pragmatic decision to gain access to a research network that has continued to animate his work: “I really took the next step in my coding ability.”

Ten study collaborators (or 21% of the interview sample) described coming to the U.S. to explore and to experience other countries and ways of being as well as career possibilities and different research interests. Palash, for example, came to the U.S. to gain professional experience as well as to investigate other career options. He had begun his professional life in industry as an engineer and was, in his words, “fed up.” He wanted to explore other arenas in which he could use his skills and decided that gaining more professional training would help him meet this goal. He came to the U.S. as a PhD student, and this decision was ultimately Palash’s route into academia as he experienced the career satisfaction he was seeking.

Often closely associated with this need for exploration is also the desire to find and experience new intellectual challenges. Five study collaborators (or 10% of the interview sample) described a certain ennui or apathy in their career development and, consequently, they sought new places where they might put their skills and knowledge to more innovative practices. Matteo, for example, first came to the U.S. because he was not feeling fulfilled with his career and had heard from other family members that he would have more interesting choices in the U.S.: “I was moving from one place to another, never going to the same place. Getting bored is my problem....” Once in a graduate program, Matteo continued searching for likeminded people in a variety of academic and industry settings that would give him challenging problems to solve and continually found the U.S. provided opportunities to do so.

Nine study collaborators (19% of the interview sample) described the need to escape circumstances such as war, revolutions, unstable political situations, and unmet socioeconomic needs. Isaac, for example, found that he wanted to escape some aspects of the social structure he grew up under while pursuing professional aspirations. He said that he wanted “...to disconnect and for three years leave everything behind...” He came to the U.S. as a graduate and then as a PhD student, eventually marrying someone from the U.S. and starting a family.

Finally, 4 study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described the need to use their position in the U.S. to promote and influence research agendas on an international and/or global level. Anthony explained that he chose to come to the U.S. because he wanted to influence peaceful solutions amidst conflicting national agendas: “I came to this country not seeking political asylum, nor trying to seek economic wealth, or

anything. I came because I was invited to come to America... [to help with peace-building].” Throughout his narrative, Anthony continued to speak of his ultimate goal, which is to help individuals explore what unites them with others rather than focusing solely on what divides them—“unity in diversity,” as he put it.

Another Level of Analysis

In the process of analyzing interviews with Atlas.ti, I also completed a second layer of analysis on all the interviews using the same categories of narration (described above). Instead of looking at specific quotations as I did in Atlas.ti, however, this level of analysis involved listening, reading, and re-reading study collaborators’ interviews and, then, thinking about each interview in its entirety—from a holistic perspective. To capture these findings, I followed Luttrell (2005) in looking for “...an overall point, the gist of...[an interviewee’s] life story” and taking “note of recurring images, words, phrases, and metaphors” (page 250). I eventually marked two responses for each professor—a primary reason for coming to the U.S. and a secondary and/or overlapping one. The results were as follows:

Table 15: Motivations for Study Collaborators Coming to the U.S. from a Holistic Perspective

28 primary reason for coming to the U.S. 12 secondary/overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.	40 study collaborators altogether (83% of the interview sample)	<i>Experience</i> (gaining professional and educational experience and/or additional training)
9 primary reason for coming to the U.S. 14 secondary/overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.	23 study collaborators altogether (48% of the interview sample)	<i>Exploration</i> (to experience other countries, ways of being, career possibilities, and different research interests)
5 primary reason for coming to the U.S. 13 secondary/overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.	18 study collaborators altogether (38% of the interview sample)	<i>Escape</i> certain circumstances (war, gender inequality, revolutions, unstable political situations, and unmet socioeconomic needs)
2 primary reason for coming to the U.S. 8 secondary/overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.	10 study collaborators altogether (21% of the interview sample)	<i>Innovation</i> (find inspiration through new challenges—to stay energized by the choices)

	sample)	available)
4 primary reason for coming to the U.S. 1 secondary/overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.	5 study collaborators altogether (10% of the interview sample)	Use their position in the U.S. to <i>Influence</i> (research agendas and other places in the world)

From this analysis, almost all study collaborators described coming to the U.S. to gain professional experience, either as a primary or secondary/overlapping reason. While other reasons were also part of the consideration, often associated with inner fulfillment and purpose, a major stimulus for migration remained the same—professional development, training, and access to career options. The next 4 cases show some possible combination of primary and secondary reasons.

Luca: professional experience and innovation

Luca described coming to the U.S. because a professional opportunity presented itself for further career training as a post-doctoral student. However, other circumstances soon augmented his desire to stay. Not only did he discover the VDAC channel with other scientists, a discovery that grounded and gave momentum to his work in coming years, he also met and married someone from the U.S. and started a family. Throughout his interview, Luca described staying in the U.S. because of family and because of the innovative challenges that continued to stimulate his academic interests: “...this channel called VDAC...is regulated in a variety of ways, so it’s a very rich situation.”

Camille: exploration and escape

In the country where she spent her childhood, Camille completed undergraduate training in language and linguistics and started a PhD program before making the decision to come to the U.S. for an extended period as a graduate student, attending film school in Los Angeles, California. She made this decision in order to explore another possible creative direction for her skills and abilities as well as to explore what different

social aspects U.S. society had to offer.

However, a secondary and/or overlapping reason that emerges is that of escape. By 1968, her childhood country was in the midst of social unrest, culminating in students revolting against government policies and holding a national strike. When Camille came to the U.S., she was a young adult in her mid twenties, seeking new experiences and evaluating whether they would provide her the stable framework she sought. Camille described her admiration of individual expression that she experienced in the United States: "...the [U.S.] is also a much more democratic society, for the better and the worse – in the sense that everybody has a voice, or tries to.... You don't always have to go through your representative.... Here, you have a lot of power given to communities, to organizations...."

Nicolas: professional experience and escape

The impetus for Nicolas coming to the U.S. was presented as a "fortuitous" opportunity that came as he became increasingly interested in physics and astronomy:

... somebody knew somebody and this person was working in the U.S.... at the Center for Astrophysics and ... he was coming to visit.... So I did a project with Emilio, and Emilio convinced two of us for applying to U.S. schools ... and I was accepted in one of them.

Nicolas' primary reason for coming to the U.S., as described in his narrative, falls under the category of seeking professional experience through additional training. A secondary and/or overlapping reason involved that of escape. The intellectual opportunities weren't "tremendously appealing" in his country of birth, given the political and economic state of the region after years of political instability. Nicolas wanted to "escape" the professional tract he was on for that of another, more stimulating one that could be obtained in the U.S.

Yun: professional experience and escape

Yun ultimately decided to pursue further professional training in the U.S. as a PhD student because she wanted the exposure to elite technology in her field of study. While she was accepted into several universities (Harvard, Colombia, Princeton, Stanford, and the University of Tennessee, to name a few), she eventually chose Princeton because of its commitment to funding and her family's worry that they would not be able to provide the financial support they would have liked to if circumstances would have been different in her country of birth. Additionally, Yun described a secondary and/or overlapping reason for coming to the U.S.: escaping the realization, in her country of birth, that international connectivity was negatively impacting their economic growth and rebuilding efforts. Yun felt that, on the contrary, this kind of exposure and social network building would provide a much better platform for which to contribute her skills and abilities and to help her country of birth progress on a world stage.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Between my two levels of analysis, Atlas.ti and my holistic reading of each interview, I found that at least 40 study collaborators (83% of the interview sample) described gaining some type of professional experience as an important factor in their migration choices. However, while I interpret that this impetus is viewed as a major driving force, it is also interconnected to several layers of individual experience, such as a desire to seek new social structures or to explore other career possibilities, that often crafts the decision making process into a highly individualized experience. In one sense, this group is not only acculturating and evolving as professionals in a new country, but

they are also testing their frameworks for esteem and self-actualization and for home and family life – all while pursuing new professional heights. And, like native born, they too grapple with finding routines and habits that unify the social, cultural and professional dimensions of their circumstances. After their initial settlement, what keeps this group rooted in the U.S. is a continual reevaluation of these dimensions and how satisfying they are to their individual well-being:

I know that I’m not going to stay here forever, but I also feel like I’m trying to stay as long as I can. I don’t know how much longer I’m going to be able to continue. Some days I feel good about it [my decision to stay] and others not so much. I don’t feel like I have found a balance (Victoria).

III. Decade of Arrival in the U.S.

Table 16: Decade of Arrival for Study Collaborators

14 study collaborators (29% of the interview sample)	1960s—1970s
23 study collaborators (48% of the interview sample)	1980s—1990s
11 study collaborators (23% of the interview sample)	2000-2010

Fourteen study collaborators (or 29% of the interview sample) arrived in the U.S. during the 1960s and 1970s during an era of counterculture, culminating in a revolution of social norms. This was an era of increasing self-expression and acknowledgement of civil rights alongside the divisive politics and national outcry brought about by U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. Luca entered the U.S. during this time period, experiencing the vitality of the era and the resulting changes. His wife, for example, was part of the vanguard who experienced the challenges associated with being a female scientist and the changing the social fabric: “She was abused by one of her faculty members, and she switched [career directions] ... that brought her back into art.”

By the end of the 1970s, the combined inflation and unemployment rate known as the misery index had reached almost 20% (*Inflation and CPI Consumer Price Index, 1960-1969*). However, during the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, the economic climate would change. Twenty three study collaborators (or 48% of the interview sample) moved to the U.S. during this time—when the U.S. was moving towards a neoliberal period that included economic liberalization, privatization, free trade, open markets, deregulation, and reductions in government spending in order to enhance the role of the private sector in the economy. The fall of the USSR in the early 1990s only made these economic trends more visible (Kotz, 2003). While economic in nature, however, these trends would eventually affect dimensions of social life, including the increasing gap between rich and poor, the nature of work, the role of big money in politics, the quantity and quality of public services, and the character of family life (Kotz, 2003).

Camille, Nicolas, and Yun all experienced this reality. When Camille came to the U.S. in 1980, she described the quality of the media environment: "... I also liked the fact that the media reflected society in a much more accurate way. I am not saying positive... [but] there was this idea that somehow the media had to respond to all groups within society...." Nicolas described arriving during the Bill Clinton administration, which was an era of economic expansion and the dot-com bubble. Funding opportunities in the sciences were good. Within a few years, some of this funding would start to diminish. Yun described coming to the U.S. during the late 1990s, on the cusp of the 2000s, having been accepted into several universities, but having varied offers for funding.

Eleven study collaborators, or 23% of the interview sample, came during the decade of the 2000s where economically there was a sharp reversal from the previous

long period of prosperity, which culminated in a recession (Shomali and Giblin, 2010). Camille described the widening gap she has started to see: “I must say that also, unfortunately, I see that things have changed ... over the past twenty years.... For instance, I would say power of big organizations; banks seem to me much bigger now. There is less balance between the little people and some powerful groups” A defining moment of this decade was most certainly the events of 9/11 and the subsequent “war of terrorism” in Afghanistan and Iraq. Camille acknowledged that some of her comfort level living in the U.S. has diminished with these events: “...I know that it is a huge change since 2001 and the situation related to 9/11, and subsequently, what happened.” Finally, new technology and social media venues have begun to reshape the social and communications processes. Yun remembered what it was like to communicate with her family before these changes: “I remember the cheapest long distance rate...was like eighty cents to a dollar per minute. You don’t have a Skype type of thing [which she now has and is free—making communication more frequent between families living a part from one another].”

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Forty-three study collaborators (or 90% of the interview sample) arrived in the U.S. as young adults, between the ages of 20-39. This statistic is significant in that it describes a population in the midst of establishing their professional identity in a new country while dealing with the social and economic adjustments normative of adulthood.

Table 17: Study Collaborators & Age at Arrival in the U.S.

2 study collaborators <i>(4% of the interview sample)</i>	Child (0-19 years)
43 study collaborators <i>(90% of the interview sample)</i>	Young Adult (20-39 years)

3 study collaborators <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Adult (40-59 years)
--	---------------------

Regardless of social and political events, study collaborators were in the midst of learning, improving, and building their skills.

Differences, however, were apparent in their reception, dependent on decade of arrival (described above). However, over time, these differences become less stark as study collaborators lived through changing times and events. If they arrived, as Luca did, during economic upheaval, they might experience an ebb and flow in this arena over time, depending on their years in the U.S. Ultimately, the longer they stay, the greater sense they obtain for the flexibilities and the realities of their career positions as they relate to the changing political and social circumstances of the U.S. What makes the situation of the foreign-born unique is that they can critically examine and compare their experiences with others they have had living and working in the U.S. and elsewhere.

IV. Selecting a Graduate School

Thirty-five study collaborators (or 73% of my interview sample) came as graduate students to the U.S. Of those, 22 study collaborators (or 46% of my interview sample) received both a masters degree and doctoral degree in the U.S., and 13 study collaborators (or 27% of my interview sample) either received a doctoral degree or masters degree in the U.S.—but not both. Amit, for example received his masters degree in his country of birth and then came to the U.S. for his PhD. By contrast, Dani completed his masters in the U.S, but then decided to go abroad for his PhD: "...I got into an MA program in Chicago at the University of Illinois in Chicago, lived there for three years, and then moved back to Europe for a year. I did my first year of PhD at the

University of Edinburgh in Scotland.” The rest, 13 study collaborators (or 27% of my interview sample) either came to the U.S. in a post-doctoral position or as already established professionals.

Table 18: Study Collaborators and Career Status Upon Arrival

35 Study Collaborators <i>(73% of the interview sample)</i>	Students
4 Study Collaborators <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Post-Doctoral Positions
9 Study Collaborators <i>(19% of the interview sample)</i>	Established Professor/Professional Positions

In this section, I only noted responses for decisions about graduate school. Since work and social lives were major parts of my study collaborators’ narratives, I treated these aspects as separate factors/variables in order to describe the complexity of this life stage.

Comparisons

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) described their decision-making process to pursue graduate studies in the U.S. comparatively. Two examples include the experience of meeting others like themselves who were living abroad and going to school: “In graduate school [in the U.S.], not everybody, but half of the students were foreign. So immediately, I met people that were from other countries, and we had something in common” (Greg); and finding the best place to pursue graduate education: “...while I think undergraduate work in Europe is a little better than here in the states, graduate education is terrible, and I had this feeling that if I wanted to do serious study on the graduate level, I should probably use this opportunity to move out” (Val). Other comparisons included evaluating the best places to receive funding, differences in application standards and processes, stigmas associated with staying in the same place for both a masters and a doctorate, and individual university benchmarks for

making progress towards a degree. Victoria, for example, found that in her country of birth, benchmarks were achieved through apprenticeship with a more advanced student; whereas in the States, she found the system to be more “horizontal” where everyone, regardless of their seniority, was exposed to the same training.

Other Types of Professional Experience

In addition to these comparisons, 8 study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) also described pairing their degrees with other types of professional experiences (internships, projects, grants, professional certifications, etc.) or with complementary degrees or training in related disciplines or sub-disciplines. Vincent spoke to this breadth of experience that he obtained over 10 years of graduate education: “...it was a beautiful education. Also, it was really intellectual. So, I not only learned science, I also learned philosophy.” He found, for example, that there was much cross-fertilization between science, his chosen field, and theology. Mandisa talked about the range of possibilities. During her PhD program in Europe, she discovered ethnography, a complementary methodological approach, she found, to her communications training.

Social Networks

Finally, 4 study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described how social networks played a key role in determining where they pursued their graduate education: “Connections got me to Urbana and connections got me here [to this University]” (Arjun). Study collaborators also described how their intellectual interests were shaped by these social networks: “...I worked... [at the University in my country of birth] for two years in the philosophy Department where there was a cluster of people doing game theory.” Kamil continued his narrative illustrating how this “cluster of

people” influenced his choice of graduate school in the U.S. by helping him to identify others who were also studying and working with this field.

Luca: Social Networks

Luca attended the same university for both undergraduate and graduate work, eventually obtaining a PhD. For Luca, the decision to stay at the same place was motivated by advisors who were already engaging his academic interests and helping him to develop his intellectual vision: “... [my university] was great; it was just amazing.” At the end of his undergraduate years, Luca felt there was still more he could learn from the people and resources available to him, and he did not feel there was a stigma attached with staying at the same place for his PhD—as different with some university contexts and environments in the U.S.

Camille: Other Types of Professional Experience

Camille had already started a PhD program in her childhood country when she decided to pursue film studies in the United States: “...when I started my PhD in... [the country I grew up in], I said, ‘I’m going to finish my PhD’ [in that country].” Camille wanted to “merge” her two interests with film and literature and decided that the U.S. would be the right environment in which to do so. After she started the program, however, she came to the realization that she was “not an artist,” and she went back to the country where she had spent most of her life and finished her PhD in language and literature. In her case, Camille had two intellectual interests (literature and film) that she concluded were best explored in the social and cultural contexts of two different countries.

Nicolas: Comparisons

Although social networks are what most significantly impacted Nicolas' decision to pursue a PhD in the U.S., this part of his narrative is a statement of fact without much explanation. Nicolas spent more time describing the differences in education between the two countries: "The surprises tend to be in the smaller things.... [the] style of teaching, the fact that not everything went into the final exam.... That was all new...." He ultimately chose to continue pursuing his PhD in the U.S. because these differences interested and challenged him—helping him to reach new heights in his professional development and training.

Yun: Other Types of Professional Experience

Although Yun came to the U.S. to have access to the latest technology in her sphere of interest, she ultimately chose to continue pursuing her studies in the U.S. because she felt she could best contribute to her country of birth through a U.S. education and subsequent experiences, accumulated while living abroad, and because of the kind of professional training and development she was receiving: "I think that it was also my parents and other people, sort of intellectuals...that if eventually you want to go back to... [my country of birth], you should work and have some experience here [in the U.S.] first."

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I find that study collaborators, regardless of what factor they described as being the tipping point for choosing a particular graduate school, also experience the alchemy of time and place. While they weigh the pros and cons of one place over that of another or network to gain access to certain institutions or map the trajectory of their choices through other types of professional experiences, they described

their initial experiences with graduate school as full of unanticipated experiences with other people, with research agendas and projects, with institutional environments, and with surrounding regional identities. These experiences were rich in difference. For example, 31 study collaborators (or 65% of the interview sample) lived in cities upon arrival in the U.S., while 17 study collaborators (or 35% of the interview sample) lived in towns or more rural areas upon arrival in the U.S (see table 19 below for geographic locations). Consequently, they described very different first impressions. While some were energized by the cultural diversity they experience in different cities, for example, others experienced “culture shock” living in a more homogenous small town. Julien remembered his first experiences living in a U.S. Midwest city to be a “culture shock” for someone who had spent his entire life living in an international, cosmopolitan capital city. He had decided on this Midwest location because of an advisor that he wanted to work with, but he never completely adjusted to his new environment.

Table 19: Study Collaborators and First Geographic Location Upon Arrival in the U.S.

24 study collaborators <i>(50% of the interview sample)</i>	East Coast City
3 study collaborators <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Midwest and Southwest City
4 study collaborators <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	West Coast City
9 study collaborators <i>(19% of the interview sample)</i>	East Coast Town
6 study collaborators <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Midwest Town
2 study collaborators <i>(4% of the interview sample)</i>	West Coast Town

While study collaborators often described enjoying the more temperate climate of West Coast City living, they also described the constraints of living in this high cost area. And, those who went to Midwest towns and cities tended to talk more about the extreme cold and the feeling of being an outsider. Those in east coast cities, however, tended to

describe a vast array of diversity surrounding their university experiences. In fact, these initial settlement experiences, as different from study collaborators' carefully weighed out comparisons of different universities and institutions, often become pivotal in the decision making process of whether to stay or go elsewhere.

V. Work Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

Learning the Profession: Work Expectations, Evaluations, Autonomy, & Diversity

Nine study collaborators (or 19% of the interview sample) talked about the characteristics of their early work environments as students and/or in post-doctoral positions. They remembered working long hours, using words such as “all night” and “seven days a week” to describe the intensity of their initiation into academic life. Wendy narrated that this work expectation was not demanded of her but rather modeled for her as she watched other students perform: “Whenever I came to the lab, students offices were open. I always saw students there doing research. I was motivated by them....”

Additionally, they found that independent research abilities were valued along with meeting continual high standards. Ruby remembered how challenging it was to grasp and meet these standards in the beginning: “...you had to write the second year paper which was supposed to be something like a publishable journal [paper]. They [the professors who evaluated me] almost didn't pass that, but they did in the end. Then I was advanced to candidacy.” Also important was the ability to interact with diverse groups of people. In fact, most study collaborators recalled living in neighborhoods where many of the people there were also foreigners like themselves, living abroad and studying. Bruno recalled that in one of his PhD classes, there were 22 students and only 2 were native-

born. As a result, they were not only learning about connections and differences between them and U.S.-born, but they were also doing the same with foreign-born living abroad like themselves but from different geographic locations.

Institutional Environments: Training, Advising Relationships, Peer Support, and Funding

Ten study collaborators (or 21% of the interview sample) narrated that in addition to learning more broadly the academic environment and lifestyle, they were also learning about specific institutional environments and the people who were part of them.

Consequently, they were introduced to different nuances in their professional training and advising experiences. Bai, for example, described the personal relationship she had with her advisor and how she worried that as his graduate student she was not giving him the work results he needed to move forward in his career:

I loved my professor [my advisor] there, but he was an assistant professor. I started working for him. I thought he wasn't fitting in as well either, so in the end he didn't get tenure. It was a very bitter experience because I felt I wasn't doing enough to get him tenure.... [Later] he ended up winning a Nobel prize, so now he's very famous.

By contrast, Alex had little in person contact with his advisor and actually moved across borders during the last stages of his PhD in order to meet with him on a more regular basis. Another aspect of work lives also included peer relationships. Ruby talked about how the members of her cohort supported one another in the midst of tough qualifying exams and professors who “terrified them.”

Finally, 4 study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described living in a continual state of needing money or needing to ask for money. Matías described this reality: “...in the ‘80s, it was -- they paid you very little. So, and especially my boss he would be -- he was very, very stingy. So he gave you the minimum amount of money possible.” Ruby too remembered speaking with the department chair for an extra year of

funding to complete her degree. She said to him: “ ‘You [the department chair] are just so used to having money that you don’t know what it is like not to have any money. If I am going to finish this degree, I can’t afford to do it by myself. I have to have funding.’ And they gave it to me.”

Luca: Work Ethic and Funding

When Luca moved to the U.S. for a post-doctoral position, he described an intense and vital work atmosphere: “...we worked through the night and slept until noon and then came in again; it was a great time.” After two years, he was offered an assistant professor position at the same university, but his job security was dependent on his obtaining yearly grant money. He felt the continued stress of this career lifestyle and decided to search for a position that was salaried by an institution—not by outside funding.

Camille: Professional Development

Camille completed her PhD in her childhood country and then spent several years living between two countries (the U.S. and her childhood one) through studies abroad and work-related activities. While she appreciated “the language, the routine, [and] years and years of daily life” that circumscribed and continues to circumscribe life in her childhood country, she found that the educational system in the U.S. gave her the support to change career directions: “If you want to do something different [in the U.S.], it will take some time, but you will be supported. In the end and you will achieve it. I think this is what makes this particular society or culture really different.”

Nicolas: Professional Development and Funding

After his PhD work, Nicolas decided to continue his professional development in the U.S., looking for and obtaining a post-doctoral position: “I was very excited about the field, and I was very excited about knowing more things. And, I just kept going on the same path.” Like Luca, he was offered a research position when his post-doctoral position ended, and like Luca, this research position was also dependent on outside funding. By then, Nicolas had three children, all born in the U.S. and having money to move and to live in a stable social environment for their school years became increasingly important—spurring Nicolas to consider other career options. Consequently, he began searching for a position that did not require him to bring in part of his salary through grants.

