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Abstract

This paper sets out a case for the adoption of a transnationalism paradigm for population, specifically for the study of migration. The canon of transnationalism research is reviewed, along with key discontents, and recent trends in the field. Four definitions of transnationalism are introduced: activities, relations, social fields and subjectivity. Three sets of categorizations of the field are also identified. Five identifiable critiques of the transnationalism concept are explored. These critiques involve some very sound definitional observations on how transnational activities and relations are not so novel. Transnationalism retains its greatest possibility as a new conceptual approach, which can trouble traditional understandings of unidirectional movement and the expectation of assimilation. As a paradigm, transnationalism facilitates a holistic examination of the forms of mobility and communication. It also facilitates stronger theoretical attention to the relation between movement and identity. Some of the gaps of the emergent field are identified, and ways forward suggested.

In this paper, I advocate the utility of a transnationalism paradigm for population studies. In making this case, I reflect from my on-going work on the topic of transnationalism in Australia, with my colleagues David Ip (University of Queensland) (1992), Christine Inglis (University of Sydney), and Susan Thompson (University of NSW). These reflections fundamentally spring from a reading of the extant literature on transnationalism. This literature includes what we might call the “transnationalism canon” that has emerged in the work of Portes and his collaborators (1999; 2001), notably Guarnizo, but also from Ong (1999), Pries (2001), Glick Schiller (1992), and Basch (1994). I also pay attention to the observations of some important “transnationalism discontents”, notably
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Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004), and also Foner (1997). The incisive work emerging from Canada, and especially the Vancouver Metropolis Centre (Ley 2003; Kobayashi 2003; Hiebert 2003; and Waters 2003; Walton-Roberts 2005), is also important. The Vancouver school of transnationalism research, with its empirical depth and breadth, continues to check and temper some of the more extreme assumptions of the “transnational advocates”. Finally, I look to two very interesting sets of literature, that have demonstrated a nascent and interesting antipodean emphasis to this research field. These include some recent Australian doctoral projects (O’Connor 2005; McAuliffe 2005; Voigt-Graf 2002), and some recent articles from early career researchers whom humbly recommend certain trajectories for transnationalism research (Conradson and Latham 2005; Velayutham and Wise 2005; Yeoh 2005). This review of the field strongly affirms the intellectual basis, and strategic advantage, in thinking about a transnational paradigm for the study of population movement. But before progressing to the abovementioned literature, and my substantive argument, I should define and introduce the concept of transnationalism.

**Identifying the Field of Transnationalism**

Transnationalism is often used to describe and categorise certain activities, some of which are familiar to us as the “normal” activities of immigrants. These include the sending of remittances, gifts, correspondence (e- and snail-mail), telephone contact, immigrant property ownership in countries of origin, political activity, and various forms of care and emotional networking (Basch et al. 1994). Transnationalism has been defined as the “multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states” (Vertovec 1999:447). Through transnational activities, immigrants become transmigrants able to “maintain, build, and reinforce multiple linkages with their countries of origin” (Glick Schiller et al. 1992:2). Glick Schiller et al. (1992; Glick Schiller and Fouron 1999) and Pries (1999) referred to the “transnational social fields” that migrants now lived in. More radically, there has been reference to a de-territorialised world, in which the power of the nation-state to control population movement, and other forms of circulation, has been increasingly weakened.

The cultural and political specificities of national societies (host and home) are combined with emerging multilevel and multinational activities in a
This view of a de-territorialised world, and of empowered mobile citizens, was explored most fully in Ong's analysis of Chinese immigrants in the USA (1999; Ong and Nonini 1997). There has also been discussion of transnational subjectivity. This refers to people who have dual or multiple national loyalties, all of which may be primary. Many people today do advance global views or perspectives, they see themselves as world citizens (Hannerz 1992). Interestingly, this is a value that we inculcate in high school geography. In broad then, transnationalism has been used in four general senses: to refer to specific activities, a set of relations, to a new social field or context, and to a subjectivity or perspective.

In response to the exploding scholarship on transnationalism (see Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004:1181), attempts have been made by some of the canonical contributors to define and reign-in the field. This focusing of the field was also in response to a series of criticisms that transnationalism was not a new phenomena (see next section). Portes et al. (1999) identified a series of conditions which needed to be met for an activity, or a relation, to be considered transnational. The specific criteria for transnationalism were: new types of linkage or movement (an example would include email-based communication); a massness of the activity (a quantitative measure of transnationalism); frequency; continuity (not ephemeral or a once-off movement or contact); which together make the activity routine and normative (Portes et al. 1999:217-9,225-7).