Yun: Professional Development and Advising Relationship

During her training as a PhD student and later in a post-doctoral position Yun recalled learning to “pitch ideas” and put presentations together. She also described the impact of her advising relationship: “I certainly really loved working with my advisor who had played a very important role in my professional development.” Most of all, Yun’s narration focused on the transition between student to professional and the role of peers and advisors in facilitating this process: “...especially in...[my discipline], you are looked after by your advisor.... It’s no longer the case when you are a professional.” Yun described learning to be a professional and the skills she amassed, under the tutelage of her advisor, in order to be independent and professionally recognized in her own right.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I interpret that study collaborators had anxieties associated with transitioning from student life to early professional life as they learn the academic

work environment. And while they may have had varying degrees of interaction with their advisors, they described an apprentice-type learning experience as they become more fully committed to the profession. Different in their narratives is the desire to return to their home countries once they have completed their training overseas. While some narrated ambivalence about returning, almost from the moment they arrive, like Nicolas who was unsure that he could find professional satisfaction in his home country, others are certain of their return when their professional life becomes increasingly grounded in their current geographic location, like Yun who found that the people involved in her training experiences had formed the foundation of her current career path. In fact, when study collaborators finished their education, it is not always so apparent that it will be a seamless transition back to where they originated from as they had begun developing professional ties and affiliations where they were currently located, and these relationships and experiences were not so easily replicated by going back because they had now spent a large part of their professional life away from their countries of birth.

VI. Social Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

Disconnected

Nine study collaborators (or 19% of the interview sample) described their first impressions with U.S. culture and society as disconnected from their experiences with the university itself—often describing two levels of integration 1) work at the university and 2) social life in the larger surrounding society. Val, for example, talked about how the city, where his university was located, was both disconnected from his everyday work reality and also totally unfamiliar to his sense of living a city-life: “I was just kind of disoriented there, and I thought, ‘How am I going to live here?’ Maybe it would be better

to pack up and go....” While Val eventually took the time to become more engaged with the surrounding neighborhood and become part of social settings outside his academic world, he still felt the distinction between both realities (the university and U.S. society).

Finding Connections

Twelve study collaborators (or 25% of the interview sample) described how they began to connect to their social surroundings. One strategy was to find others from their home countries, living in the local area, or to find other foreigners living abroad like themselves but pursuing different career paths. Another strategy was to meet the challenge of interacting with local types of diversity. Isaac, for example, described his affinity for New Orleans and the French Quarter: “I got to know the people, and I fell in love with the people of New Orleans... Black white, yellow, whatever, in fact I was in the African American population before I got introduced to the Caucasian population of the US. I loved every aspect of it....”

Living with roommates was yet another way to get connected. Julia talked about the differences between her first experience in a U.S. university where she could afford to live in a small studio apartment and Berkeley University where her money didn’t go as far and where many students lived with roommates: “And, I know that I am so much happier just living with those three students. It’s not that we’re good friends, but we talk from time to time.... and it was so much more fun just to know that someone else is at home beside you.” Finally, study collaborators also became more connected to U.S. culture and society when they entered a relationship with someone who was U.S.-born.

Practical Matters

Seven study collaborators (or 15% of the interview sample) described dealing with the practicalities of supporting and sustaining themselves while also pursuing a long-term terminal degree or a post-doctoral fellowship. Some practical issues that needed attention included visa statuses and taking care of families. Matías narrated his struggle to earn enough money to take care of his family and how his wife had limited work opportunities because of their visa statuses: “And lets say what we didn’t love was not having money or enough money especially with two kids, and my wife, for many years, she couldn't work because of her visa here. And so, she would do really menial work....” By contrast, Saheed talked about the benefits of graduate funding in a typically high-cost living area: “We had student housing ...for \$300 including utilities. Outside it would be around \$1,500....” Other concerns included completing program requirements while contemplating the best time to start a family: “That’s the only reason really why I spaced them [my children] that far apart because I had to do fieldwork....”

Maintaining Relationships with their Home countries and Other Places of Settlement

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described maintaining relationships and ties with people in their home countries and other places where they had lived. Some of these connections included finding familiar food that reminded them of time spent with their families: “When I came to this country, in Boston, there was not a single Indian restaurant; there was not a single grocery store so that you could not get spices. We used to get them by mail order from a Middle Eastern store in Manhattan” (Amit). Others described writing letters and making phone calls in order to keep lines of communication open. Finally, study collaborators planned visits back home, a few having

to wait several years to do so: “When I was a graduate student, I didn’t go back for eight years. I was doing my graduate school” (Bai).

Luca: Local Connections and Starting a Family

When Luca came to the U.S. in a post-doctoral position, he recalled feeling welcomed by the locals: “Actually, I was so naïve....so, I was walking down the street, with my suitcase, and somebody came up to me and said, ‘You know, it’s kind of dangerous to do that; you need a place to stay?’ I just felt very welcome.” In fact, Luca further described how the local population continually “noticed” the foreign students and “helped them” by renting apartments to them and explaining potentially dangerous behaviors and situations. In addition to this local connection, Luca married a U.S.-born woman and had two children, also U.S.-born.

Camille: Without Children and Safety Concerns

In contrast to Luca, Camille did not marry and have children, and she expressed that this choice gave her a certain amount of independence, without the added complexity of immediate family concerns: “...I was not married. I did not have any children. I can imagine, for women, it becomes a bit more difficult. You have to drag the whole family....” However, she did feel that the U.S. was a “safer place” during her first years as a student as compared to her later years as an established professor amidst a changing socio-political climate: “...2001 was really a disaster -- this safety aspect.... Because in Europe, we had been used to wars and occupation and terrorism for many years.... I really had the idea of the States being this fortress... and this was a big disaster.”

Nicolas: Starting a Family and Socially Disconnected

Nicolas came to the U.S. with his wife, who was also from his country of birth. However, she could not work as she had been used to working because of their visa statuses: “So I was on a J visa, which meant that my wife could be employed although not to maintain us, only to gather funds to improve her own education.” Over the course of his years as a PhD student and later a post-doctoral position, Nicolas had three children, all U.S.-born, and, as a result, he has experienced a deeper connection to U.S. society than when he first arrived because now he had his children’s school connections. He was interacting with teachers and other parents. Yet, he still expressed a social disconnect—that life would be “easier” and more integrated from his perspective “if we [myself and my wife] had extended family here or if we had already friends by the time we had children.” He has missed his extended family and the social structure of his country of birth or, more particularly, the urban center he grew up in. By contrast, he did not express the same kind of disconnect with his work life; in this arena, he expressed continued satisfaction in meeting his research goals and in interacting with other researchers who he could dialogue with about his research questions. In this sense, he compartmentalized his social life from his work life.

Yun: Maintaining Relationships with People Back Home

While Yun was used to living away from home as a small child, going to school, it was a culture shock to be so far away from her parents and extended family. She had been used to having them close by, even when she attended university as a college student, which gave her a sense of security: “I was born and raised in...[the same capital city] and my college was also in...[this capital city]. So even though I was in the dorm, I was not too far away from home and my parents.” Additionally, she entered the U.S.

before Skype and other Internet services that made communication easier and more frequent with people all over the world. As a student, she remembered having to pay almost eighty cents to a dollar per minute to talk with her family. However, while a PhD student, she reconnected with her now husband, who is also from her country of birth and who had met Yun when they were college students there.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

I found that study collaborators described a difference between their work lives and their social lives. They tended to first learn and understand what was expected of them as academics and how to conduct themselves as career professionals. They expressed, however, challenges and difficulties integrating and/or acculturating to life outside of work, which they experienced through their social lives. Study collaborators varied in their responses—ranging from admiration of different social and cultural frameworks, like Camille, to frustration and personal loss, feeling socially isolated, like Nicolas. While having children who were born in the U.S. and being in a relationship with a U.S.-born partner made a significant difference, these experiences did not always lead to a strong sense of attachment or belonging to the U.S. At this stage in the life course, study collaborators expressed looking for some level of social and cultural confidence that they could balance with their work lives. In the process, they sometimes recreated a world left behind, making it less necessary to form strong attachments with U.S. society. Regardless of what strategy they eventually arrived at, however, at this point, they described exploring and discovering what possibilities exist.

VII. Assessing the U.S. in the Student or Post-Doctoral Stage

Comparing Perceptions

Thirteen study collaborators (or 27% of my interview sample) compared their perceptions about the U.S. with their actual experiences. Thirty-nine (or 81% of the interview sample) came to the U.S. as students or in post-doctoral positions. The result is that many were entering the U.S. for the first time, in their early twenties, and were comparing what they had heard about the U.S. from others and what they had seen about the U.S. through media coverage with their actual experiences once in the country. Val, for example, found that learning the university culture in the U.S. was a smoother transition than learning and living with the everyday habits, norms and practices, of U.S. society: “It’s much easier to figure out how to deliver an academic paper or how to do some conventional thing, that is conventional for everyone, but habits, everyday things, that is hard.”

In general, study collaborators were prepared to adapt to U.S. university culture, but other aspects of their daily interactions often surprised them. Saeed spoke about his admiration of U.S. higher education but of the negative feelings for U.S. politics that had influenced him in his home country. As a result, he was surprised by his reception at the airport. Saheed recalled that it took between 3 and 4 hours to get through customs, and he had put his daughter on his shoulders while they were waiting. A police officer approached him and took him to the front of the line and told customs that they didn’t need to check Saheed’s bags. While he did not comment on his political opinions, Saheed did express that he was not perceived as negatively as he had expected.

The most talked about aspect of study collaborators’ initial involvement with U.S. culture was after their return home, after a few months or sometimes a few years: “The

thing that happens is that first time you have been away from your home country and then [when] you go back, you see things that you have never seen before in your own country” (Amit). They were surprised at how much their perceptions had shifted and/or expanded.

Comparing U.S. University Standards and Expectations

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) made comparisons regarding U.S. university standards and expectations. Some differences included more course work, closer advising relationships and benchmarks within the process of research and writing a dissertation. They also commented on the wider-range of opportunities that were given to them and the accompanying independence. Marie, for example, spoke about an internship with National Parks where even though she was there for only a short period of time, her supervisors gave her professional training and experience regardless of the immediate benefit to the organization: “They offered me opportunities like getting trained as a firefighter which is a very prestigious training opportunity.... If I—the lowly intern—had a good idea they were more than willing to listen to it, and implement it for that matter and tell everybody that it was my idea.”

Comparing Cultural Norms

Six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) compared different cultural expectations such as gender norms, independence, and social interactions. Connor, for example, talked about how he and his wife attended church and had to learn more “traditional” gender roles in order to feel comfortable in that environment. And, Ruby described her frustration with social interactions, specifically with Americans and their sense of politeness, which she thought often comes across as insincerity:

‘Have a nice day’ didn’t mean have a nice day. ‘How are you?’ was not a genuine question. I found this really jarring. I could not figure out why

you couldn't just have a conversation with someone and that people just weren't really interested in you; they said these things and they were meaningless.

Luca: University Standards and Expectations

In addition to his perception of being “welcomed,” Luca also found his post-doctoral environment to be invigorating. As a child, Luca had spent long hours with his father, learning carpentry and other apprentice-like skills. With this perspective in mind, he likened the U.S. to a “drill press”—a place that supported a strong work ethic and enjoyed the subsequent results.

Camille: Perceptions and Cultural Norms

Camille appreciated some of the social possibilities that she perceived the U.S. had to offer, such as a less hierarchal professional structure and the ability to more easily change career directions later in life. She also really liked the culture of West Coast city living: “It’s more artistic; it’s more relaxed, and there is a sense of... People are enjoying life a bit more. They are less stressed.”

Nicolas: University Standards and Expectations and Cultural Norms

Nicolas was prepared to encounter changes in teaching and classroom expectations; however, he recalled that it was other differences that initially surprised him. He was surprised that so much social interaction, for example, happened within a religious setting: “I am completely a nonreligious person and my wife is not particularly religious either. So we are not part of a church group or anything like that. I don’t know if you have noticed, but many social interactions in the U.S. happen in that type of environment.” Additionally, he recalled being surprised by living conditions and how people separated space: “...what they were calling apartments [where I went to school in

the U.S.]...were really a floor in a [single family] house....What we call an apartment [in my country of birth]...would be what you call a condominium here in a big apartment block.”

Yun: University Standards and Expectations

Reflecting on her experiences as a PhD student in the U.S., Yun found that the rigorous academic training in her country of birth played a significant role in preparing her to become a professor; however, she felt the professional training she had access to in the U.S. really gave her the kind of career satisfaction she was seeking: “I know I cannot be where I am without the foundation [of my past educational experiences], but I also know I cannot be where I am if I don’t have this professional training [in the U.S.]. For Yun, she found that the apprentice-like professional training she received was different than what she would have experienced had she stayed and studied in her country of birth.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

In crossing national borders, I found that study collaborators described what they liked and what they did not like as they compared their new experiences with their past ones. Most found some aspect of U.S. academia to possess a characteristic that they found favorable and beneficial to their career trajectories. More complex and varied were their comparisons concerning U.S. culture and perceptions about U.S. society. Because they had experienced more than one social and cultural framework(s), they often had a unique vantage point for presenting the strengths and weaknesses of their new environment. Consequently, they tended to segment their experiences into two fields: those at the university, which they often found exceeded their expectations, and those in the surrounding residential neighborhoods, which evoked a wide range of responses.

Ultimately, how they reconciled what they discover was a highly individualized experience.

VIII. Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate

Learning different registers and places

Five study collaborators (or 10% of the interview sample) described the process of learning societal and cultural references. More specifically, they perceived two very different cultural registers that had to be acquired: that of academia and that of the cultural geography of their place of residence. Charlotte, from a European country, explained that while she understood the language, the linguistic register and cultural temperaments were more difficult to infer: "...in the U.S., I came across as very diffident and very reserved and very kind of I don't know quiet."

Learning about Universities

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described their surprise in learning about U.S. university rankings and professional networks as well how application processes operated. They expressed how they might have made different initial choices had they known more about the system, and they believed they often had to overcome a steep-learning curve. Matteo, for example, was accepted into Cornell, Catholic University, and MIT. He ultimately decided to attend Catholic University because he would be close to family living nearby, and he liked the DC metropolitan area: "So if you look at it in the context of an American citizen, you would have gone to MIT in a heartbeat, but I didn't have that concept." Likewise, Kamil talked about his initial decision to accept a fellowship at Harvard, but once he visited the University of

Chicago, he realized that there was a better social network and research concentration for his area of interest: “And, even though I accepted at some point a fellowship from Harvard, when I went to Chicago, it sort of became obviously clear to me that I made a mistake.” Kamil’s story exemplifies how study collaborators had to learn about different factors when considering and selecting a university. Rank is important but so too is where scholars and programs are located and the networks available to them that correlate with research interests.

Learning about their Discipline

Six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) also described learning about their discipline, much like any PhD student or new professional in the field. They were learning the kinds of questions to ask, the norms and practices, how to write-up research results, and how other disciplines interact with theirs. Bruno said, “What was very tough was when the time to do research came, and that’s what separates economics from other disciplines.... We usually try to answer smaller questions in order to shed some light on the bigger ones.” Likewise, Marie described how the study of geography interfaces with the world: “We live in space. We just don’t get out of that. So, you can literally study absolutely anything and its relationship to space.”

Learning About Research

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described learning about new research directions and research networks. Connor still remembered what an exciting time it was for him when he started to understand and become part of a research network: “So, I did a lot of field work in Florida, and I started to really get integrated into the American professional societies...and become familiar with American funding agencies,

NACF and NIH....So it's climb up the steep learning curb...." Similarly, Mandisa related her discovery of ethnographic research while in a communications program. While her PhD experience was not in the U.S., her narrative highlighted that this process of discovery is not so different for students elsewhere, regardless of where they are educated:

I fell in love with ethnography with anthropological research, with ethnographic research, living in a community, getting to know the women in the community, asking them questions about meaning making.

Learning about Themselves

Finally, 7 study collaborators (or 15% of the interview sample) often narrated this time in their lives as one of discovery—in better understanding themselves. After working with nuclear power plants and different aspects of engineering, Matteo was confident that he could design an experimental project: “And they wanted to build this power plant and they didn't have a clue whatsoever, so I said okay I'll design it for you.... So we were trying to make electricity out of hot water, and it had to be done in Arkansas of all places.” This work solidified for Matteo that he needed new challenges in his research or he tires of the work. Throughout his career, he has sought new challenges that sometimes require learning new material.

Luca: Learning about Their Discipline

Luca's time as a post-doctoral fellow broadened his understanding of his own discipline: “It was a time of discovery.” What he learned there about the VDAC channel influenced, by his own account, the next 25 years of his career.

Camille: Learning about Themselves

Camille described the process of self-realization that occurred as a graduate student in film in Los Angeles. A fellow student committed suicide, someone who she

thought was the most talented of everyone there: "... they [artists] have a special way of looking at the world.... most of us didn't have this. We were just happy kids working there with a comfortable life.... So, it doesn't mean that it is the end of the world. It just means that, well, there are other things we can do."

Nicolas: Learning Different Registers and Places

Nicolas expressed his surprise at different kinds of social interactions he experienced outside of the university. When he started making plans with his children's friends parents, for example, he found that social interactions needed more planning than he was used to: "Here, it's very impolite not to call somebody to say essentially whatever your plans are. It's a little bit of a chore too -- distances are larger -- so it's a little bit of chore to get people in a car and then you need to meet somewhere at some place just to be there and then come back."

Yun: Learning About Themselves

Yun learned that she benefitted and enjoyed her international networking and learning from a broader circle of people about her research and interests. She enjoyed the diverse perspective. This realization was something she guessed before leaving her country of birth but more fully embraced through her long-term experiences in the U.S.: "I also know that I would not be where I am now and to be reasonable successful in my own profession and career—to be working in the frontier of the technology in my field and be able to really have some international recognition and [social] networking if I did not come out."

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I interpret that study collaborators reflected and narrated more about adjusting to their university lives and the accompanying expectations for their work. Four of the 5 primary learning themes reflect this interpretation: Learning about Universities, Learning about Their Discipline, Learning about Research, Learning about Themselves. When they talked about their social lives (Learning about Different Registers and Places), they described another sphere of adjustment—that from their perspective had the potential to be more difficult to adjust to and/or sometimes less satisfying than their university lives.

Differences between study collaborators were more directly related to their geographic locations and the types of social interactions they were exposed to as well as understanding the larger context of university rankings and standards in conjunction with types of advisors and research networks that intersected with their work interests. Altogether, study collaborators were learning about their chosen fields of study while also learning about new social arenas and academic aspects that they hadn't experienced before—a steep learning curve indeed.

IX. Summary of Findings

Major Similarities Between Study Collaborators

- (58%) Lived abroad for the first time when they came to the U.S.
- (42%) Lived other places abroad before coming to the U.S.

Study collaborators chose migration as a strategy to obtain something that they are unable to access in their current geographic locations.

While study collaborators consistently described the U.S. as a place that has a reputation for excellence in higher education, it is not, however, always the first choice for migration, and is, in fact, often one possibility among an array of choices, when evaluating the many circumstances that circumscribe their personal and professional lives.

- (83%) Described moving to the U.S. as a means for gaining professional experience

Like native born, they too grapple with finding routines and habits that unify the social, cultural and professional dimensions of their circumstances. After their initial settlement, what keeps this group rooted in the U.S. is a continual reevaluation of these dimensions and how satisfying they are to their individual well-being.

- (48%) Moved to the U.S. between 1980-2000--when the U.S. was moving towards a neoliberal period.
- (90%) Were between the ages 20-39 when arriving in the U.S.

This statistic is significant in that it describes a population in the midst of establishing their professional identity in a new country while dealing with the social and economic adjustments normative of adulthood.

- (81%) Were graduate or PhD students or in post-doctoral positions when they arrived in the U.S.

While study collaborators anticipated what their initial experiences in the U.S. would be like with regards to their training and future career plans, they described their initial experiences with graduate school as full of unanticipated

experiences with other people, with research agendas and projects, with institutional environments, and with surrounding regional identities.

- (65%) Lived in urban environments (cities) upon first arrival in the U.S.

I found that study collaborators described a difference between their work lives and their social lives. They tended to first learn and understand what was expected of them as academics and how to conduct themselves as career professionals.

They expressed, however, challenges and difficulties integrating and/or acculturating to life outside of work, which they experienced through their social lives.

Major Differences Between Study Collaborators

- In addition to gaining some type of professional experience, other reasons for coming to the United States are varied (Exploring different ways of being in the world and different career options, Meeting intellectual challenges and solving them, Influencing research agendas on a global scale, and escaping political and social circumstances).
- Education – there is no consensus for choosing a graduate school. Rather study collaborators' choices intersect with a variety of factors both in their countries of birth and their individual research interests and career aspirations.

While study collaborators had varying degrees of interaction with their advisors, they tended to describe an apprentice-type learning experience as they become more fully committed to the profession.

- Social experiences were assorted in how study collaborators connected life outside the university setting.

- Learning as a student or post-doctoral fellow had many different facets

As expected the intangible issues are the hardest to define and understand. A decision may be made to move or attend a certain school or connect with others, but the internal motivations guiding these selections and choices can cross a broad spectrum. Different in study collaborators' narratives is the desire to return to their home countries once they have completed their training overseas. In fact, when study collaborators finished their education, it is not always so apparent that it will be a seamless transition back to where they originated from as they had begun developing professional ties and affiliations where they were currently located, and these relationships and experiences were not so easily replicated by going back because they had now spent a large part of their professional life away from their countries of birth.

At this stage in the life course, study collaborators expressed looking for some level of social and cultural confidence that they could balance with their work lives. In the process, they sometimes recreated a world left behind, making it less necessary to form strong attachments with U.S. society. Regardless of what incorporation strategy they eventually arrived at, however, at this point, they described exploring and discovering what possibilities exist.

Most found some aspect of U.S. academia to possess a characteristic that they found favorable and beneficial to their career trajectories. More complex and varied were their comparisons concerning U.S. culture and perceptions about U.S. society. Because they had experienced more than one social and cultural framework(s), they often had a

unique vantage point for presenting the strengths and weaknesses of their new environment.

This analysis continues in Chapter 6 with a look at study collaborators' life courses and career trajectories as they mature in their careers and life choices.

Chapter 6: Adulthood & Being Professors

In Chapter 6, I have reached the most current life stage and accompanying career trajectories with my study collaborators as they inhabit what I label as “Adulthood.” For the purposes of this study, adulthood usually encompasses the years after entering into a career in academia as a professor or another professional sector and follows study collaborators as they progress through promotion stages within academia. Adulthood is also characterized by a period of optimum mental functioning when individuals’ intellectual, emotional, and social capabilities are at their peak to meet the demands of career, relationships, and children. Consequently, along with variables such as relationship status, having children, current legal status, years living in the U.S., geographic locations lived in the U.S., and age at the time of interview, my analysis of the 48 interviews also attempts to interpret correspondingly more intangible life experiences, including: choosing to make a career at the university, reasons for leaving the U.S., choosing to stay in the U.S., work life as a professional/professor, social life as a professional/professor, assessing the U.S. as a professional/professor, learning the U.S. as a professional/professor, and personal identifications. The analysis that follows builds upon similarities and differences found among my study collaborators.

I. Choosing to Make a Career at the University

Discovering the University as a Career Option

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) narrated how they came across academia as a career option. Mandisa considered the profession since childhood: “When I was growing up, when I was in middle school, my father asked me

what I wanted to do, and I said, I have four different jobs I would like to do. I can be an air hostess; I can be a pediatrician; I can be a television anchorwoman; and I can be a university professor.” By contrast, Matteo discovered the profession later in life. He had worked in industry for several years before being offered an assistant professorship, a position he hadn’t even applied for but found he enjoyed nonetheless: “So in ’81...they [the department chair and university administration] offered me this job..., so I came here and I started teaching and....so I'd quit the company that I was working with at that point.”

Evaluating Characteristics of Different Career Paths

Eight study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) discussed choosing a career in academia later in life after assessing other potential career niches. Ashok, for example, left an industry job because he wanted more intellectually challenging work: “Honeywell had set up a product development team in Minneapolis....[But,] I didn’t want to join Bell Labs because I thought that I would be so comfortable at Bell Labs that I wouldn’t do anything more exciting.”

The University as a Natural Choice

On a more pragmatic level, 6 professors, or 13% of the interview sample said they chose academia because their professional development in graduate school naturally led to this choice. For example, Greg described his career path as organic, one step leading to another: “So after you get your PhD, the standard thing is to try to get some postdoctoral position. So you apply for a job. ...And then after that, you try for some sort of tenure track position....” For Greg, his career path followed this straight-line trajectory.

Luca: Evaluating Characteristics of Different Career Paths

Luca spent several years working in a university medical school setting and found that he liked the intellectual stimulation of university life but that he enjoyed the variety of disciplines found in a liberal arts university setting where people from different disciplines interacted and informed one another: “There are pros and cons. In med school, you tend to have people focused in a particular area, and that’s great. But I enjoy the breadth of knowledge the university gives....” Additionally, Luca knew he wanted a career position that was not dependent on him obtaining grant funding.

Camille: The University as a Career Option

Camille described the independence and autonomy within the academic profession—one that she came to discover later in life: “At forty, I had gone through several jobs, and I said to myself, ‘Well, what is the job where you don’t have a boss?’.... A job I don’t have to go nine to five...and I can sometimes be at home, with a constant focus on certain things, a job where I can travel.” Camille found that the world of academia was the career “fit” she had been seeking.

Nicolas: The University as a Natural Choice

Over time, Nicolas realized that he was seeking a research career over that of an administrative one. This realization stimulated his migration to the U.S. to pursue a PhD. Upon finishing, the natural next step was to look for a post-doctoral position. From there, Nicolas described a progression, where one decision led to another—each bringing him closer to the professoriate: “So it was very clear to me that I wouldn’t be a good researcher or a very competitive researcher if I just took whatever I got from grad school and went back [to my country of birth].” Instead, Nicolas took his training and followed the traditional course of advancement into a university position.

Yun: The University as a Career Option

Yun had considered a career in academia since she was a child. She narrated that her motivation then was to win the Nobel Prize. She described that in the mid 1980s', there were only three people who had won the Nobel Prize from her country, and they all had come to the U.S. and become citizens. Eventually, Yun did win a prize in middle school for her computer and science skills, and a reporter came to interview her. Yun described their interaction: "When the reporter came to interview....she asked what I want to be when I grew up, and I said exactly what I had told my father [that I wanted to be a scientist and win the Nobel Prize]."

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Twenty-five study collaborators (or 52% of the interview sample) described why they chose academia as a profession.²⁰ From this qualitative information, I interpret two important factors that are linked to these study collaborators' career choices. First, they develop a skill set that could be used in a variety of settings (medicine, human resources, government, industry, etc.), and second, they are often looking to use this skill set in a work environment that affords both intellectual stimulation and independence. Positive career attractors also include opportunities for teaching, studying, and travelling. The main difference between study collaborators' narratives appears to be when they decide to pursue an academic profession—either as a young adult or later in life after years of experiencing other types of career choices.

II. Reason for Leaving the U.S.

²⁰ Twenty-five out of 48 were explicit in why they chose the profession while the other 23 spoke about their decision in more tacit and implicit ways.

After coming to the U.S. for a period of time, 10 study collaborators (or 21% of the interview sample) left the U.S, either 1) to return home, to their countries of birth (4 study collaborators), 2) to gain more professional experience elsewhere (1 study collaborators), 3) to explore other places (2 study collaborators), or 4) to maintain a relationship (3 study collaborators). Jonathan, for example, returned to his country of birth because the economy was good, and he could get job: “I was offered an opportunity to go and teach back in Costa Rica, so I went back for three or four years. I opened my own practice there.” By contrast, Kamil returned to his home country because the political situation stabilized: “And we were in the States actually when Solidarity broke out in the summer of 1980, and the moment I heard the news that it's happening, we went back immediately.... we came back, and we participated in building the whole thing.” In both cases, study collaborators were also nostalgic, anticipating what a return “home” would mean.

Not all study collaborators, however, left the U.S. to return to their countries of birth. Dani, for example, left the U.S. after obtaining his masters degree because he was curious to see new places: “I was tired of the U.S. and life in the U.S., and I wanted to try something different. And that program was one of the best at the time in Edinburgh.... and I was always intrigued about Scotland and life there....” By contrast, Simon did not express boredom but rather a desire to expand his professional training and development—leaving the U.S. because he was offered a post-doctoral position at a premiere institute: “...I also got a post-doctoral position at the Max Planck Institute in Bonn, Germany.” He described pursuing the research in his field with the top scholars—wherever that took him.

Finally, study collaborators moved to different countries because of a personal relationship. Andreas, for example, married another academic, and they both found work at a university outside of the U.S.: “And so, I was looking for a job here, and I couldn’t find anything. I gave myself a year, I think, and after that, we decided to go England.... And so, we did that for eight years.” Likewise, Ruby said, “I got a tenure track job at...[another University outside of the U.S.], so we solved the two body problem....”

Luca: Considered Returning to Country of Birth

Although Luca never left the United States to live elsewhere for a period of time, he did consider, at one point, returning to his country of birth. However, he found that the lifestyle there would no longer suit him. He explained that he enjoyed “doing things for himself” and was not certain that he would find the desire “to progress and discover” in returning to his country of birth: “I’ve been back to...[my country of birth] and there is a lot of beauty. People always rave over...[my country of birth], but the mindset [there]...not just to live and to have beautiful surroundings...[I need the mindset] to progress, to discover....”

Camille: Return to Childhood Country

By contrast, Camille did return to her childhood country: “I went back because I had always assumed I would be going to the States to complete my studies and then go back to...[my childhood country]. Since then, however, Camille has spent over twenty years going back and forth between her childhood country and the U.S. with long-term stays in Boston, Massachusetts and San Francisco, California: “... every time ... I went back, [I] found something to do here. And after a while, my contract would end, so I would go back to...[my childhood country].”

Nicolas: Gain Professional Experience & Relationship from Country of Birth

Nicolas married someone from his country of birth, bringing a little bit of “home” with him when he traveled to the U.S. by keeping some of his language and customs present through their shared life together. After finishing his PhD, however, Nicolas decided to pursue more professional experiences in the U.S. (post-doctorate position, research position, and assistant professor position). While he and his wife, and now three children, have visited his country of birth each year for the holidays, he still expressed that something is always missing: “It doesn’t mean that I don’t feel comfortable here or there. It just means that when I am here, I miss something that’s there. When I am there, I miss something that is from here.”

Yun: Gain Professional Experience & Relationship from Country of Birth

Yun always planned to return to her country of birth; however, like Nicolas, she wanted to gain more professional experience by taking advantage of the opportunities that the U.S. had to offer: “I would say that with or without a stage clearly labeled as post doctoral study, there is a post doctoral period where you have to learn to do the job, learn to establish yourself, learn to transition from that student mode to the professional.” In addition, Yun met someone from her country of birth, married, and now has two children who are U.S-born—one who needs constant medical attention and who Yun perceived would not thrive as well if she were to return with her him and her family to her country of birth.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I interpret that study collaborators think of returning home as a way to bring their professional experiences to bear on their countries of birth. However,

how they choose to construct that relationship varies—providing alternative models for how one participates and understands different national and regional contexts. While Luca has visited other places, he described a “rooted” existence in the U.S. By contrast, Nicolas and Camille have moved more regularly between two national contexts. And, Yun has gradually begun thinking of shifting her initial goal of return to permanent stay, becoming less of a visitor here and more of one to her country of birth. For all, their cultural production is about finding and defining their social fields – one(s) that operate with their long-term goals and daily lifestyles.

III. Choosing to Stay in the U.S.

Professional Opportunities

Sixteen study collaborators (or 33% of the interview sample) chose to stay in the U.S. or return to the U.S. because of professional opportunities that included competing in an open job market, opportunities for funding and applying for grants, access to resources and academic specialties, development of social networks, opportunities for professional training, and the possibility of achieving tenure. Ivan narrated developing his professional network in the U.S. during his years in graduate school and the difficulties in using that network to obtain a career in his home country primarily because he had not studied there long enough to develop a similar network: “In the American system, it was much more easy for me to get a job, or at least much more straightforward and less political.” Likewise, Wendy found that the job market in her country of birth was extremely competitive: “...so much competition and so many people started to go back to [my country of birth] to get a job.... If I went back....I could not easily find a job, and I

think if I went back now to find a job, I would need to go through competitive interviews; it would be really hard.”

Even when the possibility of obtaining jobs in their countries of birth were possible, access to resources became a concern. Sean spoke about his country’s initiative to reverse brain drain but that the policy came at a time in his career when he had already become established: “Shortly after I got my position...[my country of birth] started a program to reverse the brain drain because they were worried....I wasn’t about to leave so suddenly; plus there’s more resources fundamentally in the United States than in...[my country of birth].”

Getting tenure also factored into study collaborators’ decisions to remain in the U.S. Mandisa spoke about the process of evaluation and the stress associated with how “prolific” and “productive” one has to be: “...it’s always how other people are going to look at your work and how they are going to evaluate it.” At the time of our interview, Mandisa was planning on applying for citizenship in a few years after she makes her application for tenure and receives the results.

Family

Fourteen study collaborators (or 29% of the interview sample) described family situations factoring into their decision to stay long-term. For example, Victoria married someone from the U.S.: “I met my ex-husband who was a professor at Georgia Tech. I eventually got married to him in 1987; then, I moved to Atlanta, where I lived for five years.” Additionally, if spouses had good career opportunities in the U.S., this dual career satisfaction impacted their decisions. Isaac described how his wife’s career “took off” at about the same time his career was advancing, making it easier to choose a long-term stay

in the U.S. over taking his wife and his growing family back to his country of birth:

“...and then things were so much more attractive here. My wife had a career that was taking off and my career was taking off. And it didn’t make sense to leave it all just to go... [back to my country of birth.]. That’s how we decided to stay.”

Children also played a role in long-term decisions to stay. Study collaborators were more likely to stay in the U.S. if their adult children had either 1) moved to the U.S., “I mean, our two children and their respective partners live in New York City, and I don’t think wild horses would get them to leave New York. So, we’ll probably stay here for that reason” (Graham), or had 2) been born and thus enculturated in the U.S, “...it would be very well possible to stay here. And my children are also more at home here than I am” (Jan).

Lifestyle and Values in U.S. Society

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) spoke about values or ideational systems such as the “American lifestyle” and the ability to express oneself, issues related to gender and social equality, support in the work environment, and learning from everyone, not just the experts in the field. William, for example, liked the values supporting the *No Child Left Behind Act* – which placed emphasis on learning and growth over time, in addition to helping students reach high standards. He described the difference between how his developmental or remedial child was segregated from the rest of the student population in his country of birth, placed in a separate school entirely, versus how his child was integrated into the classroom in the U.S. with various kinds of students: “...if you have a slow developing child [in my home country], it is an awkward one [situation]....then they have that division imposed upon you to either go to this

school or to that school. And, that's not very nice....” Dani described liking the fast-paced and busy lifestyle that he associated with his years in the U.S.—a belief in production that motivated people: “I came back to the U.S. because once I guess you live in this country and kind of get used to the lifestyle and the way in which things are done...[the lifestyle pace is] too slow I guess [in some of the other places I have lived].” And, Victoria found, for example, that there are “two kinds of Americans,” one who has “hardly gone out in the real world and doesn't speak any other languages” and then one who “goes all over the place and is totally cosmopolitan.” In general, study collaborators indicated from their interviews that they resonated more with the latter type of American.

State Politics and Policies

Three study collaborators (or 6% of the interview sample) found the U.S. was often a desired geographic location because of negative treatment in another country. Ruby described her experience of living in Quebec when the referendum to secede from the rest of Canada occurred: “...for about two weeks after the referendum, if you were on public transportation you could hear a pin drop; no one was going to let it be known what their first natural language was. It was really ugly...and we looked at going back to the States.”

Ability to Support Themselves and Their Families

Three study collaborators (or 6% of the interview sample) narrated that the U.S. was a place where you could support yourself with one position. Diego, for example, described having to work at three different employment locations in his country of birth in order to support himself and his family: “It's hard to have a research agenda because you're splintered in very different types of projects because you need to make a full

salary and you make it in pieces. And not all those pieces are part of the same project.”

The U.S. was a place where Diego could be financially secure and find the research focus he desired.

A Good Work Location

Fourteen study collaborators (or 29% of the interview sample) described the many dimensions of location that factored into their decision-making processes for long-term stays. Geographic location was often important in terms of being an east or west coast city and near other research organizations. After living several years on the west coast, Alex, for example, found that an east coast city was a better choice for him because of travel back to his country of birth and because of his proximity to research organizations that were important to his work: “Scientifically, my contacts are predominantly in Europe and not in Asia, outside of this country, and I have family in...[my country of birth]. So, traveling from Californian was a mess, so the migration to the east coast was natural....”

On a more spiritual or emotional plane, Amit narrated that the U.S., in particular the geographic location of his university, was the place where he could accomplish his goals and be the kind of person he wanted to be. For ten years, he contemplated “packing up and leaving.” Then, after taking a sabbatical where he went back to his country of birth for five months, he found that where he “fit” and where he could “help” his country of birth was here in the U.S.: “And what I found was that I...[could help my country of birth] much better by building a good strong group here [in the U.S.] than in going back there.” Anthony too talks about his desire to help and finding a way to do this in the U.S.—through cultivating and nurturing international conversations on religious differences.

This country [the U.S.] has gone through four hundred years of slavery and genocide as far as the native Americans are concerned; I am not wanting to say this is alright, but still, it is the only place in the world that we can all work together. If you go out in the street here and ask: ‘What’s your religion? What’s your religion? and What’s your religion?’ [you will find a diversity of responses] You have the world here.

Luca: Family, Lifestyle and Values, and State Politics and Policies

In addition to his U.S. born wife and children and his preference for a U.S. lifestyle/value of “work” and “progress,” Luca also mentioned state politics and policies that factored into his decision to stay long-term: “I liked the United States and there were difficulties in...[my childhood country] with the separatist movement, so I applied for citizenship. And, being a scientist, I was able to be competitive, and I was accepted.”

Camille: Lifestyle and Values

Throughout her interview, Camille described the evaluation process between here and there, taking more than twenty years to decide to settle in the U.S. more permanently. She eventually determined that the economic means, the professional opportunities, and the resources made moving preferable although not at the exclusion of her childhood country. She has property there and returns over the summer and during holiday breaks: “[I was] Not happy [with my life in my childhood country].... Many aspects, not just one thing. I could compare and say, ‘what is the best system for me?’

Nicolas: Family and Children and Professional Opportunities

Nicolas explained that his children feel connected to American society, having been born here, and that, in addition, he has had opportunities for career development and advancement in his field. Yet, he still has wanted to inhabit the “comfort” of familiar relationships that he has yet to wholly experience in the U.S. While acknowledging that his long-term intention is to stay in the U.S., he does not dismiss the notion of moving

abroad entirely: “An attractive job in South America would be attractive... I think what we [myself and my family] have works.... It could be better but.... On the other hand, there is no reason for not moving...if I think it would be a better place or it would have a long-term value.”

Yun: A Good Work Location

While Yun acknowledged that her motivation for coming to the U.S. was for professional training and development, she has continued to stay in large part because of the medical resources available to her in her current location. Her son has medical issues that would be potentially difficult to treat in her country of birth: “My son had some medical issues that would require...professional or systematic medical care....we need to know that it’s available [in my country of birth] if he were to ever need that. The medical practice and resources...are really not comparable to here [this geographic location].” However, another motivating factor in choosing to stay has also been the professional position she currently holds, which continues to give her access to the technology that animates her work.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Ultimately, choosing to stay in the U.S. is about a variety of factors—often connected to work opportunities—where one can function in the best possible way. However, my interpretation of the findings is that there is a difference between those study collaborators who would choose more broadly the U.S. and those who would choose more specifically a distinct university and geographic location within the U.S. The former group described choices that were more limited in scope, i.e. not necessarily expressing that it would be so easy to return to their countries of birth and find the career

satisfaction they are seeking, while the latter group tended to describe a wider array of choices, i.e. having the ability to be more selective between a variety of places and institutions that would be a potential “fit” for their personal and professional lifestyles.

IV. Work as a Professional/Professor

Expected Behavior

Fifteen study collaborators (or 31% of the interview sample) described their profession as a way of life, a career or vocation that is all consuming. Greg described how his profession circumscribed his life: “It's 24 hours. I mean you cannot just say that you work 9:00 to 5:00 and then go back home. It's something that's really consuming, and it's really a passion.” Dani emphasized too the prolific amount of hours that he dedicates to his career, his way of life—as different from the hours required to commit to a job that one leaves at the end of the day: “So 80, 90 hours per week are spent doing things related to your profession. So I guess it does become a type of center of your life.” And, Ashok expressed that he does not wish to retire: “So, I will be 70 this June, and I am still here more often than most of my younger colleagues are. I am spending more time here than most of them are”

In addition to their work dedication, 6 study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) expressed that they embraced other characteristics of their work lifestyles such as solitude and engaging with diversity. Val described that part of his work satisfaction comes from the fact that he enjoys being alone: “I enjoy kind of being left alone, having a certain degree of solitude, and also being able to work--not to be completely consumed in certain everyday things.” Bai enjoyed too contributing and being part of a diverse environment: “The University...is a very diverse, large international

community; there's a lot of women in my department. Our chair is a woman. So we have a lot of Asian faculty in my department, and so I feel a part of it, mixed in."

Institutional Environments

However, while there was much in their narratives to suggest that academia was a positive career choice, 6 study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) did mention the stress derived from negotiation—meaning they had to maneuver through administrative politics, disciplinary boundaries, and perceptions about who they are as scholars and their accompanying motives and research agendas. Kamil, for example, talked about his interests in game theory that took him beyond disciplinary walls. He found that while he could attach himself to several disciplines, he needed to find one to call his "home." Otherwise, he risked being isolated and without university resources:

In this tribal world of academia, you have economists and you have sociologists and you have political scientists, and one tribe looks down on another tribe. And this other tribe looks down on the third one and so on; those are pecking on you. The borders are not penetrable really. I mean for someone to have the joint appointment say between economics and sociology or economics and political science is essentially unheard of, and if it is a joint appointment, then it is an economist who agrees to be listed as faculty...but never the other way around. So if you have multiple identities, then the end result is that no discipline really claims you.

Kamil has found a way to embrace the porousness of intellectual boundaries vis-à-vis the constraints of a university organizational structure.

Three study collaborators (or 6% of the interview sample) described the importance of their colleagues within their institutional environments. Chen, for example, described a sense of esteem that comes from his colleagues: "That is, the value is based on your research, is based on your merit, the merit of your international contribution rather than what color your skin is or what origin you come from." In addition to work input and feedback, Matías found too that his colleagues often became his friends: "And

so I don't hangout with them much – with...[other living in the area from my home country]; it's more related to work, so then you know you become friends with those people [your colleagues].”

Luca: Negotiation—Research Agendas

When Luca first joined the faculty at his current University, he found that the University's research agenda was not as highly perceived as it has become in more recent years. “...I was asked to judge high school science fair [my first year here], and I would ask the students, where they were going to college. And, nobody wanted to go to...[this University], now it's the opposite; people from all over want to come...[here].” Luca has found that with this shift in perception, research agendas and goals have also evolved.

Camille: Importance of Colleagues

Camille described how important her colleague relationships are, not only in terms of professional feedback and collaborations but also because many have become personal friends: “...it's mostly through my profession that I get to know people.” Camille continued that because the profession is so consuming, she doesn't have the time to create another “circle of friends.” She has found, however, that many of her friends, within faculty circles, are foreign-born like herself: “...it is true that there is always this connection, whether they come from a foreign country or...[from my childhood country]... there is always this connection somehow.”

Nicolas: Work as a Way of Life

Nicolas narrated that he tries to instill in his graduate students that pursuing academia is more than a career—that it encompasses an attitude towards life and living: “I try to explain this to my students. I don't know if they realize it at this stage, but

hopefully they will realize it later. But the point is this is not a job. I would say this is not even a profession. I mean it's more like a way of life.”

Yun: Negotiation—Administrative Politics

While Yun has found that her work environment has many benefits, she does find also that some of the administrative policies seem “unfair” with regards to the politics of diversity. As a professor of Asian background, she is counted in a positive way to help support the image of the University as a diverse place, that she is a “professor of color,” but when it comes to minority status and the accompanying university resources, she is not counted: “We [Asian professors] are actually counted in a very unfair way. When they need to count more faculty of color or students of color, we are counted, but we are not considered a minority, whenever they have a special resource.”

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I interpret that study collaborators embrace their career almost like a vocation, forgetting about specific hours worked and instead focusing on research question and agendas for an indeterminate period of time—unable to compartmentalize their work and personal lives. One difference noted, however, was in how they experience native-born perceptions of themselves as being outsiders or as being different. Yun, most prominently, spoke about this experience and what it means to be “Asian.” Other study collaborators talked about where they found more personal connections and where they felt more comfortable sticking with their professional identities.

V. Social Life as a Professional/Professor

I found that study collaborators generally made a distinction between social and work lives in their narratives, generally describing their work lives as the motivating factor for movement. Consequently, I followed their structural lead in writing about these two domains separately. Kamil, for example, says the following about his place of residence: “I would have been equally happy in Minnesota or California or anyplace even though I may have a preference.... But this is absolutely secondary.” And, Jan finds that the distinction between these two realms of life are attached to different levels of satisfaction, where the work environment is “far superior” but the social life is more “challenging.”

Disconnections between work lives and society

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) described feeling disconnected with their lives in U.S. society, the most cited examples included fragmented emotional attachments and social interactions. Jan expressed a disconnect with a “U.S. mainstream.” He missed what he felt was a more collective experience: “These are two areas (home and work life), and the totally different thing is living in a society where you sometimes feel there is no such thing as a society in this country.” Rohan found that holidays are difficult: “...there are days like Thanksgiving where there are kind of artificial pressures and ... You have to get invited somewhere or people invite you because they think you are alone. It’s very artificial.” As a single professor, Rohan found that U.S. society makes it difficult for someone in their thirties and forties to feel connected unless they are in a relationship. Among my study collaborators, 38 (or 78% of the interview sample) were married.

Table 20: Study Collaborators and Marital Status

38 study collaborators <i>(78% of the interview sample)</i>	Married
8 study collaborators <i>(17% of the interview sample)</i>	Single
2 study collaborators <i>(4% of the interview sample)</i>	Divorced

Charlotte also talked about the struggles with having a social life if both partners are academics: "...with academic couples, this often happens where they get jobs in different places. And then, you live apart for a while. You know, I've met people who managed to do it for years and years, and we did it for two and it was awful."

Alternatives are for one partner to get a job in academia and the other to settle in the area and look for work outside of academia or to see if the university offers spouse hires.

However, these alternative sometimes present their own emotional crisis as one contemplates his/her identity outside of the university or in relation to a partner's success and achievement:

I do American History [at this university]. She does British literature [but hasn't been hired at a university yet].... So she's in a sort of existential crisis about whether she continues on...or whether she does something else. She talks darkly about working at Starbucks, which she'd be the most overqualified barista... (Richard).

Connections to U.S. Culture

Fifteen study collaborators (or 31% of the interview sample) described what connected them more fully to their social lives. Study collaborators, for example, indicated that part of connecting to U.S. society was about living in an international area, where they could either 1) socialize with other people from their countries of birth:

"...there are a lot of Greeks in the area. So we have by now a social circle of Greek friends" (Greg); or 2) with others living abroad like themselves: "We have some very

good friends. People, who are American, people who are from Europe, and other countries.... [it] is a very cosmopolitan place” (Palash).

Study collaborators also described living with other types of diversity, including social class, religious, and political. They expressed how these differences often help them to establish a connection to their social lives as they become engaged in understanding this diversity and finding their place among the variations. Victoria, for example, said, “I love... [my hometown]. I always tell people I am not an American citizen, but I am... [from this small town]. Actually, I’m very involved. I was a member of the seventy-fifth anniversary committee. I prepared the symposium and I am now on the planning board.”

Another powerful connector was that of marrying a U.S.-born person: “I think being married to my current wife, who is Irish American by heritage, made a huge difference because I think I got more embedded in this community after getting married to her...because now I have extended family here... ” (Arjun). Through his relationship, Arjun found the emotional attachment that had been missing in his social life previous.

However, one of the most powerful connectors that study collaborators described was that of their children. In my interview sample, 31 had children (or 65% of the interview sample).

Table 21: Study Collaborators and Children

31 study collaborators <i>(65% of the interview sample)</i>	Children
16 study collaborators <i>(33% of the interview sample)</i>	No Children
1 study collaborators <i>(1% of the interview sample)</i>	Not Mentioned

For those whose children grew up in the U.S., their kids were one link in their adjustment sphere that connected them to the U.S. through national institutions such as

schools, after work activities, cosmopolitan and ethnic connections, and ideological values:

It was not until I had kids and going to PTA meetings and things like that, that I started being pulled back into real American society. I had isolated myself, not on purpose, but this is my area. It is intellectually elite, so now I am... It's a reintegration into American society, I'm discovering things I didn't even know, having been here since 1985. There are things I am learning now while I'm talking to parents. I'm discovering what a high school looks like because I never went to school here, not until my daughter went to high school; now I know what it is all about. These are all aspects that I never knew (Isaac).

As study collaborators “walked” through the educational system with their children, they became more enculturated to the common factors that unite those who are native-born as they progress through life stages. They also started to see their children learn English and how they often become comfortable with being “American.” Marie talked about this process with her son, who she had attempted to bring up bilingually in a household of all U.S.-born except for her: “But then we had four people in the house that spoke English to him, and only I spoke...[in my native language] to him. So, he started understanding and comprehending English a lot sooner.”

Practical Matters

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) related staying connected to U.S. society to practical matters, including safety, obtaining health insurance, and changing residency statuses, to name a few. Andreas described the necessity of having a credit history. He was fortunate in that he had attended graduate school in the U.S., so he had saved a credit card that he had from that time in his life: “And so, for some reason I had a credit history and just because I didn't make any debts, I had really high points. And so, it was easy for me to get a mortgage.”

However, Sean found himself in a less enviable position with regards to health insurance. He had to bring his adoptive mother to the U.S. because of her declining health and found that getting her the kind of health care she needed was extremely costly, especially because she had pre-existing conditions: “I had to have private insurance.... You pay a certain amount per month...and you can get insurance for non pre-existing conditions. Unfortunately, she [my adoptive mother] was hospitalized twice with the pre-existing conditions, and so this company refused to pay any of it.” Although Sean managed to get better coverage, the plan is still not great, and he’ll always remember the vulnerability attached to this early circumstance.

Thomas also recalled a vulnerable moment when he applied for his citizenship. He was going through the process in the 1980s when Reagan granted amnesty for approximately 3 million undocumented immigrants. As a result, Thomas went to the bottom of the cue, and he felt angry. He expressed how he was a contributing member of society and brought his education and skills and that he should have been given preference above those being granted amnesty (field notes). At the time of interview, 48 study collaborators (or 60% of the interview sample) had become citizens.

Table 22: Study Collaborators and Legal Status at Time of Interview

29 study collaborators <i>(60% of the interview sample)</i>	U.S. Citizen
15 study collaborators <i>(31% of the interview sample)</i>	Permanent Residents in the U.S.
4 study collaborators <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	On a Visa Status

Connections to Other Places They Have Lived

Twelve study collaborators (or 25% of the interview sample) described staying linked the U.S. as having the ability to connect to either their countries of birth or other places they had lived. Jonathan said quite succinctly that, for him, home isn’t a

geographic space anymore; it's people and it's a place one makes by oneself: "I think home is where my wife and I are right now. I don't think it is a place that is specific anymore." In order to maintain these connections, study collaborators talked about using social media, forming personal relationships with people from other countries, and buying property in different places. Diego, for example, said: "So, my Facebook network in a way has three very different universes. It has the academic universe, it has this sort of exile universe [from my years in another country during political upheaval], and it has a political universe in...[my country of birth]." In fact, at time of interview 20 study collaborators (or 42% of the interview sample) held more than two citizenships and sometimes multiple citizenships.

Table 23: Study Collaborators and Citizenships

20 study collaborators <i>(42% of the interview sample)</i>	More than two citizenships
28 study collaborators <i>(58% of the interview sample)</i>	One citizenship

Luca: Rooted

At the time of our interview, Luca was married with two adult children and had become a citizen of the U.S. He did not claim multiple citizenships. Luca had connected to U.S. society on both a personal and professional level through his first experiences as a post-doctoral fellow. Since then, he has become "rooted.": "I'm the kind of person who lays down roots and doesn't want to move; my wife is different. She's thinking about going to Maine and retiring in Maine....But this area, we have the seasons, and I like the seasons." Luca has found satisfaction in his work and with his family and expressed pleasure with the lifestyle that he has built over several decades: "...part of it is that, to have the lifestyle [the home] we have, we have to do the work ourselves, and otherwise we couldn't afford it."

Camille: Two Homes

At the time of our interview Camille was not married nor did she have children. As for her political status, she was a permanent resident working towards obtaining her U.S. citizenship while retaining citizenship in her childhood country. Camille expressed a strong connection to two places, her home in the U.S. and her home in her childhood country. She grew and adapted to this fluid reality over a lifetime and, consequently, she has now become securely fixed in both places. She has chosen to inhabit both in order to experience the lifestyle that demarcates her life. Camille acknowledged that not having children has helped facilitate this lifestyle. However, she also said that the longer she remained in the U.S. some of her comfort level has diminished with events such as September 11th, the beltway sniper attacks, and local tornadoes: "...I know that it is a huge change since 2001 and the situation related to 9/11, and subsequently, what happened."

Nicolas: Betwixt and Between

At the time of our interview, Nicolas was married with three school-age children. He had recently become a U.S. citizen while maintaining citizenry in two other countries. Nicolas described missing his extended family and the social structure of his country of birth, more particularly, the capital city he grew up in. Additionally, he had no extended family living nearby to ease the demands of parenthood and to create a more balanced social life. He acknowledged that, in the future, he would have more time for exploring social interactions, as his children grow and become independent. However, he did find his work and colleague interactions were extremely satisfying and productive: "I enjoy talking to my colleagues about the X, Y or Z of some arcane topic in physics or

astronomy or even engineering sometimes. So that's the intellectual simulation that we all need. It's at least what makes life interesting for me." For Nicolas, the differences in experience between his personal and professional lives created both satisfaction and longing—placing him betwixt and between two places, one that satisfied his professional ambition and one that refreshed his interpersonal interactions.

Yun: Attached

At the time of our interview, Yun was married with one pre-school age child and another on the way, and she had become a U.S. permanent resident. After having her son, Yun found that her parents and in-laws came to visit her in the U.S. more than she and her family traveled back to her country of birth to visit them. Part of this decision was grounded in her son's medical treatment: "...my parents and parents-in-law come to visit us, so we are visiting there [my country of birth] less often—probably in the order of once every two years." As a result, Yun described her physical circumstances as being increasingly attached to her residence in the U.S. and specifically at this geographic location of her university.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

In general, I interpret that study collaborators expressed high satisfaction with their work lives, but had less agreement about satisfaction with their social lives. A variety of factors influenced this reality such as geographic location, having or not having children, types of social interactions; however, the most talked about reasons for feeling disconnected from one's social life were those related to 1) emotional ties, such as finding a partner and/or having children and experiencing close friendships, and 2) learning and feeling comfortable with everyday social interactions, such as relating to

other parents, celebrating holidays, and frequently managing more than one home (both here and abroad).

VI. Assessing the U.S. as a Professional/Professor

After living and working in the U.S., the average from my interview sample being 25 years, study collaborators often had rich, comparative knowledge bases to draw from, based on their experiences of living other places abroad and more than one place within the U.S. Twenty-two study collaborators (or 46% of the interview sample) had lived at least two places within the U.S.

Table 24: Study Collaborators and Years in the U.S. at Time of Interview

18 study collaborators <i>(38% of the interview sample)</i>	0-19 years in the U.S. at time of interview
22 study collaborators <i>(46% of the interview sample)</i>	20-39 years in the U.S. at time of interview
8 study collaborators <i>(17% of the interview sample)</i>	40-59 years in the U.S. at time of interview

Table 25: Study Collaborators and Number of Moves within the U.S.

1 study collaborator <i>(1% of the interview sample)</i>	6 moves
6 study collaborators <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	4 moves
13 study collaborators <i>(27% of the interview sample)</i>	3 moves
22 study collaborators <i>(46% of the interview sample)</i>	2 moves
6 study collaborators <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	1 moves

Lifestyle Preferences and Values

Thirteen study collaborators (or 27% of the interview sample) made comparisons about lifestyle preferences and values. Health insurance and human rights were topics of concern. Vincent expressed that he felt the U.S. needed to more fully embrace the value of making sure that everyone, regardless of social standing, had access to health care:

“But what I think is better in...[my country of birth] is much more concern for the poor and for everybody having basic health insurance.... So, it’s the basic idea that everybody should be healthy and have health insurance.”

Other areas of comparison included religious values and the construction of social class, gender, and race. Jan, for example, described the operationalization of religious tolerance in the U.S.: “What I found is the United States is fantastic because of spiritual freedom. But it is becoming a little bit less. People tell more and more how other people should behave which I think is an unfortunate trend.” Additionally, Charlotte, spoke about differences in gender relationships: “...[my country of birth] is really sexist.... The things that people feel free to say about people of other gender and women especially -- their own partners you know -- and there’s scarcity of friendships between men and women relative to the U.S....”

University Standards and Expectations

Seven study collaborators (or 15% of my interview sample) compared university standards and expectations within the U.S. Palash, for example, made the following observation about where people pursue graduate education: “Research is still a struggling thing [in my country of birth]; there are a few institutions where good research takes place, but most students come to Europe and the U.S. for graduate studies, or in the last few years, have turned to Europe and Australia, and so on.”

While study collaborators often came into the U.S. prepared to experience different societal norms, they expressed surprise by the variety of standards and rankings within university culture in the U.S. These comparisons were often learned through life experience and were also an experience shared with U.S.-born who also go through a

similar learning process as they made decisions about where to pursue their educational goals: “Just to show you some of the cultural differences. A first class degree in...[my university in my country of birth] well a pass degree is based on 40% of a 100 marks. The first class degree [highest honors] is based on 65% [score]” (William).

Geographic Locations of Universities

Ten study collaborators (or 21% of the interview sample) compared geographic locations of universities. Matías, for example, talked about the differences between a small university town versus a university in a metropolitan area: “I would say and that's the difference with a small town; there seems to be more connections than here [in a metropolitan area]...where everybody lives in a different city basically.... Instead in Oregon in Corvallis all the professors lived in that [same] town.” Charlotte too experienced differences in city versus town life: “When I was in Morgantown, and I was like, ‘I don’t know, my job is great but I kind of don’t like it [the surrounding area] very much. I had a feeling of sort of horror, and I was like I got to get out of here, like I can’t, I’m not going to do that.”

Cultural Personalities and Habits

Thirteen study collaborators (or 27% of the interview sample) compared their perceptions about cultural personalities and habits such as English self-deprecation versus American directness, Indian body language and American handshakes and eye contact, concepts of politeness, and the New Zealand relaxed attitude.

Political Actions of the State

Finally, 12 study collaborators (or 25% of the interview sample) also compared political actions of the state in different countries. Palash described, for example, his

country of birth's corrupted service industry, making the observation that the U.S., as a political state, would not allow similar behavior to occur—although it does allow other types of corruption to exist: “Here [in the U.S.], too, there is corruption, but it is of a different kind. There [in my country of birth] it is in...the small things that you do, trying to set up a telephone, or trying to get a plot of land or sell a plot of land; everything involves under the table....” In addition, study collaborators made observations about the benefits of citizenship, such the mobility attached to an E.U. passport versus that of an U.S. one or the implications for long-term estate planning: “And I had a very close friend at DuPont. He was a Swiss chemist, and he unfortunately passed away....And his family was horrified to find out that the treatment of the estate was hugely different depending on whether you're an American citizen....”

Luca: Lifestyle preferences and values

At the time of our interview, Luca had lived in the U.S. for a total of 39 years and had inhabited two East Coast cities. In addition to his connection with what he called American independence and “drive to progress,” Luca also described how his academic field had changed over time and that now the field was focused on more complex aspects than when he was in graduate school. He remembered as a PhD student and as a post-doctoral fellow how excited and driven he was to discover new facets of the field: “Now, the field focuses...on more complex aspects, but at that time, you could just try something new. I remember...we [my peers and I] worked through the night and slept until noon and then came in again, it was a great time.”

Camille: Lifestyle preferences and values

At the time of our interview, Camille had lived between the U.S. and her country of birth for over 21 years. And, she had experienced settlement in two West Coast cities and two East Coast cities. Camille described several aspects of American society that resonated with her from being able to change career directions later in life to what a democratic society implied; however, another area of comparison was that of the culture of achievement. She liked, for example, the way success is considered in the U.S. as opposed to her experiences with achievement in the country she grew up in, where she felt that there was “always a little bit of suspicion when you succeed.” “Here [in the U.S.], it is a very positive thing to be successful, which might sound totally obvious to you, but when you succeed it is great. You are allowed to fail with the understanding that it will allow you to perhaps move forward....”

Nicolas: Cultural Personalities and Habits and Geographic Locations

At the time of our interview, Nicolas had lived in the U.S. for a total of 20 years and had lived in two different East Coast cities and one West Coast city. While Nicolas expressed frustration with the more austere social interactions of the U.S., he also found that different cities had their own personalities. While he really enjoyed the geographic location of his university on the West Coast, he did not enjoy the cost of living there: “...San Francisco is a beautiful city that has a lot of character. And there is a lot of nature, so there was much to be liked... I mean the reason why we moved away in the end is well, first, it was impossible to afford the house with my salary and my wife’s salary....”

Yun: Political Actions of the State

At the time of our interview, Yun had lived in the U.S. for a total of 16 years and had lived in two different East Coast cities. She compared differences in national services and political actions of the state. In her country of birth, for example, she found that there was a growing distance between the rich and the poor and the rich and the middle class “that has a number of social implications.” She highlighted that medical services, care of the elderly, and environmental issues were better managed in the U.S. By contrast, she found that the U.S. was “not without its own problems.” Issues such as gun control and race relations were areas of concern: “...there is also a strong tension...I think a strong issue about race that I have seen in university settings and also other broader social settings....”

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

With these varying degrees of difference, I found, however, from these comparative responses, that study collaborators aligned themselves, first and foremost, with their intellectual proclivities more than with a particular geographic location or cultural orientation. Although he traveled to his country of birth a couple times a year and owned a house there, Matteo, for example, described a world where place of residence becomes secondary to the intellectual and creative passions he pursues, such as designing and building boats:

And then you realize that...you have recreated exactly what you had or I don't know how to explain...but they [both cities I inhabit in the U.S. and in my country of birth] look alike. So, in other words, my sailing club in...[both places] are the same thing—that the people here look a lot like the people there. That's probably not true, but I see them the same way.... So the places where I am, [they] become the same.... a seamless reality.

Throughout his interview, Matteo expressed his search for like-minded people and intellectual communities that foster creativity and help bring his ideas to new heights. For Matteo, he followed his ideas more than a particular geographic location, and I found that even if study collaborators were disgruntled or frustrated by an aspect of U.S. society, they found a balance they could inhabit through life and work at the university.

VII. Learning the U.S. as a Professional/Professor

I found that for many study collaborators, they do not narrate their lives as a unidirectional process, but rather, they often insert or break-up their narrative(s) through what they have learned and what they are learning: about themselves and others and about their work. In other words, they are both narrating and reflecting on their narration.

Learning About Their Careers

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described an evolving understanding of how their career(s) function and how they can use their positions to help themselves and others. Some examples include an analysis of how the job application process works or strategies used applying for grants. Alex, for example, described his many job interviews and searches and learning from each of them to finally join a university that was in the right geographic location and was aligned with his research goals: “What did I do wrong that only places in the Midwest are interested in me?... That was a part of what I realized later on is that part of the game....” Alex narrated that he still applies for jobs and keeps his options open, learning each time he is invited for an interview—more about what he wants out of his career and how the university system itself function.

Learning About Others

Eight study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) also described learning about others—often in thinking about the communication process itself and how different audiences understand and relate to the material professors present. Simon explained his method: “...you need to somehow figure out how to present something.... Yeah, someone...said that if you can’t explain what you’re doing to a ten-year old, then you don’t really understand what you are doing.” Mandisa too highlighted this aspect of learning by bringing her knowledge and research to communities outside of academia: “I am also involved with interfaith activities and cultural activities. I am part of the Jewish Islamic dialog society....and I am building interfaith dialog between Jewish and Muslim young women.”

Learning Through Exchange with Others

Eleven study collaborators (or 23% of the interview sample) also described the process of learning as an ongoing experience of exchange that transforms their work. This exchange happens at the university between themselves and scholars abroad, at the interdisciplinary level, and between different stakeholders invested in their research. Jonathan described his work with an interdisciplinary team of scholars at Harvard University as well as with stakeholders in the region where he works with the built environment. Finally, he talked about international exchange and how it has transformed the way he looks at what’s possible in the architectural world and vice versa: “In Colombia, Venezuela and Brazil, they have been building these projects where they attach the slums with the city. So, they would have a cable cart, and they would build a library in the middle of the slum. That allows people to come to the city.” From this kind

of international exchange of ideas and observation, Jonathan is able to examine more closely how his work influences aesthetics as well as a host of social, cultural, and economic factors.

Learning About Themselves

Six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) described learning more about themselves. For example, at this point in his career, Liam found that he could reassess the value of English history. He initially chose to study American history because he found the story more compelling; now, however, he sees English history in a new light because he uses his approach to primary material and can communicate and understand historical narratives differently than how they are sometimes presented in textbooks: “So that was the caricature, the stereotype of what it meant to do English history. I carried that with me for a long time and it took me a while to shake it off and realize English history is just as interesting as American history.”

Luca: Learning about Others and Learning about Himself

Over the years, Luca has visited several countries as well as his son who works overseas for a U.S. embassy. Through these experiences, he has learned more about how others live. He has also learned more about his own likes and dislikes. For example, his wife left the world of scientist to become an artist, and she has garnered her own reputation. Luca described building a studio for her in their home and the richness that her choices have brought to his life: “I guess I would have never gotten into the arts as much as I have if it weren’t for her, which is very nice.”

Camille: Learning about Herself

While learning that she was not an artist, Camille also learned that she wanted to be a professor: "...one thing I really did not want to do when I was in my twenties and in my thirties was to be a professor.... At forty, I had gone through several jobs." Camille further described her process of knowing that she wanted to inhabit the professoriate: "...what is the job where you don't have a boss, somebody is the chair, somebody is the director... a job I don't have to go 9 to 5, or 9 to 8 or what have you, and I can sometimes be at home, with a constant focus on certain things, a job where I can travel?"

Nicolas: Learning through Exchange with Others

Nicolas expressed that some of his greatest learning experiences were in his conversations with other colleagues both in his discipline and in akin disciplines. Through these exchanges, he also learned more about how he was viewed as a foreigner. The same university, for example, where he now holds a faculty position did not accept him as a PhD student. When asked how he perceived this experience, he replied that part of the problem was that it takes time and patience to translate foreign credentials, which does not always occur as it should: "...in all fairness, it is very difficult to evaluate foreign students. You see the applications, and you really don't have much information to judge them. So, 'Who is this guy and where is he coming from...?' 'We have never heard of the country' or something like that. That would be typical."

Yun: Learning about Others and through Exchange with Others

As Yun has lived in the U.S. and learned about racial tensions and had interactions with different groups of people, she has found that there is a benefit to this exchange and wants her son to experience this kind of diversity: "I would not like my

child to be in a class where 90% of his peers are Chinese [of one type of social class as there is diversity within ethnic groups]. I think there is a benefit for him to be able to interact with white peers, with African Americans, with Hispanics, and with a variety of backgrounds.”

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

Not surprisingly, through these responses, I interpret that study collaborators become more well-rounded as they age, gaining more breadth and insight. Whereas in their younger years, they learn about and gain depth in their specific fields and disciplines as well as learning the realities of their new environments, in their older years, they expand their horizons and widen their circles of interaction. Whether this expanse happens through interdisciplinary action or travelling or gaining a new interest or hobby, the result is gaining more confidence and creativity in their work and social lives. Yun, for example, felt empowered to express her empathy and her frustration with minority politics, and Luca’s office has as many fine art pictures as it does those of molecules.

VIII. Personal Identifications

Thirty-nine study collaborators (or 81% of the interview sample) came to the U.S. as students or in post-doctoral positions. Consequently, their professional development and career networks were grounded in these experiences, and the next career step often naturally led to a position in the U.S. They tended to identify first as professors and view their long-term stays as continually open for (re)evaluation. At the time of our interviews, 35 (or 73% of the interview sample) were age 40 or older with several years of life experiences and established, successful careers:

Table 26: Study Collaborators and Age at Interview

13 study collaborators <i>(27% of the interview sample)</i>	20-39 years of age (young adult)
22 study collaborators <i>(46% of the interview sample)</i>	40-59 years of age (adult)
10 study collaborators <i>(21% of the interview sample)</i>	60-79 years of age (older adult)
3 study collaborators <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	80 or older years of age

Place: Nation, Region, Global

One shifting category of personal identification included that of place and its accompanying culture. Seven study collaborators (or 15% of the interview sample) used national identification to describe themselves: “...if people are badmouthing American policies, I feel far more defensive than if people are badmouthing...[my country of birth’s] policies. But, there was a time when I remember it was the other way around...” (Arjun). Likewise, Vincent was also surprised by this quiet transformation: “While on sabbatical, I was visiting a professor in...[my country of birth], and my wife also went there. And...we realized that we had become Americans. We did not fit anymore...” By contrast, 8 study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) described their regional identities as adding another layer of texture:

But I don’t feel very strongly involved being Spanish especially because you may not know much about this, but Catalonia has been an autonomous division within Spain for most of its history. It [Catalonia] has a strong feeling of [having its own] national identity. So many people in Catalonia would want to become independent from Spain.²¹

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) also found that while they possess an inheritance or legacy from their countries of birth and other places they may have lived, they are more aligned now with a sense of international, world, or global

²¹ I didn’t identify a name or pseudonym with this quote to protect my study collaborator’s identity as I have not been linking country of birth with specific individuals but rather have linked continental regions with study collaborators’ narratives.

identity: “I think of myself as a global citizen, and I’m just trying to contribute positively to the world. So that, I think, helps make it more comfortable...” (Connor).

Interviews indicate, however, that this process of becoming one or another, however, is rarely finalized. Study collaborators described an amalgamation of identities at different stages in the life course. Returning to visit their home countries after a few years in the U.S., 8 study collaborators (or 17% of the interview sample) described themselves as feeling as a foreigner or a stranger: “It’s like you forget your own country” (Ivan). Yet, even when they return to the U.S. and stay long-term, they don’t always feel altogether American either: “...my wife...was born in England...[and] grew up in Argentina.... In Argentina, she was like, *La Inglesa*, the English person.... [But] When we go back to Argentina, they say, ‘The Americans are here.’ So, I am sort of a nowhere person” (Matías). Six study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) described themselves as “not American,” while 6 study collaborators (or 13% of the interview sample) described themselves as “being more Americanized” than they think they are.

Professional Identification

In this context, being in academia often becomes an increasingly important part of their self-identification(s), which resonates with the learning of university culture. Eighteen study collaborators (or 38% of the interview sample) described themselves through their professional lens: “It’s important for me to be able to do what I do. I wouldn’t be happy if I couldn’t do it. So this is central to me” (Greg). In many ways, the profession becomes a lifestyle for this group. Lucas found that “work and pleasure” are not “two separate things.” And, Marie found the profession to be central in giving her the

“gaze” she has desired. Since being in the U.S., she experienced a difference in reception from male colleagues in her country of birth:

I go every year and I’m treated better now since I’m an established U.S. researcher.... And for a long time, I had to deal with this, “You’re just a pretty little thing. Stand there. We’re going to talk to the real scientists.’ ... But I’ve been there long enough now that all the conflict is gone, and I think for my publication record and my collaboration has convinced most people working there now that I’m a researcher to be reckoned with.

Other Identifications: Parent/Grandparent, Religious, Independent, Balanced

Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) identified with their family role as parent or grandparent: “And the amazing thing is I go to parts of India where I don’t know the language. I do not drink their food. I can’t drink their water. But I love these children calling me ‘grandfather’ ” (Bolin). Four study collaborators (or 8% of the interview sample) described themselves in terms of their religious identifications: “...so Hebrew is part of my DNA” (Lucas) or “You know, I am not a fanatic, but I always consider myself accountable to a higher authority” (Anthony). Two study collaborators (or 4% of the interview sample) expressed that they were independent: “I had friends that were usually coming out after me, but I wasn’t a person that depended on friends” (Saheed). Finally, 3 study collaborators (or 6% of the interview sample) described themselves, in addition to other identifications as being a balanced person:

I say things like ‘make sure whatever you’re doing in college, whatever job you have is something that is stimulating you intellectually, something that is making you happy every day. If it’s not doing those things consistently then get out of those things, make a change, do something different.’ And by implication I would say that if I applied that to my own life, I would still be sitting here talking to you because I’m generally happy most days. I generally find intellectual stimulation and passion in my work so I’m a happy camper (Richard).

Luca: Professional Identification

At the time of our interview, Luca was 65 years old, and he described himself first and foremost as a “scientist.” When applying for citizenship, he expressed that aspect of his identity is what he felt recommended him to the U.S. as a permanent stakeholder.

Camille: Regional Identification

At the time of our interview, Camille was 59 years old, and she described herself through her regional identity, as a member of her childhood capital city: “[people from this city] think they are special. They may...[have a national identity], but they are...[from this city] first and foremost.”

Nicolas: International, World, or Global Identification

At the time of our interview, Nicolas was 45 years old, and he considered himself a triple citizen of three countries and tended to view himself in terms of an “international identity:” “...would I have become a citizen of the U.S. or of...[another country] if that wasn’t convenient...? ...I tend to see...nationality [as]...something that is more practical than anything else.”

Yun: National Identification

At the time of our interview, Yun was 39 years old, and she described herself as a hybrid—as “Asian-American” or sometimes using her specific country of birth as the first part of the hyphenation. Her narrative underscored the fact that she was the professional, and sometimes cultural, product of both places.

Interpretation: Similarities and Differences Between Study Collaborators

From these responses, I interpret that study collaborators were presenting to me the interviewer the identity they felt most suited the context of our conversation together.

However, it would be greatly oversimplifying to say that one identification encapsulated the totality of who they are. Different in their narratives, however, is how they arrive as a place of cultural confidence and security. Saheed illustrated this process of adaptation through a fictional story of a scientist who had a pet fish that he trained to live outside of water. Yet, the fish met his demise when he accidentally slipped on a bridge, fell into water, and drowned in the very environment that had sustained him for so many years:

That's what I feel when I go back.... That's my home. That's my roots. [But] When I go there...I'm suffocating. It's like that fish that is used to living outside of his habitat, and when it goes back, he dies. So, home is where you feel safe; you feel you can be yourself; [and] you feel you know some people.

While Saheed found that he could no longer exist within his original cultural framework, he described finding a place of comfort and security:

I feel for [my country] perhaps because of the memories that I have and because of the people that are suffering there. Sometimes I miss Berkeley more than I miss my hometown I think where you enjoy, where you can express yourself, that's where your home is.

Comfort in Saheed's narratives takes on different forms of involvement, but he has worked to find his own inner sense of balance. As their responses illustrate, study collaborators must, at some point, adapt their personal identities within the context of a new country – evaluating the related meaning of their new routines and habits to these personal identities.

Like native-born, however, they also have inhabited several life roles, and while they often grappled with them through their cumulative international migration experiences, natives too have grappled with them through regional identities they have experienced.

IX. Summary of Findings

Major Similarities Between Study Collaborators

- Two important factors that linked study collaborators' career choices are 1) developing a skill set that could be used in a variety of settings (medicine, human resources, government, industry, etc.), and 2), looking to use this skill set in a work environment that affords both intellectual stimulation and independence.
- Study collaborators embraced their career almost like a vocation, forgetting about specific hours worked.
- (78%) Were married.
- (65%) Had children.
- (60%) Had become citizens of the U.S.
- (58%) Had only one citizenship & (42%) had multiple citizenships.
- Study Collaborators tended to report high amount of satisfaction with their work lives.
- (63%) Had lived in the U.S. for more than 20 years.
- (88%) Had lived two or more places within the U.S.
- Study collaborators aligned themselves, first and foremost, with their intellectual proclivities more than with a particular geographic location or cultural orientation.
- Study collaborators become more well-rounded as they aged, gaining more breadth and insight—expanding their horizons and widening their circles of interaction.
- Study collaborators tended to identify first as professors and view their long-term stays as continually open for (re)evaluation.

- (73%) Were age 40 or older at the time of interview with several years of life experiences and established, successful careers.
- Study collaborators inhabited several life roles, and they often grappled with them through the lens of their cumulative international migration experiences.

Major Differences Among Study Collaborators

- Study collaborators differed in when they decide to pursue an academic profession—either as a young adult or later in life after years of experiencing other types of career choices.
- Study collaborators thought of returning home as a way to bring their professional experiences to bear on their countries of birth. However, how they chose to construct that relationship varied—providing alternative models for how one participates and understands different national and regional contexts.
- There is a difference between those study collaborators who would choose more broadly the U.S. and those who would choose more specifically a distinct university and geographic location within the U.S. The former group described choices that were more limited in scope, i.e. not necessarily expressing that it would be so easy to return to their countries of birth and find the career satisfaction they are seeking, while the latter group tended to describe a wider array of choices, i.e. having the ability to be more selective between a variety of places and institutions that would be a potential “fit” for their personal and professional lifestyles.

- Study collaborators expressed different experiences with native-born perceptions—some as described being perceived as outsiders and/or where they found more personal connections as well as where they felt more comfortable sticking with their professional identities.
- Study collaborators had less agreement about satisfaction with their social lives. A variety of factors influenced this reality such as geographic location, having or not having children, types of social interactions; however, the most talked about reasons for feeling disconnected from one's social life were those related to 1) emotional ties, such as finding a partner and/or having children and experiencing close friendships, and 2) learning and feeling comfortable with everyday social interactions, such as relating to other parents, celebrating holidays, and frequently managing more than one home (both here and abroad).

Put another way, they differed how they arrived at a place of cultural confidence and security.

Conclusion:
Major Findings and Recommendations for Further Scholarship

I. Career Trajectories

I identified two major types of career trajectories among my study collaborators:

1) those who first came to the U.S. as graduate and PhD students or as post-doctoral fellows, and 2) those who came as already established professors or other kinds of professionals.

In the first career trajectory, the majority of my study collaborators (81%) were graduate or PhD students or in post-doctoral positions when they arrived in the U.S., and 90% were between the ages 20-39. This statistic is significant in that it describes a population in the midst of establishing their professional identity in a new country while dealing with the social and economic adjustments normative of adulthood. In effect, they eventually become high-skilled immigrants after stays in the U.S.—highlighting the second aim of my study to show the diversity of experiences among different immigrant populations. This finding was unexpected as I assumed most participants came to the U.S. after achieving career status in their countries of birth or elsewhere abroad.

During their years of being professionally developed in the U.S. through higher-level degrees and apprentice-like and mentoring relationships with others in their field of studies, study collaborators not only described developing social networks and professional abilities but also developing varying levels of intercultural competencies. This finding suggests that in this particular career trajectory, being educated and professionally developed in the U.S., potentially leads to an international resource for universities to harness (Gahungu, 2011). Universities have a cadre of faculty who are

able to recognize cross-cultural differences and operate accordingly—albeit through the lens of different countries of birth and at differing levels of competence.

Future research questions could also focus on whether this group is more likely to have an international dimension to their careers than those who are not educated and professionally developed abroad (Finklestein, Walker, and Chen, 2013). In other words, how do foreign-born faculty's professional connections in the U.S. and elsewhere animate their careers over their life courses and how do they contribute to U.S. universities?

In the second career trajectory, those who first came to the U.S. as already established professionals, study collaborators also expressed intercultural competencies but, in addition, they often described the process of choosing from career positions located in different countries. They could have gone elsewhere or stayed in their countries of birth. This ability to choose suggests that they may have amassed skills and abilities, beyond that of higher-level degrees or career experiences that have yet to be recognized or measured. Some studies have found, for example, that foreign-born and foreign-educated faculty are more productive than their native counterparts (Webber, 2013; Kim, Wolf-Wendel, and Twombly, 2011). Future research directions could seek to identify what some of their specific skills and abilities are and how those compare with native-born in similar positions.

Nineteen percent of my study collaborators came as already established professionals, representing a significantly lesser percentage than the first career trajectory. Another future research direction would be to compare the experiences of both groups, exploring similarities and differences. For example, there may be differences in

work expectations, and some studies have found that there is less work satisfaction among foreign-born faculty than their native counterparts (Sabharwal, 2011; Corley and Sabharwal, 2007). What we don't know is what contributes to this degree of satisfaction? Does it make a difference if one is educated in the U.S. versus if one is educated abroad and comes to the U.S. later in her career trajectory—after she has achieved professional status? Or, what role might having a career mentor play in continued work satisfaction (Lee, 2014)?

II. Domains of Connection

The two career trajectories described above emerged from using the perspective of the foreign-born faculty rather than external labels. An insider viewpoint allowed me to explain incorporation processes in all their diversity and served as a stepping stone to tackle the guiding research question, namely, “What variables influence domains of connection for this group?” I found that political, lifestyle, and professional domains influence how study collaborators use agency to connect to the larger society using both their perceptions and the labels they are categorized by. They adapt or become pragmatically engaged in order to fit the parameters of a given social and political structure (i.e. becoming a citizen and abiding by a country's laws); however, decisions change as they move through the life course and better understand their own lifestyle preferences.

The distinction I am making here is that people can and do adapt in order to meet a larger goal or objective, but they make personal choices about incorporating into something larger only as they become more aware of who they are and what they want.

My study collaborators, for example, rarely described their long-term stays as fixed or permanent. Like native-born, they too grapple with finding routines and habits that unify the social, cultural and professional dimensions of their circumstances. After their initial settlement, what keeps this group rooted in the U.S. is a continual reevaluation of these dimensions and how satisfying they are to their individual well-being.

This finding, of course, contradicts classic assimilation models surrounding immigration that posit immigrants will eventually become part of a larger American mainstream ideology, some features include a strong, protestant work ethic and the embodiment of the “American Dream” (Salins, 1997). Based on my study collaborators’ constant evaluation of long-term stays in relation to their desired lifestyle, I hypothesize that they search for an attachment and sense of belonging that fulfills them, rather than the milestones suggested by assimilation and/or incorporation theories. In summary, their domains of attachment are varied and multi-dimensional and may also be reversed as circumstances change (Wimmer, 2009; Brown and Bean, 2006). Even if national origins, socioeconomic status, contexts of reception in the United States, and social and financial resources play a role in this outcome, incorporation experiences become variegated and diverse and cannot be theorized through the lens of any one major variable.

In what follows below, I explore incorporation responses as they relate to the three major domains of connection stated above. In looking at the first aim of my study, to understand immigrant adjustment within an occupational unit, I follow a super-diverse approach which Vertovec (2007a) defined through an increasingly complex immigrant demographic in Britain that described a “dynamic interplay of variables” among small, immigrant groups that could no longer be understood through one major unit of analysis

such as country of birth; rather, they needed to be understood through several factors such as stays in other countries, transnational connections, socio-economic standings, and legal statuses, to name a few variables that could impact their experiences and incorporation responses (1024). On the basis of Vertovec's European analysis on changing immigrant demographics and patterns, I posit that the U.S., who like Britain, finds itself in an increasingly globally connected world might not be so different.

The findings of this study contribute to the scholarship on immigration by highlighting a population that has been somewhat invisible from broader investigation as they are not fully accounted for in institutional categories recognizing foreign-born status and as they often become subsumed in other institutional categories relating to diversity and cultural minorities (Wei, 2008; Price et. al., 2005). Understanding who they are and what comprises their incorporation experiences from their own perspectives requires the identification of an "interplay of variables" where national origin is but one unit of analysis. As I have demonstrated, their incorporation experiences are rooted in their work lives, which then become the major domain of connection in the U.S.

I invited many of my study collaborators to my dissertation defense, and when presented with my research results, I was surprised by some of the reflections they had on the basis of their perceptions of who they were. For example, one described her frustration with not having an appropriate category to mark on official institutional records since she is one national origin that has several ethnic identifications and to mark her national origin calls into question her ethnic identifications. This situation is further compounded by her fulfillment of being considered a faculty of color. Yet another professor said that he thinks of himself simply as a "human being"—that having lived

through some war-torn events, he contributes to a foundation that gives back to children from his originating country and considers his role as a “human being” to be the most important one. Of course, an interplay of variables is at work here, shaping the trajectory of these choices, which my research documents.

Political Connections

Most of my study collaborators came from European and Asian countries, 18 each (or 76% altogether). Study collaborators from Asian countries (specifically India and China) spoke about the difficulty of keeping double citizenships or travelling without a certain type of visa to their countries of birth. And, study collaborators from European countries described the appeal of the European Union passport. Altogether, they described citizenship as more practical and pragmatic than anything else. They described varying degrees of connection to their countries of birth but a much larger degree of connection to their professional identification.

As study collaborators’ realized that they had achieved their primary education and career aspirations, the reality of political incorporation became an issue that needed to be addressed. This was especially apparent as they made the decision to extend their stays in the U.S.; however, that is not an indicator that they would align with a political party or that they would participate in national agendas. Reed-Danahay and Brettell (2008) argue that anthropological studies of immigration need to find frameworks that approach political incorporation beyond legal citizenship to encompass forms of participatory citizenship—this addresses how immigrants acquire the civic and leadership skills that help them to move from peripheral positions to engage in U.S. civil society.

In cosmopolitan theoretical frameworks, individuals are often conceptualized and defined by an interconnection of categories such as family ties/relationships, job skills, labor categories, to name a few, and through these interconnections as being morally and politically engaged with community, society, and citizenship at a global level (Amelina and Faist, 2012; Hannerz, 2006). My research indicates that this “engaged” perspective is not always sought after or even present at the university but there are experiences that foster this outlook more than others. For example, my study collaborators indicated that they may find themselves joining the PTA because they are interested parents or organizing a local neighborhood meeting to rally to support a proposed local ordinance because it will have positive impact on their environment. They might also use their research in an applied setting to address social concerns. As these events occur, however, they make changes because it suits their lifestyle preferences. In other words, most came to the U.S. to enhance their professional careers, and the longer they stay, they have opportunities to become more connected to U.S. society. Further research directions could explore what venues and experiences are more likely to engage foreign-born faculty in civic engagement and leadership roles—places where they connect in their everyday lives.

Lifestyle Connections

The majority of study collaborators came from white collar social backgrounds (73%), urban environments (77%), and had complex family histories with immigration (generational, circular, or multiple immigration experiences in the ascending generation). They sought to recreate their urban and white collar social backgrounds within the context of life in the U.S. As my data shows, study collaborators definitely had preferences for

east and west coast city living—for these city lifestyles. However, they varied in their response to finding other people from their countries of birth. While they enjoyed the social diversity of interacting with others living abroad, most didn't necessarily seek out similar ethnic populations in order to feel comfortable with life in the U.S. It's not that ethnicity is unimportant; it's just not the dominating factor in connecting with others. In my study, education and occupation were more salient than ethnicity in composing career trajectories.

Raj (2003) addresses this complexity through first- and second-generation middle-class South Asian families living in London. In her book *Where Are You From?*, she critiques models of multiculturalism that reify notions of ethnic nostalgia that keep immigrants locked in certain kinds of representational imagery. By centering on issues of identity from the perspective of these middle-class immigrants themselves, of which she is a part, she is able to explore how they negotiate the links between ethnicity, community, culture, identity, and location that are prescribed from the state and others.

In my research, like Raj, I found that study collaborators had complex reactions and connections to their ethnic identifications as they were perceived in the context of the U.S. and its discourse surrounding race and ethnic minorities. Some had to adapt themselves to being counted as cultural minorities or as faculty of color; however, they expressed frustration if that same category did not become a pathway to resources for their research and professional development.

This finding in many ways questions the foundation of diversity frameworks as they often originate with the U.S. Census categorization. Even if as social scientists we are especially sensitive to the social construction of categories, eventually, as my findings

demonstrate, those data are what we use to compose social categories at institutions such as the university, greatly influencing the way we see each other and ourselves, individually and as a community (Etzioni, 2002). If foreign-born categories are obscured in favor of accounting for ethnicity --Black, Latin@, Asian--, gender, and other minority categories, then it seems we are reifying new categories for immigrants to assimilate into and are missing the many other forms of diversity that encompass individual lives (education, occupation, childhood experiences, family histories with migration, etc.)

In short, there are two reductionist poles to be avoided in theorizing incorporation: focusing solely on what creates social cohesion through homogeneity or focusing on what creates difference through extreme cultural relativism that is “based on naïve, essentialist conception of culture” (Rodriguez-Garcia, 2012: 257). Social cohesion is a result of both similarities and differences (Vertovec, 2010).

Future research could enlarge on my finding and explore how the construction of race and ethnicity in the U.S. impacts this group’s understanding of their ethnic identifications and how they navigate this new “gaze.” Stepick and Stepick (2003), for example, interviewed Cuban, Haitian, and Nicaraguan immigrant school children. What they discovered were a host of factors contributing to the shift in immigrant mentality and ethnic identification from first generation to the second. Through interviews, they found that immigrant children are juggling their ideas about American culture with their affiliations to their parents and homeland culture. Another large part of their self-image is also tied to their experiences with prejudice and discrimination. In exploring high-skilled experiences in the same domain of connection, future research could compare experiences and look at how institutions (such as secondary and higher educational)

structure them.

Overall, study collaborators described a difference between their work lives and their social lives. They tended to first learn and understand what was expected of them as academics and how to conduct themselves as career professionals. Some expressed, however, challenges and difficulties integrating and/or acculturating to life outside of work, i.e. social dimensions of experience. Study collaborators eventually become more well-rounded as they aged, gaining breadth and insight—expanding their horizons and widening their circles of interaction. However, they tended to identify first as professors and view their long-term stays as continually open for (re)evaluation.

Glick-Schiller (2009) questioned the units of analysis of contemporary immigration theory—the nation-state, the ethnic group, and the transnational community—that structure discussions of immigration and development. Glick-Schiller argued instead for a global conceptual framework that addresses the reproduction and movement of people and profits across national borders:

Such a perspective places the debates about international migration and development and the contemporary polemics and policies on immigration, asylum, and global talent within the same analytical framework, allowing migration scholars to address the mutual constitution of the local and the global (14).

In a similar vein, I found that my study collaborators inhabited several life roles, and they often grappled with them through the lens of their cumulative international migration experiences. Like native-born, they were looking to construct a lifestyle that brought all dimensions of their lives into focus (social, cultural, emotional, and mental); however, I found that because they crossed national borders, the way they created this balance was often more difficult to navigate as many travelled for work and for satisfying social

interactions—making the trajectory of their careers more invigorating and animated by social networks here, there, and other places. Sometimes this made their interpersonal connections less satisfying as they had to wait to see loved ones elsewhere or to socially interact on a level that was comfortable to them.

From this perspective, incorporation is reminiscent of articulation frameworks that envision the local, “domestic” community interacting with larger, global structures and the accompanying power dimensions. However, my foreign-born study population, a component of high skilled labor sectors, while implicated in the global market place, are not often publicly understood as a cultural minority when they immigrate (Triadafilopoulos, editor, 2013). My research expands the traditional view of articulation theory in exploring how immigrants, such as my study collaborators, become officially categorized and understood in the university workplace and further if and when they navigate those categories beyond their work lives.

Altogether, I found the unit of analysis that allowed me to more fully understand my study collaborators was that of lifestyle preferences. While work was the overwhelmingly dominating factor in their lifestyle preferences, other considerations (family, relationships, political circumstances, etc.) influenced variability among my study collaborators. My findings point to discourses of the local, the particular, and the everyday that are being transformed by global and transnational structures, connected to both work and social lives. Currently, in the U.S. the foreign-born population comprises approximately 16% (or 53 million) of the U.S. population—some 41 million documented, per the U.S. Census, and an estimated 12 million undocumented, per secondary accounting sources such as the Pew Research Center (Passel et al, 2013). Current

legislation on the foreign-born in the U.S, however, has focused more predominantly on the estimated undocumented—those here “illegally.” As such, the focus tends towards policing U.S. borders. And, a large portion of scholarly work has focused on disproving the notion that this group threatens U.S. society (Glick-Schiller, 2010). Often left out of this important policy and scholarly discussion is the diversity of the foreign-born population, in motives, intentions, experiences, and contributions.

My study population seem to perceive themselves as being more anchored in international space, on the move for work, conferences, family, and research agendas and not necessarily only grounded in a one specific national context. Rather than consider their incorporation choices as a deficit, I suggest we view this lifestyle as a plus for the nation-state as it contributes to the internationalizing and globalizing of the university, ultimately helping to position the nation-state on a world stage, which several transnational and cosmopolitan theorists seek to uncover and understand in the context of immigration in a variety of sectors within society (Brettell, 2011; Glick-Schiller and Caglar, 2011).

Professional Connections

While study collaborators consistently described the U.S. as a place that has a reputation for excellence in higher education, it is not, however, always the first choice for migration, and is, in fact, often one possibility among an array of choices, when evaluating the many circumstances that circumscribe their personal and professional lives and their ability to easily cross national borders to satisfy their needs.

While study collaborators anticipated what their initial experiences in the U.S. would be like with regards to their training and future career plans, they described their

initial experiences with graduate school as full of unanticipated experiences with other people, with research agendas and projects, with institutional environments, and with surrounding regional identities.

I argue here that as my study collaborators became part of the university system, “structures of opportunity” became available to them that factored into their decision whether to pursue a career in academia right away or come back to it later. Like native-born, who were also trained in the U.S., my study collaborators had to decide to follow these “structures of opportunity” or choose something else. And, like native-born, they too differed in whether they decided to pursue an academic profession—either as a young adult or later in life after years of experiencing other types of career choices. Two important factors that linked study collaborators’ career choices are 1) developing a skill set that could be used in a variety of settings (medicine, human resources, government, industry, etc.), and 2), looking to use this skill set in a work environment that affords both intellectual stimulation and independence.

Study collaborators described intellectual interests that sometimes did not perfectly align with disciplinary borders and boundaries. One major variation or difference among study collaborators was that of political circumstance. More Asian and South America countries, for example, struggled with the effects of war and revolution than European and North American ones at the time of the study collaborators’ immigration. The result is that these regions often become more insular, limiting the choices available in educational and career pursuits as political interests dictate. Consequently, finding one’s intellectual interest or passion often becomes

compartmentalized over the life course, not always readily acknowledged during the undergraduate years, sometimes found later, and sometimes pursued “after hours.”

These experiences often illuminate what transnational theorists describe as spheres of interaction or social networks (Vertovec, 2002; Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton, 1992). My study documents these connections as my study collaborators talk about travelling to contribute to university programs in other countries, to present at national and international conferences, and to recruit and bring global talent back to their home institution, to name a few ways that lived experiences invest in both their sending and host societies (Vertovec, 2002: 7-8; Glick-Schiller and Caglar, 2011). Future research could examine more closely how institutions and, by extension, nation-states are changed as a result of those (foreign-born) connections.

Using a transnational framework, Ong (2000) finds that patterns exist among national groups, related to political circumstance, but finds no easy blueprint for how individuals cope with their values and contexts in terms of movement. In fact, when my study collaborators thought of returning home as a way to bring their professional experiences to bear on their countries of birth, how they chose to construct that relationship varied—providing alternative models for how one participates and understands different national and regional contexts.

I found that there is a difference between those study collaborators who would choose more broadly the U.S. and those who would choose more specifically a distinct university and geographic location within the U.S. The former group described choices that were more limited in scope, i.e. not necessarily expressing that it would be so easy to return to their countries of birth and find the career satisfaction they are seeking, while

the latter group tended to describe a wider array of choices, i.e. having the ability to be more selective between a variety of places and institutions that would be a potential “fit” for their personal and professional lifestyles. As a result, they constructed different kinds of mobile lifestyles with some choosing frequent travel between countries and others not as much.

What I learned from these unexpected findings was not to just assume that because immigrants are skilled that they have access to resources that make them feel connected to countries or that they are “cosmopolitan” and open to new experiences. They too are negotiating a complex world of power relationships (Horevitz, 2009). Part of the culture of immigration is understanding the trajectories of individual choices. For example, the political circumstances of my study collaborators’ childhoods and early adulthoods influenced and affected their career choices, creating a place where they sometimes felt separated from their professional disciplines or intellectual interests or in their ability to choose another move and career position.

Further research could identify how both foreign-born and native faculty connect with their research interests, especially when they go beyond disciplinary boundaries. The university may have invisible networks at play that, if harnessed, could lead to greater productivity and success at answering research questions. How do academics across disciplines integrate their accumulated knowledge to pursue important research topics and how are foreign-born faculty implicated in this knowledge production?

High-skilled immigration cannot be simply defined as exemplified by the motivations that draw foreign-born faculty in my study to transit national boundaries—which are also complex and not easily defined. The array of migration choices available

to a person with transferable/desirable skills and social resources shed light on another type of immigration experience. My hope is that this study has contributed in a positive way to add to the general body of anthropological knowledge on immigration--especially as our world continues to incorporate notions of diversity into the discourse of what it means to be a global society. As such, a final recommendation for future study would be comparing the experiences of foreign-born faculty in the U.S. with native-born faculty in the U.S. with U.S.-born faculty working abroad—highlighting the full spectrum of experiences that connects people working in our global society.

Epilogue: Anthropological Recommendations for Policy

As I have indicated throughout my analysis and interpretation of research data, ethnicity is only one axis of differentiation among many in my study of skilled immigrants. There are other axes, deeply embedded and even more influential in the process that governs how one adapts and responds at an individual level, which determine incorporation experiences (Vertovec, 2007a). However, these axes, by their nature are often invisible in the panoramic lens of society at large. My study collaborators described a layer of invisibility in the institution where they work and by extension the larger encompassing society in terms of the politics of recognition and the discourse of cultural minority status/resource allocation—in the context of life in the U.S.

My study has built on other scholarly models of immigration to show that lifestyle preferences, rather than national identifications, provide a more complex and diverse portrait of incorporation experiences—often highlighting ways in which the U.S.-born population is similar to that of the immigrant one. Universities attract foreign-born faculty as evidenced prominently by their presence in math, engineering, and science disciplines (Corley and Sabharwal, 2007). As such, my policy recommendations are at three different levels: 1) the university where my study is located, 2) U.S. universities in general, and 3) U.S. immigration policy more broadly.

The university where my study is located

I recommend an examination of what makes this population feel “invisible.” My study revealed that the institution does not recognize (formally acknowledge) them as being from another country unless they carry a certain visa status, so the institution as a community remains “formally” unaware of their numbers and consequently does not

fully appreciate or highlight the significant impact this population has on the culture of academia. Second, I recommend an investigation into how the cultural capital of university professors can be harnessed to amplify current discourses of diversity and what their social networks abroad could bring to bear as far as further globalizing the university structure.

U.S. universities in general

US universities have identified internationalization and and/or globalization as important goals in higher education. What has not yet been sufficiently thought out is the need to think through the roles that foreign-born faculty can play, and how their skill, talent, and professional networks can be used to enlarge the connectedness of universities to the world stage.

In addition to the above recommendations, I would also include ways to communicate and connect: from mentoring to social spaces set aside for faculty interaction to platforms for recognition. While all faculty benefit from these measures, foreign-born faculty may be situated at a university and in a department that has a high-concentration of other foreign-born faculty or they may find themselves one among few foreign-born faculty either in their department or in the larger university setting. Additionally, they may be in a more rural setting, isolated from a larger concentration of others living abroad like themselves or they may be in an urban setting where there is a high concentration. At the university where my study was conducted, there was a high concentration of foreign-born faculty in the computer, math, and natural sciences and the school of languages and literatures, and overall the university is one of the leaders in attracting foreign-born students and faculty. However, this does not mean that this

university or others are adept at incorporating faculty and students in such a way as to reach their potential in academic standing, professional stature and productivity. Also there are the intangibles of loyalty to the institution and alumni participation that can be so integral to a university's long-term goals. Creating places for communication and connection can only strengthen these goals—regardless of where universities are located or how many foreign-born faculty are there.

U.S. immigration policy more broadly

With regards to immigration policy makers in general, the over-arching assumption is that if someone moves to the U.S., they want to stay here. Policy is geared towards this assumption—that the end point of moving is to become a citizen. In the more complex arena of international, foreign-born faculty we need to make policy targeted to their specific situation that encourages these highly skilled individuals, who have a multitude of options, to make a choice in favor of the U.S. university environment. But as my study demonstrates, this reality is not necessarily the case. Study collaborators narrated continually that their decision to stay was usually short term and up for constant renegotiation until they finally evaluated that their stay had become long-term. And even then, the future was not certain. Perhaps a better indicator of whether someone had made a decision to stay permanently is the evidence of civic engagement as Reed-Danahay and Brettell (2008) suggest with their concept of participatory citizenship. Rather than just focusing on making the pathway to citizenship easier, policy makers should also be focusing on how they can create categories of recognition that highlight the contributions of this global talent and promote strategies for civic engagement.

They should also consider policy geared towards stimulus for staying. For example, making it easier for spouses to obtain work visas or instating official mentoring programs that give these high-skilled workers a reference and resource for navigating their professional journeys in a new country. Other practical incentives could be health care packages that don't cause undue financial stress to include extended family members or ways to make large purchases, such as a home, that do not require a credit history within the U.S. These kinds of benefits have the potential to reduce negative impacts associated with long-term settlement and will encourage foreign-born faculty to share their rich, diverse lives and educational experiences with students in U.S. universities.

Appendix A: IRB Application

1. **Abstract:** Belonging and Attachment Among Foreign-Born Faculty at the University

This research is being conducted under the advisement and guidance of Dr. Judith Freidenberg a socio-cultural anthropologist and immigration specialist in the Anthropology Department at the University of Maryland. Through her *Immigrant Life Course Research Program*, I became increasingly interested in professional populations of migrants and their relationship to U.S. society.

Specifically, in my earlier research pre-study with foreign-born faculty at the university, I found that institutional data only reflect certain visa statuses and does not take into account faculty who have naturalized or stayed via other statuses. To address such incongruence, I began to conduct virtual ethnography. By researching, for example, faculty profiles, biographies, and curriculum vitas, uploaded in departmental websites, I was able to complete a list of foreign-born faculty.

My project builds on this database in an effort to recruit, interview, and survey faculty at the university to elicit how their sense of attachment or belonging is internalized. The project has three major objectives: (1) To explore, through life history interviews, how the ability to be globally mobile over their life courses has allowed these international professionals' to operate within a larger, more inclusive social class as well as within a global context; (2) To analyze these data in order to identify and explain the role that "attachment and belonging" plays towards influencing the mobility decisions of these international professionals; and (3) To survey a large group of foreign-born faculty at the university using a questionnaire built upon analysis of the smaller sample of life histories in order to verify and validate my findings.

2. **Subject Selection:**

- a) Subjects will be recruited through the list I have created, using university emails. I also will send out a recruitment advertisement via the university FYI listserv.
- b) The target population will be foreign-born faculty at the assistant, associate, full and emeritus professor statuses. I have chosen these ranks, in particular, because my initial research indicates that they represent a population who has chosen to stay at the university for a longer term in order to establish a career, as opposed to someone who is a visiting scholar, lecturer, or research associate, who is staying only temporarily. Consequently, the sense of identity and attachment of this target population is positioned differently.
- c) In their edited collection, "The Human Face of Global Mobility: A Research Agenda," Favell, Feldblum, and Smith (2006) argue that relatively little research has been done on the skilled, educated, or professional categories of migration. They additionally find that there is a larger gap in knowledge about the migration experience from the perspective of the professionals themselves, people who can and do move because of personal choices, including relationships, career and

educational opportunities, etc. To address this deficiency, I propose interviewing foreign-born faculty at the university to understand how this group incorporates at the local level, directly addressing the assumption that their education makes this experience less challenging (21-22).

- d) I plan on collecting a small sample of life history interviews, up to 10 based on a rationale for sampling from my established list, and a significant amount of surveys, a minimum of 100, (or as many foreign-born faculty at the assistant, associate, full, and emeritus level that will participate). For the follow-up survey, I will again send an email from the list I have compiled.

*Note: While I will not actively recruit family members, relatives or friends of participants for my study, if a participant would like to recruit and include them in one of the life history interview sessions to position their life story in relationship with them, I will include them although the foreign-born faculty member will remain the central focus of the interview. I will, however, select how many and during which interview session. Since I plan on having two, two-hour life history interview sessions, I will interview the foreign-born faculty member by herself/himself during at least the first session. During the second session, if the participant would like to include family members, relatives, or friends, I will ask that no more than 2 be included as I don't want the focus to shift from an interview of the foreign-born faculty member to that of a larger, group interview. Finally, all people recruited as complementary participants must be 18 years of age or older.

*My rationale for including these complementary voices in the interview is because a life history is not just a chronological account of the events making up a person's life, but rather, it is an intimate story used to construct an identity against the backdrop of the human condition. Segments of one's life story often play repetitively in one's mind both consciously and unconsciously and are often shared in various social settings to construct an identity that one is comfortable with in a current living situation. As such, if participants want to include spouses or close friends, for example, this is one way to understand how they construct their identities, i.e. tell their stories in relation to the people who surround them.

3. Procedures

1. Personal Competence: I have completed my CITI certification as a social and behavioral research scientist.

2. Data Collection: Conduct Two life history interviews (each 1-2 hours and taped) for every person interviewed. In addition, I plan on asking for the voluntary collection, in the form of scanned copies, of photographs or other kinds of memorabilia that document 'the inner experience of individuals, how they interpret, understand, and define the world around them' (Faraday and Plummer 1979: 776). I'm looking for images or metaphors that invite me, the interviewer, to understand details about specific experiences over the participant's life course in ways that cannot always be secured through direct questioning.

Please see attached interview schedule for a list of potential questions. An interview schedule is essentially a guide for the life history interview, presenting initial prompts or questions for conversation and fostering the emergence of topics over the life course. The interview schedule may or may not be modified to fit the needs of each research participant. The interviewer may take hand-written notes during the interview. Also, the participant may identify topics that may be addressed at any time in an interview or in subsequent interviews. The interviewee may decline to answer any question posed by the interviewer and may stop the interview at any time without any consequence.

Finally, the interviewee may also invite additional participants to be interviewed with them, to complement sharing their story, (such as family members, relatives, or friends) although the original interviewee will remain the central focus of the life history interview. I will be asking these additional or complementary participants about their connection to the original interviewee and the experiences he/she shares.

Some questions that may be asked of these additional/complementary participants (family members, relatives, or friends) include:

- a) How do you know the person being interviewed and what is your relationship?
- b) What are some shared experiences you have with him/her?
- c) What are some similarities and/or differences between the two of you?
- d) What have you learned through this person? (about yourself, the world, life, etc.)

3. Analysis of Interviews and Photographs using *Atlas.ti*, a qualitative software program for creating codes and connecting those to larger themes.

4. Development of a survey to be circulated electronically, through a web-based application and through internal university mail, to foreign-born faculty on my list. Once the survey has been developed, I will file an Amendment application to the IRB and submit the final version of the survey before I administer it.

4. Risks

Possible embarrassment or discomfort with the experiences shared during the interview. However, participants may stop participating at any time and not be penalized or lose any benefits to which they otherwise qualify.

Additionally, there is risk of breach of confidentiality through the publication of statements from the interviews. However, I will minimize this risk by using pseudonyms to protect the privacy of participants and to maintain the confidentiality of identifiable data at each segment of the research: 1) in taking notes during the interviews, 2) in storing data on my computer, and 3) in writing and publishing statements from the interviews.

5. Benefits

There are no direct benefits to participants. However, possible benefits include being able to share their experiences and to contribute to a better understanding of a foreign-born population that tends to be hidden from the view of policy makers and the general public.

6. Confidentiality

I will keep personal information confidential by not including the real names of participants in any part of the final product(s) or in any notes that I may take during the interview. If I write a report or article about this research project, participants' identity will be protected to the maximum extent possible. Their information may be shared with representatives of the University of Maryland, College Park or governmental authorities if someone is in danger or if I am required to do so by law.

Digital recordings and transcriptions of interviews, along with scanned photographs and memorabilia, and survey results will be stored on my personal computer, which is password protected. I will have access to this information, along with Dr. Judith Freidenberg, my advisor and head of the *Immigrant Life Course Research program (ILCRP)*, of which my research is a part. In addition, other CITI certified students, who are members of the *ILCRP*, will have access if they assist with transcription and counting survey results.

7. Consent Process

Before beginning a Life History Interview, the participant and/or complementary participants will be given a consent form, which will be summarized verbally and then read by the participant(s). Only after obtaining signature(s) will the Life History Interview begin.

All participants will receive a signed copy of the consent form for their records.

Additionally, survey participants will be anonymous. I will not require that names be submitted with their responses. I intend to send out the survey electronically, web-based, with a statement that reads as follows: "If you have read and understand the above statements about my research, please click on the "Continue" button below to indicate your consent to participate in this study." Additionally, I will set up the web response to come to me anonymously.

I also intend to circulate a hard copy of the survey through internal university mail. Again, I will not require that names be submitted with their responses. With the hard copy, I intend to attach a statement that reads as follows: "By submitting this survey, you confirm that you have read about and agree to participate in this research." I will then have a box that should be checked if they consent.

8. Conflict of Interest

There are no known or anticipated conflicts of interest at this time.

9. Hipa Compliance

Not Applicable

10. Research Outside the United States

Not Applicable

11. Research Involving Prisoners

Not Applicable

12. Supporting Documents

Your Initial Application must include a **completed Initial Application Part 1 (On-Line Document)**, the information required in items 1-11 above, and all relevant supporting documents including: consent forms, letters sent to recruit participants, questionnaires completed by participants, and any other material that will be presented, viewed or read to human subject participants.

For funded research, a copy of the Awarded Grant Application (minus the budgetary information) must be uploaded. If the Grant has not been awarded at the time of submission of this Initial Application, a statement must be added to the Abstract Section stating that an Addendum will be submitted to include the Grant Application once it has been awarded.

Appendix B

Interview Schedule

Section I: Demographic Information

1. Date of birth:
2. Place of birth:
2. Gender:
4. Marital status:
6. Residence status:
7. Date of arrival in U.S.:

Section II: Childhood

Memory

What is your earliest memory?

Household

Where did you grow up?

What kind of house did you live in? (Sights, Sounds, Tastes, etc.)

Whom did you live with?

What were they like?

Were there any adults you were especially close to...why?

Celebrations and Values

What sort of things did your family celebrate? (holidays, birthdays, etc)

What sorts of things were your parents strict about? How? Why?

How much influence did your parents have over your life choices?

What life lessons did they try to impart to you?

Education

Where did you go to school?

What kind of student were you? Did you enjoy school? Did you get good grades?

Were there any school teachers you particularly liked?

What did you think you were going to be when you grew up?

Neighborhood/Community

What was your neighborhood or community like? Did you have favorite places you liked to go in your neighborhood?

What did you do in your spare time? (clubs/youth organizations/sports/games/dances/hobbies/cinema/theatre?) Describe what was involved.

Section III: Moving and Adulthood

Becoming an Adult

When did you feel you had become an adult?
Were you ever married? How did you meet your spouse?
Did you have children? What was it like to become a parent?
How did you decide on your most recent or current career?
Were there other career paths you considered taking?

Moving

How did you come to the decision to move away from home?
Did you move other places before coming to the U.S.? If so, what were they like?
Tell me about your experiences with moving to the U.S. How did you come to the decision to move here?
How was your initial contact with U.S. society? (Prompt: Did you socialize much? Did you use public services, such as health care centers or community organizations? How were you received by U.S. society?)
Could you give me word picture or metaphor to explain how you felt during this transition?

Section IV: Life Today

Nowadays

Tell me about your life now. (Prompts: How has it changed from when you first arrived? Do you still live with the same people? In the same place? Have you moved around different parts of the country?)
What are the things that most interest you these days?
What political issues or world events most concern you?
What is a typical day like for you?

Neighborhood/Community

What is your neighborhood or community like? Do you have favorite places you like to go in your neighborhood or community?
What are your main hobbies and interests? Which are things you've always enjoyed?
Which are new pleasures?

Work Now

What lessons has your work life taught you?
If you could do anything now, what would you do? Why?
Do you plan on retiring? If so, when? How do you feel about it?
Do you have any favorite stories from your work life?

Belonging

Do you feel comfortable in this country? Why or why not?
How do you feel that migration in general affects society in the United States?
How do you think about international boundaries?
How would you define your sense of "home"?

Photograph (s), Quotations, Excerpts From Literature, Songs, or Poems, etc.

Do you have a favorite photograph or object/artifact? Why is it a favorite?
Do you have a quote, excerpt from a piece of literature, a song, or a poem that you feel defines your particular perspective about life? If so, what is it and why?

Appendix C: 19 Themes in relation to 83 Topics

1. Family History with Immigration

- Family History with Crossing National Borders
- Family History with Moving within Their Country of birth

2. Parents' Occupation and Educational Achievement

- White Collar
- Blue Collar

3. Elementary and High School Educational Experiences

School Performance

- Excelled in School
- Hard Worker
- Liked School and/or Liked Reading

Educational Contexts

- Public School
- Private/Elite school
- International School and/or Social Class and Diversity experiences
- Family Contexts (profession, politics, and living standard)
- School System Structured to Specialize Early in Chosen Field

4. Undergraduate Education

Meaning of Undergraduate Education

- A Time of Discovery (academic fields, travel, freedom, etc.)
- Evaluating which profession(s) would give them more chances of gaining employment

Learning Environments

- Training (competition, resources, benchmarks, exams, military experience, etc.)
- Social life (dorms and interaction with peers)

5. Reasons for Going Abroad

- Policies and Politics (immigration laws and national conflicts and agendas)
- Work and Education
- Relationships

6. Reasons for Coming to the U.S.

- *Experience* (gaining professional and educational experience and/or additional training)
- *Exploration* (to experience other geographic locations, ways of being, career possibilities, and different research interests)
- *Escape* certain circumstances (war, gender inequality, revolutions, unstable political situations, and unmet socioeconomic needs)
- *Innovation* (find inspiration through new challenges—to stay energized by the choices available)
- Use their position in the U.S. to *Influence* (research agendas and other places in the world)

7. Selecting a Graduate School

- Comparative Benefits of choosing one school over that of another
- Social Networks
- Other benefits such as pairing their degrees with other types of Professional Experiences (internships, projects, grants, professional certifications, etc.) or with complementary degrees or training in related disciplines or sub-disciplines

8. Work Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

Learning the Profession

- Characteristics of work environment (autonomy, strong work ethic, engaging with diversity, and dealing with the pressures of being evaluated)

Institutional Environments

- Work Structure (professional development, advising relationship, peer relationship)
- Standard of living (obtaining funding to supporting themselves and sometimes families)

9. Social Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

- Experiencing a Disconnect between their work lives at the University and their social lives—living in U.S. Culture
- Finding Connections to U.S. Culture (children, regional identities, engaging with diversity, lifestyle choices, U.S.-born partners)
- Consciously creating connections between the U.S. and other places they have lived (food, international experiences, communication [letters and telephone], planning visits)

- Practical Matters (visa statuses, supporting families, contemplating the best time to start a family, finding familiar food ingredients, and gathering the resources to travel back home)

10. Assessing the U.S. in the Student or Post-Doctoral Stage

- Comparing perceptions with actual experiences (what they had heard about the U.S. and other places from others and what they had seen through media coverage with their actual experiences once in a new country) (technologies and weather and regional differences included)
- U.S. University Standards and Expectations (work load, dissertation expectations, advising) & U.S. University characteristics (autonomy and research and work opportunities)
- U.S. Culture (gender norms, living alone for the first time in a society that encourages young adults to do so, and social interactions)

11. Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate

- Learning different registers and places (academic, place, linguistic, temperamental) (countries, regions, cities, towns)
- Learning about Universities (rankings, networks, research areas, application process)
- Learning about their discipline (questions to ask, write-up research results, norms and practices, how other disciplines interact with yours)
- Learning about Research (scholars, research directions, experimental projects)

12. Choosing to Make a Career at the University

- Discovered the University as a Career Option
- Decided on the University through a process of evaluating characteristics present in different career paths
- The University was a natural choice/progression/outgrowth of their professional training

13. Reasons for Leaving the U.S.

- Return—to country of birth
- Gain More Professional Experience
- Exploration—other places and ways of being
- Relationship—academic couples or met someone from another country

14. Choosing to Stay in the U.S.

- Professional Opportunities (a more open job market, opportunities for funding and applying for grants, access to resources and academic specialties, development of

professional networks, opportunities for professional training, and the possibility of getting tenure)

- Family and Children (Children are in the U.S.-born here, moved here, acculturated here-, In a relationship with U.S.-born, Parents passed away, Both spouses have career opportunities)
- Lifestyle and Values in U.S. society (Independence, an “American Dimension,” Diversity, Self-Expression, Gender relations, Education for all)
- State Politics (separatist movement, secession, solidarity movement crushed)
- Ability to Support themselves and others through holding one position versus several positions
- A good work location where many layers of individual experience operate at an optimal level: spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional

15. Work Life as a Professor

Expected Behavior

- Work as a way of life—consuming—and more than a career—accompanying sense of esteem
- Other characteristics of work environment (experience both solitude and engaging with diversity)

Institutional Environments

- Negotiation—meaning having to maneuver through administrative politics, disciplinary boundaries, and perceptions about scholarship, motives and research agendas
- Importance of colleagues (explaining system, introducing different social networks, and becoming friends)

16. Social Life as a Professor/Professional

- Disconnections between their work lives at the University and their social lives—living in U.S. Culture (regional identities, state politics, academic couples who are separated by their careers, social network is greater elsewhere, holidays, social life/interactions, too much diversity—no American mainstream, older children not feeling “settled”)
- Connections to U.S. Culture (children, regional identities, engaging with diversity, lifestyle choices, U.S.-born partners, becoming a citizen)
- Connections to other places they have lived (children going back to countries of birth for a time, social media, international experiences (friends from familiar countries), skype, facebook, religion, relationships (partners), financial remittances, planning visits (combining conferences and other business with visiting friends and family all over the world as well as planning isolated visits to those places)

- Practical Matters (safety, credit history, health insurance, visa, residency, and citizenship statuses, when/if to have children, social security)

17. Assessing the U.S. as a Professor/Professional

- Lifestyle preferences and values (drive to progress, work ethic, professional relationships, support for innovation, all voices need to be heard, public versus private, reasons for marriage, gun control, health insurance as a human right, materialism, age to maturity, work-life balance, student-professor relationship/expectations, religion, pluralism, travelling)
- Geographic locations of universities (economics, weather, towns, populations, size, regional personality/identity, architecture)
- University Standards and Expectations (professional development and training and different types of positions at Universities)
- Cultural personalities and habits (English self-deprecation, American directness, American identification with work, handshakes, eye contact, automatic habits, American Independence, politeness, New Zealand relaxed attitude, social interactions)
- Political Actions of the State--services (health insurance, public transportation, safety monitoring); regulations policies geared towards race, class, and gender; different meanings of citizenship

18. Learning the U.S. as a Professor

- Learning about their career in academia (job application process; university location where they can be most effective; grant application processes)
- Learning about others (what they share in common with other researchers, communicating across audiences, different histories with race and ethnicity, and learning from past events)
- Learning through exchange with others (international exchange of scholars and exchange between different stakeholders invested in a research project)
- Learning about Themselves (approaches to research that resonate with them; what they are interested in pursuing intellectually; and what outside interests they want to pursue)

19. Personal Identifications

- Nationality
- Profession
- Region
- Stranger to Your Own People
- International, World, or Global “citizen”

- More Americanized than I think I am
- Not American
- Balanced person
- Loner
- Religion
- Parent/Grandparent

Appendix D: Social Matrix Charts

1. Family History with Immigration

18 professors (38% of the interview sample)	Family history with crossing national borders
13 professors (27% of the interview sample)	Family history with moving within their country of birth

2. Parents' Occupation and Educational Achievement

35 professors (73% of the interview sample)	White collar
11 professors (23% of the interview sample)	Blue Collar

3. Elementary and High School Educational Experiences

School Performance	
8 professors (17% of the interview sample)	Excelled in school
4 professors (8% of the interview sample)	Hard worker
9 professors (19% of the interview sample)	Liked school and/or liked reading

Educational Contexts	
13 professors (27% of the interview sample)	Public school
8 professors (17% of the interview sample)	Private/Elite school
6 professors (13% of the interview sample)	International school and/or social class and diversity experiences
6 professors (13% of the interview sample)	Family influences (profession, politics, and living standard)
5 professors (10% of the interview sample)	School system structured to specialize early in chosen field

4. Undergraduate Education

Meaning of Undergraduate Education	
17 professors (35% of the interview sample)	A time of discovery (academic fields, travel, freedom, etc.)
7 professors (15% of the interview sample)	Evaluating which profession(s) would give them more chances of gaining employment

Learning Environments	
16 professors (33% of the interview sample)	Training (competition, resources, benchmarks, exams, military experience, etc.)
3 professors (6% of the interview sample)	Social life (dorms and interaction with peers)

5. Reasons for Going Abroad

4 professors (8% of the interview sample)	Policies and politics (immigration laws and national conflicts and agendas)
7 professors (15% of the interview sample)	Work and education
1 professor (2% of the interview sample)	Relationships

6. Reasons for Coming to the U.S.

26 professors (54% of the interview sample)	<i>Experience</i> (gaining professional and educational experience and/or additional training)
10 professors (21% of the interview sample)	<i>Exploration</i> (to experience other geographic locations, ways of being, career possibilities, and different research interests)
9 professors (19% of the interview sample)	<i>Escape</i> certain circumstances (war, gender inequality, revolutions, unstable political situations, and unmet socioeconomic needs)
5 professors (10% of the interview sample)	<i>Innovation</i> (find inspiration through new challenges—to stay energized by the choices available)
4 professors (8% of the interview sample)	Use their position in the U.S. to <i>Influence</i> (research agendas and other places in the world)

7. Selecting a Graduate School

11 professors (23% of the interview sample)	Comparative benefits of choosing one school over that of another
4 professors (8% of the interview sample)	Social networks
8 professors (17% of the interview sample)	Other benefits such as pairing their degrees with other types of professional experiences (internships, projects, grants, professional certifications, etc.) or with complementary

	degrees or training in related disciplines or sub-disciplines
--	---

8. Work Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

Learning the Profession	
9 professors <i>(19% of the interview sample)</i>	Characteristics of work environment (autonomy, strong work ethic, engaging with diversity, and dealing with the pressures of being evaluated)

Institutional Environments	
10 professors <i>(21% of the interview sample)</i>	Work structure (professional development, advising relationship, peer relationship)
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Standard of living (obtaining funding to supporting themselves and sometimes families)

9. Social Life as a Student or Post-Doctorate

9 professors <i>(19% of the interview sample)</i>	Experiencing a disconnect between their work lives at the university and their social lives—living in U.S. culture
12 professors <i>(25% of the interview sample)</i>	Finding connections to U.S. culture (children, regional identities, engaging with diversity, lifestyle choices, U.S.-born partners)
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Consciously creating connections between the U.S. and other places they have lived (food, international experiences, communication [letters and telephone], planning visits)
7 professors <i>(15% of the interview sample)</i>	Practical matters (visa statuses, supporting families, contemplating the best time to start a family, finding familiar food ingredients, and gathering the resources to travel back home)

10. Assessing the U.S. in the Student or Post-Doctoral Stage

13 professors <i>(27% of the interview sample)</i>	Comparing perceptions with actual experiences (what they had heard about the U.S. and other places from others and what they had seen through media coverage with their actual experiences once in a new country) (technologies and weather and regional differences included)
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	U.S. university standards and expectations (work load, dissertation expectations, advising) & U.S. university characteristics (autonomy and research and work opportunities)
6 professors	U.S. culture (gender norms, living alone for the first time in a

<i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	society that encourages young adults to do so, and social interactions)
--------------------------------------	---

11. Learning the U.S. as a Student or Post-Doctorate

5 professors <i>(10% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning different registers and places (academic, place, linguistic, temperamental) (countries, regions, cities, towns)
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning about universities (rankings, networks, research areas, application process)
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning about their discipline (questions to ask, write-up research results, norms and practices, how other disciplines interact with yours)
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning about research (scholars, research directions, experimental projects)
7 professors <i>(15% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning about themselves (transforming, what they don't want to do, what they want to pursue)

12. Choosing to Make a Career at the University

11 Professors <i>(23% of the interview sample)</i>	Discovered the university as a career option
8 Professors <i>(17% of the interview sample)</i>	Decided on the university through a process of evaluating characteristics present in different career paths
6 Professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	The university was a natural choice/progression/outgrowth of their professional training

13. Reasons for Leaving the U.S.

4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Return—to country of birth
1 professor <i>(2% of the interview sample)</i>	Gain more professional experience
2 professors <i>(4% of the interview sample)</i>	Exploration—other places and ways of being
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Relationship—academic couples or met someone from another country

14. Choosing to Stay in the U.S.

16 professors <i>(33% of the interview sample)</i>	Professional opportunities (a more open job market, opportunities for funding and applying for grants, access to resources and academic specialties, development of professional networks, opportunities for professional training,
---	---

	and the possibility of getting tenure)
14 professors <i>(29% of the interview sample)</i>	Family and children (children are in the U.S.-born here, moved here, acculturated here-, in a relationship with U.S.-born, parents passed away, both spouses have career opportunities)
11 professors <i>(23% of the interview sample)</i>	Lifestyle and values in U.S. society (independence, an “American dimension,” diversity, self-expression, gender relations, education for all)
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	State politics (separatist movement, secession, solidarity movement crushed)
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Ability to support themselves and others through holding one position versus several positions
14 professors <i>(29% of the interview sample)</i>	A good work location where many layers of individual experience operate at an optimal level: spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional

15. Work Life as a Professional/Professor

Expected Behavior	
15 professors <i>(31% of the interview sample)</i>	Work as a way of life—consuming—and more than a career—accompanying sense of esteem
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Other characteristics of work environment (experience both solitude and engaging with diversity)

Institutional Environments	
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Negotiation—meaning having to maneuver through administrative politics, disciplinary boundaries, and perceptions about scholarship, motives and research agendas
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Importance of colleagues (explaining system, introducing different social networks, and becoming friends)

16. Social Life as a Professional/Professor

11 professors <i>(23% of the interview sample)</i>	Disconnections between their work lives at the university and their social lives—living in U.S. culture (regional identities, state politics, academic couples who are separated by their careers, social network is greater elsewhere, holidays, social life/interactions, too much diversity—no American mainstream, older children not feeling “settled”)
15 professors <i>(31% of the interview sample)</i>	Connections to U.S. culture (children, regional identities, engaging with diversity, lifestyle choices, U.S.-born partners, becoming a citizen)
12 professors <i>(25% of the interview sample)</i>	Connections to other places they have lived (children going back to countries of birth for a time, social media,

	international experiences (friends from familiar countries), skype, facebook, religion, relationships (partners), financial remittances, planning visits (combining conferences and other business with visiting friends and family all over the world as well as planning isolated visits to those places)
11 professors (23% of the interview sample)	Practical matters (safety, credit history, health insurance, visa, residency, and citizenship statuses, when/if to have children, social security)

17. Assessing the U.S. as a Professor/Professional

13 professors (27% of the interview sample)	Lifestyle preferences and values (drive to progress, work ethic, professional relationships, support for innovation, all voices need to be heard, public versus private, reasons for marriage, gun control, health insurance as a human right, materialism, age to maturity, work-life balance, student-professor relationship/expectations, religion, pluralism, travelling)
10 professors (21% of the interview sample)	Geographic locations of universities (economics, weather, towns, populations, size, regional personality/identity, architecture)
7 professors (15% of the interview sample)	University standards and expectations (professional development and training and different types of positions at universities)
13 professors (27% of the interview sample)	Cultural personalities and habits (English self-deprecation, American directness, American identification with work, handshakes, eye contact, automatic habits, American Independence, politeness, New Zealand relaxed attitude, social interactions)
12 professors (25% of the interview sample)	Political actions of the state--services (health insurance, public transportation, safety monitoring); regulations; policies geared towards race, class, and gender; different meanings of citizenship

18. Learning the U.S. as a Professional/Professor

4 professors (8% of the interview sample)	Learning about their career in academia (job application process; university location where they can be most effective; grant application processes)
8 professors (17% of the interview sample)	Learning about others (what they share in common with other researchers, communicating across audiences, different histories with race and ethnicity, and learning from past events)
11 professors (23% of the interview sample)	Learning through exchange with others (international

	exchange of scholars and exchange between different stakeholders invested in a research project)
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Learning about themselves (approaches to research that resonate with them; what they are interested in pursuing intellectually; and what outside interests they want to pursue)

19. Personal Identifications

7 professors <i>(15% of the interview sample)</i>	Nationality
18 professors <i>(38% of the interview sample)</i>	Profession
8 professors <i>(17% of the interview sample)</i>	Region
8 professors <i>(17% of the interview sample)</i>	Stranger to Your Own People
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	International, World, or Global “citizen”
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	More Americanized than I think I am
6 professors <i>(13% of the interview sample)</i>	Not American
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Balanced person
2 professors <i>(4% of the interview sample)</i>	Loner
4 professors <i>(8% of the interview sample)</i>	Religion
3 professors <i>(6% of the interview sample)</i>	Parent/Grandparent

Works Cited

Adams, Walther, ed.

1968 *The Brain Drain*. New York: Macmillan.

Agar, Michael

2013 *The Lively Science: Remodeling Human Social Research*. Minneapolis: Mill City Press.

1994 "The Intercultural Frame." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 18(2): 221-37.

1986 *Speaking of Ethnography*. Qualitative Research Methods Series, no 2. Sage: London.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee

2003 *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

1999 "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism." *Sociological Forum* 14: 3–25.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M.

2005 "A Qualitative Method for Assessing Faculty Satisfaction." *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1): 803-830.

Amelina, A. and Faist, T.

2012 "De-Naturalizing the National in Research Methodologies: Key Concepts of

- Transnational Studies in Migration.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35(10): 10–21.
- American Anthropological Website
- 2014 AAA General Statement on Immigration. Accessed through
<<http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/AAA-General-Statement-on-Immigration.cfm>> Fall 2014.
- Andresen, Maike, Torsten Biemann, and Marshall Wilson-Pattie
- 2012 “What Makes Them Move Abroad? Reviewing and Exploring Differences Between Self-Initiated and Assigned Expatriation.” *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*: March 29, pp.1-16.
- Anderson, Bridget
- 2013 *Us and Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Controls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Elijah
- 2011 *The Cosmopolitan Canopy: Race and Civility in Everyday Life*. New York: W. W. Norton Company.
- Angrosino, Michael
- 2004 *Projects in Ethnographic Research*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Appiah, K. A.
- 2006 *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin Group.
- Ariss, A. & Syed, J.
- 2011 "Capital Mobilization of Skilled Migrants: A Relational Perspective." *British Journal of Management* 22 (2): pp. 286-304.
- Ariss, A. and Ozbilgin, M.

2010 “Understanding Self-Initiated Expatriates: Career Experiences of Lebanese Self-Initiated Expatriates in France.” *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 52 (4).

Bach, Stephen

2007 “Going Global? The Regulation of Nurse Migration in the UK.” *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 45 (2): 383–403.

Baldwin, G.B.

1970 “Brain Drain or Brain Overflow?” *Foreign Affairs* 48(2): pp.358–372.

Barkan, E.R.

2006 “Introduction: Immigration, Incorporation, Assimilation, and the Limits of Transnationalism.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 25: 7–32.

Baruch, Y., Budhwar, P. S., & Khatri, N.

2007 “Brain Drain: Inclination to Stay Abroad After Studies.” *Journal of World Business*, 42(1): 99-112.

Basch, L., N. Glick Schiller and C. Szanton Blanc, eds.

1994 *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. New York: Gordon and Breach.

Basu, Kaustuv

2011 “Foreign-Born, and Productive.” *Inside Higher Ed*. November 30. Accessed through <<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/11/30/foreign-born-faculty-more-productive-their-peers>>. Fall 2014.

Barth, Frederick

1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Differences*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Batalova, J. and Lowell, L.

2006 “The Best and the Brightest: Immigrant Professionals in the U.S.” In: Smith, M. P. and Favell, A. (Ed.): *The Human Face of Global Mobility* New Jersey: Rutgers State University Press.

Beaverstock, J & Boardwell, J

2000 “Negotiating Globalization, Transnational Corporations and Global City Financial Centres in Transient Migration Studies.” *Applied Geography* 20: 277-304.

Beck, U. and Sznaider, N.

2006 “A Literature on Cosmopolitanism: An Overview.” *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 153–64.

Beck, U.

2002 “The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1-2): 17-44.

Benson, M. and O’Reilly, K., editors

2009 *Lifestyle Migration: Expectations, Aspirations and Experiences*. Farnham, Surrey, United Kingdom: Ashgate.

Berg, M. and Sigona, N.

2013 “Ethnography, Diversity and Urban Space.” *Identities*, 20 (4): 347-360.

Boccagni, Paolo

2012 “Rethinking Transnational Studies: Transnational Ties and the Transnationalism of Everyday Life.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 15(1): pp. 117-132.

Bodvarsson, O. B., Van den Berg, H.,

2013 *The Economics of Immigration: Theory and Policy*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY:

Springer.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K.

2007 *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Bönisch-Brednich, Brigitte

2013 "Cultural Transfer in University Teaching: Academic Migrant Perspectives from Aotearoa/New Zealand" In *Academic Migration, Discipline Knowledge and Pedagogical Practice*. Colina Mason and Felicity Rawlings Sanaei, editors. New York: Springer, pp. 13-26.

Brettell, Caroline, and James Hollifield.

2013[2000] Introduction. In *Migration theory: Talking Across Disciplines*. Edited by Caroline Brettell and James Hollifield. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-30.

Brettell, Caroline B.

2011 "Scalar Positioning and Immigrant Organizations: Asian Indians and the Dynamics of Place." In *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Edited by Nina Glick Schiller and Ayse Caglar. New York: Cornell University, pp.

Brettell, Caroline and Deborah Reed-Danahay

2011 *Civic Engagements: The Citizenship Practices of Indian and Vietnamese Immigrants*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Brettell, Caroline

2000 "Theorizing Migration in Anthropology: The Social Construction of Networks, Identities, Communities and Globalscapes." In *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines*, edited by Caroline B. Brettell & James F. Hollifield. New York:

Routledge, pp. 97-135.

1998 "Fieldwork in the Archives: Methods and Sources in Historical Anthropology."

In *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Russell Bernard, ed. California:

AltaMira Press, pp. 513-546.

Braunstein, M.

1993 Sampling a Hidden Population: Noninstitutionalized Drug Users. *AIDS*

Education and Prevention, 5: 131-139.

Brown, Susan K. and Frank D. Bean

2006 "Assimilation Models, Old and New: Explaining a Long-Term Process."

Migration Policy Institute. Accessed through < <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/>>

Fall 2014.

Brücker, H., E. Jahn, R. Upward

2012 *Migration and Imperfect Labor Markets: Theory and Comparative Evidence*

from Denmark, Germany and the UK. Institute for Employment Research (IAB),

Nuremberg.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

2013 "Labor Force Characteristics of Foreign-born Workers News Release." Accessed

at < http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/forbrn_05222013.htm> Fall 2014.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

2013 "Occupational Employment Statistics." Post-Secondary Teachers. Accessed at

< http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/naics4_611300.htm> Fall 2014.

Burnett-Taylor, Edward (Sir)

1871 *Primitive Culture Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*. London: John Murray.

Cao, L., Hirschi, A., & Deller, J.

2012 "Self-Initiated Expatriates and Their Career Success." *Journal of Management Development* 31(2): 159-172.

Carr, S.S., Inkson, K., and Thorn, K.

2005 "From Global Careers to Talent Flow: Reinterpreting 'Brain Drain.'" *Journal of World Business* 40: 386-398.

Castles, S., De Haas, H., Miller, M.

2014 *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World* (Fifth Edition). New York: Guilford Press.

Castles, S.

2010 "Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(10): 1565-1586.

Caughey, John L.

2006 *Negotiating Cultures and Identities: Life History Issues, Methods, and Readings*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Cerdin, J.-L. and Pargneux, M. L.

2010 "Career Anchors: A Comparison Between Organization-Assigned and Self-Initiated Expatriates." *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 52(4): pp. 287-299.

Cerna, Lucie

2014 "Attracting High-Skilled Immigrants: Policies in Comparative Perspective."

International Migration 52(3): pages 69–84.

Cervantes M. and Guellec, D.

2002 “The Brain Drain: Old myths, New Realities.” *OECD Observer*. Accessed
<http://www.oecdobserver.org/news/fullstory.php/aid/673/The_brain_drain%3A_Old_myths,_new_realities.html> Fall 2014.

Chavez, Leo R.

2008 *The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation*.
Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chen, Ming H.

2012 “Where You Stand Depends on Where You Sit: Bureaucratic. Incorporation of
Immigrants in Federal Workplace Agencies.” Univ. of Colorado Law Legal Studies
Research Paper No. 12-03: pp. 1-72.

Chouliaraki, L.

2006 *The Spectatorship of Suffering*. London: Sage.

Clark, Krissy

2011 “Who are the 11 million undocumented immigrants?” In *Marketplace* (online)
Accessed December 2014 through < <http://www.marketplace.org>>.

Clemens, Michael

2013 “Why Do Programmers Earn More in Houston than Hyderabad? Evidence
from Randomized Processing of U.S. Visas.” *American Economic Review Papers &
Proceedings* 103(3):198-202.

Clifford, J.

1997 *Routes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Cohen, Jeffrey H. and N Merino Chavez
2013. "Latino Immigrants, Discrimination and Reception in Columbus, Ohio."
International Migration, 51(2): pp. 24–31.
- Collins, J.M.
- 2008 "Coming to America: Challenges for Faculty Coming to United States' Universities." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2): 179-188.
- Conte, Christopher and Albert R. Karr, editors
- 2001 *An Outline of the U.S. Economy*. U.S. Department of State. Washington D.C.: International Information Program. Accessed through
< <http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS70995> > Fall 2014.
- Corley, E. & Sabharwal, M.
- 2007 "Foreign-born Academic Scientists and Engineers: Producing More and Getting Less than their U.S.-born Peers?" *Research in Higher Education*, 48(8): 909-940.
- Counihan, Christopher
- 2008 *Private Actors in Highly-Skilled Migration*. Dissertation: University of Delaware.
- Conradson, D. and Latham, A.
- 2005 "Transnational Urbanism: Attending to Everyday Practices and Mobilities." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31: 227–233.
- Couldry, N.
- 2006 *Listening Beyond the Echoes: Media, Ethics, and Agency in an Uncertain World*. Boulder, London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Crapanzano, V.

1993 "Text, Transference, and Indexicality." In John Arthur Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 293-314.

De Haas, H.

2008 "The Complex Role of Migration in Shifting Rural Livelihoods: the Case of a Moroccan Oasis." In van Naerssen, T., Spaan, E. and Zoomers, A. (eds) *Global Migration and Development*, New York/London: Routledge, pp. 21-42.

2005 "International Migration, Remittances and Development: Myths and Facts." *Third World Quarterly* 26(8): 1269–1284.

Docquier, Frederic and Hillel Rapoport

2007 "Skilled Migration: The Perspective of Developing Countries." Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM), Department of Economics, University College London in its series CReAM Discussion Paper Series with number 0710.

Doherty, N., & Dickmann, M.

2008 "Self-initiated Expatriates—Corporate Asset or a Liability?" Presented at the 4th Workshop on Expatriation, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain.

Dumont, Jean- Christophe and Lemaitre George.

2004. "Counting Immigrants and Expatriates: A New Perspective." The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) *Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers*.

Elder, G.H.

2003 "The life Course in Time and Place." In: Heinz, W. R./Marshall, V. W. (eds.),
Social Dynamics of the Life Course , Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, pp. 57-
71.

Eller, J.D.

2002 *From Culture to Ethnicity to Conflict. An Anthropological Perspective on
International Ethnic Conflict.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Esser , H.

2001 *Integration und Etnische Schichtung (Integration and Ethnic
Stratification).* MZES Mannheim Centre for European Social Research Working
Paper no. 40.

Etzioni, Amitai

2002 "Inventing Hispanics: A Diverse Minority Resists Being Labeled." *The
Brookings Review* 20: 10-13.

Faist, Thomas

2009 "Transnationalization and Development: Toward an Alternative Agenda." In
Social Analysis 53(3): 38-59.

Fassin, Didier

2011 "Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries: The Governmentality of Immigration
in Dark Times." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 213-226

Favell, Adrian, Miriam Feldblum, and Michael P. Smith

2006 "The Human Face of Global Mobility: A Research Agenda." *Society* 44(2): 15-
25.

Fechter, Anne-Meike,

2007 *Transnational Lives: Expatriates in Indonesia*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

Fetterman, David

2010 *Ethnography Step-by-Step*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Findlay A. M. and A. Stockdale

2003 "The Temporal and Social Embeddedness of Migration: A Methodological Exploration Using Biographical Analysis." *Geography Research Forum* 23: 4-29

Findlay, A. M. and Li, F. L. N.

1997 "An Auto-Biographical Approach to Understanding Migration: the Case of Hong Kong Emigrants." In *Area* 29(1): pp. 34-44.

Findlay, A. M

1995 "Skilled Transients: the Invisible Phenomenon?" In Cohen, R (ed) *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*, Cambridge: CUP, pp. 515-522.

Finkelstein, Martin J., Elaine Walker, and Rong Chen,

2013 "The American faculty in an Age of Globalization: Predictors of Internationalization of Research Content and Professional Networks." *Higher Education* 66 (3): pp 325-340.

Foderaro, L. W.

2011 "More Foreign-Born Scholars Lead U.S. Universities." *The New York Times*. Accessed July 2013 from <www.nytimes.com>.

Foner, Nancy

1997 "The Immigrant Family: Cultural Legacies and Cultural Changes." *International Migration Review* 31: 961-974.

Frank, A. G.

1967 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Freidenberg, Judith

2011a "Researching Global Spaces Ethnographically: Queries on Methods for the Study of Virtual Populations." *Human Organization* 70(3): 265-278.

2011b *Discussant Notes*. In *Tracing Material and Relational Places and Spaces: Anthropological Reflections about Social Relationships that Matter*. Montreal American Anthropological Association Meeting.

Freidenberg, Judith and Gail Thakur

2009 "Immigrant Life Histories as a Heritage Resource for Civic Engagement." *Practicing Anthropology* 31(3): 30-35.

Freidenberg, Judith

2006 "A Conceptual Framework to Understand Latino Immigrants' Well Being: An Introduction to the Issue." *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies* 2(2): 1-10.

Gahungu, A.

2011 "Integration of Foreign-Born Faculty in Academia: Foreignness as an asset." *The International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation* 6: 1-22.

Gardner, K.

2002 *Age, Narrative and Migration: The Life Course and Life Histories of Bengali Elders in London*. New York: Berg.

Geertz, Clifford

1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

1963 “The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States.” In C. Geertz (Ed.) *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*. New York: Free Press, pp. 107-113.

Giannoccolo, P.

2004 *The Brain Drain: a Survey of the Literature*. Bologna: University of Bologna.

Giddens, A.

1990 *Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilroy, P.

1993 *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: Verso.

Glazer N & Moynihan D P.

1970[1963] *Beyond the melting pot: the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Glennie, A. & Chappell, L.

2010 Jamaica: From Diverse Beginning to Diaspora in the Developed World. Institute of Public Policy Research. Accessed through
<<http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=787>> Fall 2014.

Glick-Schiller N.

2013 “The Transnational Migration Paradigm: Global Perspectives on Migrant Research.” In: Halm D., Sezgin Z. (eds). *Migration and Organized Civil Society*. New York: Routledge, pp. 25–43.

Glick-Schiller and Çağlar, A.

2011 “Down-Scaled Cities and Migrant Pathways: Locality and Agency Without an

Ethnic Lens.” In N. Glick Schiller and A. Çağlar (eds). *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 190–202.

Glick-Schiller, Nina, Tsypylma Darieva & Sandra Gruner-Domic

2011 “Defining Cosmopolitan Sociability. Locating Transnational Religious and Diasporic Networks.” In *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34(3): pp. 399-418.

Glick-Schiller, Nina

2010 “A Global Perspective on Transnational Migration. Theorising Migration Without Methodological Nationalism.” In Bauböck, R. & Faist, T. (eds.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 109-129.

2009 “A Global Perspective on Migration and Development.” *Social Analysis* 53(3): pp. 14–37.

Glick-Schiller, N., Çağlar, A., and Guldbrandsen, T.C.,

2006. “Beyond the Ethnic Lens: Locality, Globality, and Born-Again Incorporation.” *American Ethnologist* 33(4): 612–633.

Glick-Schiller, N.

2005 “Transborder Citizenship: an Outcome of Legal Pluralism within Transnational Social Fields.” In *Mobile People, Mobile Law: Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World*, eds. F. Von Benda-Beckmann, K. Von Benda-Beckmann and A. Griffiths. London: Ashgate, pp. 27-150.

Glick-Schiller, N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc-Szanton, C.

1992 “Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity,

and Nationalism Reconsidered.” In *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* Volume 645, 1–24. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Glick-Schiller, Nina

1977. “Ethnic Groups Are Made Not Born.” In *Ethnic Encounters: Identities and Contexts*, ed. George Hicks and Philip Leis. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, pp. 23–35.

Goodman, A. H., Moses, Y. T. & Jones, J. L.

2012 *Race: Are We So Different?* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grasmuck, S. and P. Pessar

1991 *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gupta, D.

2004 “The Careers and Return Migration of Foreign-born US PhDs.” Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson, eds.

1998 *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gusterson, Hugh

1997 “Studying Up Revisited.” *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 20(1): 114-19.

Gürüz, Kemal

2008 *Higher Education and International Student Mobility in the Global Knowledge Economy*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Gustafson, P.

2001 "Roots and Routes: Exploring the Relationship between Place Attachment and Mobility." *Environment and Behavior* 33: 667-686.

Haines, David W. and Diane Baxter

1998 "Anthropology and Contemporary Migration." *General Anthropology* (5)1. Committee on Refugees and Immigration. Accessed through <<http://www.iso.gmu.edu/~cori/coriga.htm>> Fall 2014.

Hall, Stuart

1995 "Negotiating Caribbean Identities" in *New Left Review*, 209: 3-14.

Hall, Suzanne M.

2013 "Super-Diverse Street: A 'Trans-ethnography' Across Migrant Localities." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Online . pp. 1-14.

Hannerz, Ulf

2014 "Ulf Hannerz interviewed by Dominic Boyer" *Public Culture* 26(1). Accessed through < <http://publicculture.org/articles/view/26/1/ulf-hannerz-interviewed-by-dominic-boyer>>. Fall 2014.

2010 "Diversity is Our Business." *American Anthropologist* 112(4): 539 – 551.

2006 "Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics." Barcelona: Fundacio CIDOB.

2004 *Foreign News. Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents*. Chicago, IL:

The University of Chicago Press.

1996 *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. New York: Routledge

1990 “Cosmopolitans and Locals in a World Culture.” *Theory, Culture & Society*,
7(2): 237-251.

Hercog, Metka

2008 “The Role of the State in Attracting Highly-skilled Migrants: The Case of the
Netherlands.” *EIPAScope*, 2008(3): pp. 1-6.

Horevitz, Elizabeth

2009 “Understanding the Anthropology of Immigration and Migration.” *Journal of
Human Behavior in the Social Environment*. 19: 745–758.

Hugo, G

2005 *Migrants in Society: Diversity and Cohesion*, Thematic Project 4: Global
Commission on International Migration. Report to Global Commission on
International Migration.

Hull, G.A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U.

2010 “Cultural Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Practice: Global Youth Communicate
Online.” *English Education* 42(4): 331-367.

Hutchison, Charles, editor.

2014 [Forthcoming] *Experiences of Immigrant Professors Challenges, Cross-Cultural
Differences, and Lessons for Success*. Routledge Research in Higher Education.
New York: Routledge.

Inflation and CPI consumer price index, 1960-1969

2014 Prepared by Timothy McMahon using Bureau of Labor Statistics *Consumer Price Index*. Accessed through < <http://inflationdata.com/articles/inflation-cpi-consumer-price-index-1960-1969/>> Fall 2014.

Inkson, K., & Myers, B. A.

2003 “The Big OE: Self-Directed Travel and Career Development.” *Career Development International*, 8(4): 170–181.

Inkson, K., Arthur, M.B., Pringle, J.K. and Barry, S.

1997 “Expatriate Assignment Versus Overseas Experience: Contrasting Models of Human Resource Development.” *Journal of World Business*, 32(4): pp. 351-68.

IOM

2008 *World Migration Report: Managing Labour Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy*. International Organization for Migration (Geneva), pp. 105-125.

Iredale, R.

2003 “The Growth of Skilled Migration in the Asia Pacific Region”, in R. Iredale, C. Hawksley, & S. Castles (editors), *Migration in the Asia Pacific: Population, Settlement, and Citizenship Issues*. Northampton: Edward Elgar, pp. 121-140.

2001 “The Migration of Professionals: Theories and Typologies.” *International Migration*, Special Issue, *International Migration of the Highly Skilled*, 39 (5): pp. 7-26.

Istaiteyeh, Rasha

2011 *Economic Development and Highly Skilled Returnees: The Impact of Human*

Capital Circular Migration on the Economy of Origin Countries: The Case of Jordan. Dissertation, Faculty of Economics and the Faculty of Organic Agricultural Sciences of the University of Kassel, Germany.

Jackson, P. and Russell, P.

2010 "Life History Interviewing." In: DeLyser, D., Herbert, S., Aitken, S. Crang, M. and McDowell, L. (Eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Geography*. London: Sage, pp.172-92.

Johns, G., & Sacks, A. M.

2005 *Organizational Behaviour: Understanding and Managing Life at Work* 2nd ed. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Prentice-hall.

Jokinen, T., Brewster, C., & Suutari, V.

2008 "Career Capital During International Work Experiences: Contrasting Self-Initiated Expatriate Experiences and Assigned Expatriation." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19: 979-998.

Kearney, Michael

2004 "The Classifying and Value-Filtering Mission of Borders." *Anthropological Theory* 4: 131-156.

1995 "The Local and the Global: the Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 547-565.

1986 "From the Invisible Hand to Visible Feet: Anthropological Studies of Migration and Development." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 331-361.

Kim, D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S.

2011 "International Faculty: Experiences of Life and Productivity in US Universities."

The Journal of Higher Education 86: 720-747.

Kirpitchenko, Liudmila

2014 "Locating Cosmopolitanism Within Academic Mobility." *Cosmopolitan Civil*

Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal 6(1): 56-75.

Koser, K. & J. Salt

1997 "The Geography of Highly Skilled International Migration." *International*

Journal of Population Geography 3: 285-303.

Kotz, David M

2003 "Socialism and Global Neoliberal Capitalism", Paper written for the

International Conference: *The Works of Karl Marx and Challenges for the XXI*

Century, Havana, Cuba, May 5-8, 2003.

Krissman F.

2005. "Sin coyote ni patron: why the 'Migrant Network' fails to explain international

migration." *International Migration Review* 39(1): 4-45.

Lamphere, L.

1992 *Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*.

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lassiter L.E.

2001 From 'Reading Over the Shoulders of Natives' to 'Reading Alongside Natives,'

Literally: Toward a Collaborative and Reciprocal Ethnography" *Journal of*

Anthropological Research 57: 137-149.

Leckie, Jacqueline

1993 "Book Reviews: I Spent My Life in the Mines: the Story of Juan Rojas, Bolivian Tin Miner by June Nash." *Journal of Industrial Relations*. 35: 503-504.

LeCompte, M.D. & Schensul, J.J.

1999 "What is Ethnography?" In *Designing & Conducting Ethnographic Research*. London: Altamira Press, Sage Publications, 1-28.

Lee, Tony Kin Shin

2014 *The Relationship Among Self-Esteem, Mentoring, and Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of U.S-Born and Foreign-born Faculty*. Dissertation. Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. University of Oklahoma.

Levitt, Peggy

2011 "A Transnational Gaze." *Migraciones Internacionales* 6(1): 9-44.

Levitt, Peggy and Nina Glick-Schiller

2007 "Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society." In *Rethinking Migration: New Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*. A. Portes and J. DeWind eds. New York: Berghahn Books: pp. 1002-1039.

Levitt, P. and Jaworski, B.N.

2007 "Transnational Migration Studies: Past Developments and Future Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 129-156.

Levitt, Peggy

2004 "Redefining the Boundaries of Belonging: The Institutional Character of Transnational Religious Life." *Sociology of Religion*, 35(1):174-196.

Levitt, P., J. DeWind, and S. Vertovec

2003 "International Perspectives on Transnational Migration: An Introduction."

International Migration Review 37(3):565–575.

Levy, Robert I. and Douglas Hollan

1998 "Person-Centered Interviewing and Observation." In H. Russell Bernard (Ed.),

Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press,
333-364.

Lewis, Oscar

1952 Urbanization without Breakdown: A Case Study. *Scientific Monthly*

75(1): 31-41.

Little, K. L.

1965. *West African Urbanization: A Study of Voluntary Associations in Social*

Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowell, B. Lindsay

2008 "High-Skilled Migration", in (IOM), World Migration 2008: *Managing Labor*

Mobility in the Evolving Global Economy, Chapter 2. Accessed through

<<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/cache/offonce/pid/1674?entryId=20275>> Fall 2014.

Lomnitz, Larrisa

1977 *Networks and Marginality: Life in a Mexican Shantytown*. New York:

Academic Press.

Lubkemann, Stephen

2005 "The Moral Economy of Non-Return Among Socially-Diverted Migrants from

Portugal and Mozambique." In Lillian Trager, editor. *Migration and Economy:*

Global and Local Dynamics. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press, pp. 257-287.

Luttrell, Wendy

2005 “ ‘Good Enough’ Methods for Life Story Analysis.” In *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods*. Naomi Quinn, ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 243-266.

Madison, D. Soyini

2005 *Critical Ethnography Methods, Ethics and Performance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Mangin, William, ed.

1970. *Peasants in Cities: Readings in the Anthropology of Urbanization*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Marcus, George E. and Michael Fischer

1986 *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Mattoo, Aaditya, Ileana Cristina Neagu, and Çaglar Özden

2005. “Brain Waste? Educated Immigrants in the U.S. Labor Market.” World Bank Policy Research Working Paper. no. 3581. World Bank, Washington, DC.

Mayer, Phillip

1961 *Townsmen or Tribesmen?: Conservatism and the Process of Urbanization in a South African City*. Capetown, South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Mayuzumi, Kimine

2011 *Seeking Possibilities in a Transnational Context: Asian Women Faculty in the Canadian Academy*. Dissertation. Department of Sociology. University of Toronto.

McHugh, Margie, Jeanne Batalova, and Madeleine Morawski

2014 “Brain Waste in the Workforce: Select U.S. and State Characteristics of College-

Educated Native-Born and Immigrant Adults.” Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute. Accessed through
< <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/brain-waste-US-state-workforce-characteristics-college-educated-immigrants>> Fall 2014.

Meillassoux, Claude

1981 *Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and the Domestic Community*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mertz E.

2007. *The Language of Law School: Learning to “Think Like a Lawyer.”* New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Moore, Sally Falk

2007 Book Review “Foreign news: exploring the world of foreign correspondents – By Ulf Hannerz.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 13(1): 234–235.

Moran, A, Nancarrow, S & Butler, A

2005 “There’s No Place Like Home: A Pilot Study of Perspectives of International Health and Social Care Professionals Working in the UK.” *Australian and New Zealand Health Policy*, 2(25). Accessed through
<<http://www.anzhealthpolicy.com/content/2/1/25>> Fall 2014.

Morawska, Ewa

2013 “Multiculturalism ‘From Below’: Reflections of an Immigrant Ethnographer.” In Kivisto, Peter and Wahlbeck, Östen, (eds.) *Debating Multiculturalism in the Nordic Welfare States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 48-73.

2002 Transnational Migration in the Enlarged European Union: A Perspective from East and Central Europe.” In: J. Zielonka (ed.), *Europe Unbound: Enlarging and Reshaping the Boundaries of the European Union*, London: Routledge, pp 161-190.

Morgan, Lewis H.

1877 *Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*. London: Macmillan

Myerhoff, B.

1978 *Number Our Days*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Myers, B. and Pringle, J.K.

2005 “Self-Initiated Foreign Experience as Accelerated Development: Influences of Gender.” *Journal of World Business* 40: 421-431.

Nader, Laura

1972 “Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up.” In *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell H. Hymes. New York: Pantheon, pp. 284-311.

Nagel, C.

2005 “Skilled Migration in Global Cities from ‘Other’ Perspectives: British Arabs, Identity Politics, and Local Embeddedness.” *Geoforum*, 36: 197–210.

Narayan, Kirin

1993 “How Native is a 'Native' Anthropologist?” *American Anthropologist* 95(3): 671-686.

Nash, June C.

1979 *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Nieswand, Boris

2006 “Methodological Transnationalism and the Paradox of Migration.” Paper presented out the EASA Biennial Conference, Bristol, September 20.

Oliver, C.

2011 “Lifestyle Migration.” In: Betts, A. (ed.) *Global Migration Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 133-152.

Ong, Aiwaha

2000 *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Open Doors

2012 The annual report on international education published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) in New York, with support from the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs at the U.S. Department of State. For more information <<http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>>. Fall 2014.

Palerm, J.V. and I. Urquiola

1993. “Abinational System of Agricultural Production: the Case of the Mexican Bajío and California.” In Aldrich, D.G. and L. Meyer, *Mexico and the United States: Neighbors in Crisis*. Berkeley: The Borgo Press, pp. 311-367.

Park, R. E., & Burgess, E. W.

1969 [1921] *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago

Press.

Passel, Jeffrey, D'Vera Cohn and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera

2013 "Population Decline of Unauthorized Immigrants Stalls, May Have Reversed."

Pew Research Center (Online). Accessed December 2014 through

<<http://www.pewresearch.org>>.

Pieterse, Alex L, Chung, Simon, Khan, Tania, Bissram, Jeremy

2013 "Social Class and Racial and Ethnic Identity: Perspectives on the Psychological

Impact of Social Stratification and Inequality." In *The Oxford Handbook of Social*

Class in Counseling. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 379-393.

Pink, Sarah

2009 *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London, Sage.

Portes, Alejandro and R.G. Rumbaut

2014 *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. 4th edition. Berkeley, California: University of

California Press.

Portes, Alejandro

2007 "Migration, Development, and Segmented Assimilation: A Conceptual

Review of the Evidence" *Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social*

Science 610: pp. 73-97.

Portes, Alejandro

2003 "Theoretical Convergencies and Empirical Evidence in the Study of Immigrant

Transnationalism." *International Migration Review* 37 (Fall): 874-892.

1997 "Globalization from Below: The Rise of Transnational Communities." *Working*

Paper Transnational Communities 98(01): 1-27.

1999 "Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities." In *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 21-33.

Portes, Alejandro and József Böröcz

1989 "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation." Conference on International Migration: An Assessment for the '90s, on the twentieth anniversary of the *International Migration Review*, Bellagio, Italy.

Portes, Alejandro

1978 "Migration and Underdevelopment." *Politics and Society* 8:1-48.

Pratt Ewing, Katherine.

2004 "Migration, Identity Negotiation, and Self-Expression. In *Worlds on the Move: Globalization, Migration, and Cultural Security*." Jonathan Friedman and Shalini Randeria, eds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 117-140.

Price EG, Gozu A, Kern DE, Powe NR, Wand GS, Golden S, Cooper LA.

2005 "The Role of Cultural Diversity Climate in Recruitment, Promotion, and Retention of Faculty in Academic Medicine." *J Gen Intern Med* 20(7): 565–71.

Pries, L. (ed.)

2001 *New Transnational Social Spaces: International Migration and Transnational Companies in the Early Twenty-First Century*. London and New York: Routledge.

Raj, Dhooleka S.

2003 *Where Are You From? Middle-Class Migrants in the Modern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Redfield, Robert

1947 The Folk Society. *American Journal of Sociology* 52(January): 292-308.

Reed-Danahay, Deborah and Caroline B. Brettell

2008 *Citizenship, Political Engagement, and Belonging: Immigrants in Europe and the United States*. New Jersey: Rutgers.

Regets, M.

2001 "Research and Policy Issues in High-Skilled International Migration: a Perspective with Data from the United States," National Science Foundation Discussion Paper. No. 366, Arlington and IZA, Bonn, September.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler

1993 *Narrative Analysis. Qualitative Research Methods*. Ed. Peter K. Manning. Vol. 30. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Richardson, J.

2009 "Geographic Flexibility in Academia: A Cautionary Note." *British Journal of Management* 20: 160–170.

Richardson, J., & McKenna, S.

2003 International Experience and Academic Careers: What do Academics Have to Say? *Personnel Review*, 32(6): 774-795.

Robbins, B.

1998 "Comparative Cosmopolitanisms." In P. Cheah and B. Robbins, eds,
Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation. Minneapolis: University of
Minnesota Press, 246-64.

Rodriguez-Garcia, D.

2010 "Beyond Assimilation and Multiculturalism: A Critical Review of the Debate on
Managing Diversity." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 11(3): pp.
251-271.

Roudometof, Victor

2005 "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization." *Current Sociology* 53
(1): 113-35.

Ruiz, N. G., Willson, J. H., & Choudhury, S.

2012 "The Search for Skills: Demand for H-1B Immigrant Workers in U.S.
Metropolitan Areas." In Brookings Institution. Retrieved from
<<http://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2012/07/18-h1b-visas-labor-immigration#demand>> Fall 2012.

Rumbaut, Rubén G.

2005. "Sites of Belonging: Acculturation, Discrimination, and Ethnic Identity among
Children of Immigrants." In Thomas S. Weisner, ed., *Discovering Successful
Pathways in Children's Development: New Methods in the Study of Childhood and
Family Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 111-163.

Sabharwal, M.

2011 "High-skilled immigrants: How Satisfied are Foreign-Born Scientists and
Engineers Employed at American universities?" *Review of Public Personnel*

Administration, 31(2): 143-170.

2008 “Job Satisfaction of Foreign-Born Faculty in Science and Engineering by Citizenship Status.” Dissertation. Arizona State University.

Salins, P. D.

1997 *Assimilation American Style*. New York: Basic Books.

Salomone, Rosemary, C.

2010 *True American: Language, Identity, and the Education of Immigrant Children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sassen, Saskia

2007 *A Sociology of Globalization*. New York: W.W. Norton

Scott, M.L., Whelan, A., Dewdney, J., Zwi, A.B. ,

2004 “Brain Drain’ or Ethical Recruitment? Solving Health Workforce Shortages with Professionals from Developing Countries.” *Medical Journal of Australia* vol. 180: 174–176.

Shomali, Hamid and Gwendolyn R. Giblin

2010 “The Great Depression and the 2007-2009 Recession: The First Two Years Compared.” *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics* 59: pp. 15-22.

Silverstein, Paul A.

2005. “Immigrant Racialization and the New Savage Slot: Race, Migration, and Immigration in New Europe.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34(1): 363-384.

Silverstone, R.

2007 *Media and Morality: On the Rise of the Mediapolis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Singer, Audrey

2004 *The Rise of New Immigrant Gateways*. Washington DC: Brookings Institute.

Singer, Merrill

1999 "Studying Hidden Populations." In Schensul, Jean J., Margaret D.

LeCompte, Robert T. Trotter, II, Ellen K. Cromley, Merrill Singer. *Mapping Social Networks, Spatial Data, and Hidden Populations. Ethnographers Toolkit*.

Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 125-191.

Smock, Audrey

1970 *Ibo politics: The Role of Ethnic Unions in Eastern Nigeria*. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

Stepick, Alex and Carol Dutton Stepick

2003 "Becoming American: Immigration, Identity, Intergenerational Relations, and

Academic Orientation." In *American Arrivals*. Edited by Nancy Foner. Santa Fe,

New Mexico: School of American Research, pp. 129-163.

Stromquist, Nelly P.

2007 "Internationalization as a Response to Globalization: Radical Shifts in

University Environments." *Higher Education* 53: 81-105.

Taylor N. and J. Kearney

2005 "Researching Hard-to Reach Populations: Privileged Access Interviewers and

Drug Using Parents." *Sociological Research Online* 10(2). Accessed through

<<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/2/taylor.html>> Fall 2014.

Taylor, C.,

1992 "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, A. Gutmann (ed.), Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, Peter J.

2004 *World City Network: A Global Urban Analysis*. London: Routledge.

The National Center for Education Statistics

2011 Digest of Education Statistics. Table 291. Full-time Instructional Faculty in Degree Granting Institutions, by Race/Ethnicity, Sex, and Academic Rank: Fall 2007, Fall 2009, and Fall 2011. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education. Accessed June 2013 through <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_291.asp>.

Thomas, W. I., & Znaniecki, F.

1918 *The Polish peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Triadafilopoulos, Phil (ed.)

2013 *Wanted and Welcome? Highly Skilled Immigration Policies in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Springer Press.

Turner, Victor

1974 "Social Dramas and Ritual Metaphors." *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 23-59.

1967 "Betwixt and Between: The Liminal Period in Rites of Passage."

In *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 93-111.

U.S. Census

2013. American FactFinder. Accessed through < <http://factfinder2.census.gov/>> Fall 2014.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

2014 H1-B Visa Requirements. Accessed through < <http://www.uscis.gov/eir/visa-guide/h-1b-specialty-occupation/understanding-h-1b-requirements>> Fall 2014.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Report to Congress

2013 “Characteristics of H1B Specialty Occupation Workers.” Fiscal Year 2012. Annual Report to Congress. Washington DC: Office of Legislative Affairs.

Accessed through

< <http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/H-1B/h1b-fy-12-characteristics.pdf>> Fall 2012.

US Citizenship, Naturalization Regulation and Procedures Handbook

2013 Washington DC: International Business Publications.

Van Velsen, J.

1961 “Labour Migration as a Positive Factor in the Continuity of Tonga Tribal Society.” In *Social Change in Modern Africa*. A. Southall, ed. London: Oxford University Press, pp. 230-241.

Vertovec, Steven

2011 “The Cultural Politics of Nation and Migration.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 241-256.

2010 “Towards Post-multiculturalism? Changing Communities, Conditions and Contexts of Diversity.” *International Social Science Journal* 199: pp. 83-95.

2006 “The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain.” ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society *Working Paper* WP-06-25: pp. 1-36.

2007a “Super-Diversity and its Implications.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29(6):1024-54.

2007b “New Complexities of Cohesion in Britain: Super-diversity, Transnationalism and Civil Integration.” Thinkpiece for the Commission on Integration and Cohesion. Oxford: pp. 1-40. Accessed through <Compass.wwww.compass.ox.ac.uk.> Fall 2014.

2007c “Introduction: New directions in the Anthropology of Migration and Multiculturalism” in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 6(30): pp. 961-978.

2002 “Transnational Networks and Skilled Labour Migration.” ESRC Transnational Communities Research Programme *Working Papers* 02-02: pp. 1-15.

Vertovec, S. and R. Cohen

2002 “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism.” In S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–22.

Vertovec, Steven

2001 “Transnationalism and Identity.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(4): 573-82.

1999 "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2): 447-62.

Vincent-Lancrin, S.

2008 "Chapter 4: Student Mobility, Internationalisation, Higher Education and Skilled Migration." *World Migration Report*, Geneva: IOM.

Wallerstein, Immanuel

1974 "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16: 387-415.

Watson, W.

1958 *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy: a Study of the Mambwe People of Northern Rhodesia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press for Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.

Webber, Karen L.

2013 "Research Productivity of Science and Engineering Faculty at US Universities: The Contribution of Foreign Vs. US-Born Status." *The Journal of the Professoriate* 7(1): pp. 51-83.

Wei, Na

2008 *Do We Belong Here? An Exploration of Foreign-born Faculty's Organizational Attachment at a U.S. Research University*. Dissertation. Department of Educational Administration. Michigan State University.

Weir, Kirsten,

2009 The New Academic Job Market. American Psychological Association. Accessed

through <<http://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2011/09/job-market.aspx>> Fall 2014.

Werbner, Pnina

2012 “Multiculturalism from Above and Below: Analysing a Political Discourse.”

Journal of Intercultural Studies. 33(2): 197-209.

Wessendorf, S.

2014 [forthcoming] *Commonplace Diversity. Social Relations in a Super-diverse*

Context. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

2013 “Commonplace Diversity and the ‘Ethos of Mixing’: Perceptions of Difference

in a London Neighbourhood.” *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*

20(4): 407-422.

Wickham, J.

2009 “Migration and Recession: Polish Migrants in Post-Celtic Tiger Ireland.”

Sociological Research Online 14 (2/3). Accessed through

<<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/2/9.html>> Fall 2014.

Wilson, Troy M.

2004 *Global Brokers with Language Power: Migrant English Teachers in*

Guadalajara, Mexico. Masters Thesis. Department of Anthropology. Washington

State University.

Wimmer, Andreas

2009 “Herder’s Heritage and the Boundary-Making Approach. Studying Ethnicity in

Immigrant Societies.” *Sociological Theory* 27(3): 244-270.

Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller

2002 "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology." *International Migration Review* 37(3): 576-61.

Wirth, L.

1928 *The Ghetto*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wolcott, H.

1999 *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing*. Oregon: Altamira Press.

Wolf, Eric

1988 "Inventing Society." *American Ethnologist* 15:752-61.

Wood, C.H.

1992 "Equilibrium and Historical-Structural Perspectives on Migration." *International Migration Review* 16(2): 298-319.