Portes and others also outlined two necessary conditions for transnationalism to emerge. These were technological advances in transport and communications, and the presence of networks through which transnational movement of, and communication by, ordinary people could flow (Portes et al. 1999:223-4; see also Pries 1999:13). Even the transnational discontents, Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004:1179,1183), accepted that the former is correct, they observed that the latter have existed for some time, and that this has given rise to new relations between migrants and nation-states and civil society. Kastoryano (2000:308-9) usefully pointed to other important conditions that have aided transnationalism, namely neo-liberalism (such as through the expansion of world trade / exchange, as well as the ideological affirmation it generated.
for autonomous and hypermobile subjects), multiculturalism (which facilitates cultural hybridity and multiple identities), as well as international NGOs. She also pointed to the important role of emotional ties and political convictions in driving transnationalism (2000:309). Indeed, Portes et al.’s two-part set of conditions says too little about the affective conditions necessary to sustain a transnational field or a network, including obligations, nostalgia, patriotism and the like.

Categorising Transnationalism

As part of the attempts to provide direction to the field of transnationalism research a number of authors have attempted to categorise forms of transnationalism (Portes et al. 1999; Ip et al. 1997; and Vertovec 1999). Each of these is worthy of review.

Portes et al. (1999) identified three main forms of transnationalism: economic, political and socio-cultural. They also mapped those forms across a binary: transnationalism from below (the routine activities of ordinary people), and from above (the organizing and strategic actions of powerful agencies and corporations). The matrix that they developed was a very useful categorical device. Economic transnationalism included both the actions of transnational corporations, and the globe-trotting of elites, but also the cross-border economic activity of smaller sized businesses, and remittances. Political transnationalism included the work of expatriates militating against political regimes “at home”, as well as bilateral agreements between nations and the emerging influence of international NGOs. Instructive examples came from Guarnizo’s (Portes et al. 1999:231) work on the actions and influence of Dominican activists in the USA. Thirdly, all other forms of transnationalism were deposited within the “socio-cultural” category. Naming this residual and catch-all category as socio-cultural betrayed the epistemological emphases of those authors, and also, the nature of the transnational links they had studied. It revealed a strong political-economy emphasis. Even political transnationalism was identified as dependant upon labour migration (itself a form of economic transnationalism). They were quite clear in foregrounding economic matters, such as the development of capitalism, as key to the emergence of transnationalism (Portes et al. 1999:226-8). Moreover, the socio-cultural
examples provided by Portes et al. spoke quite weakly to issues of identity, belonging, attachment, and to cultural change more broadly.

Ip et al. (1997) also conceived of a three-way division: relational, experiential, and legal. This categorization suggested a much stronger interest in matters of identity and citizenship. Relational transnationalism involved individual movements between two or more countries, whether to visit relatives, holidaying or to conduct business. It also included communications. Experiential transnationalism referred to sense of identity and belonging. This had important implications for the manner in which immigrants are incorporated into national spaces, and the new fields and forms of social relations and experiences that are in turn produced (see Soysal 2000). Another important component of experiential transnational is the way immigrants imagine “home”, the way they “remember” their homelands, and perceive their new “home” both nationally and locally (Westwood and Phizacklea 2001). Another question is how identity and belonging are affected by the experience of racism and intolerance (Dunn and McDonald 2001; Vasta and Castles 1996:14)? A number of researchers have begun to pose questions about the emerging complexity of citizenship, in an era where individuals live in a transnational field (Castles and Davidson 2000; Faist 2000; Ip et al. 1997; Soysal 2000).

Ip et al.’s (1997) third category of legal transnationalism referred overtly to the formal attachments that transmigrants have in different countries, including issues such as dual citizenship. Ip et al. (1997) referred to the notion of “instrumental citizenship” to describe a process elsewhere referred to as the “commodification of citizenship”. Researchers have speculated on how migrants obtain passports and citizenship for strategic reasons. These reasons could include the construction of escape routes to a safe haven, perhaps to avoid sovereign shock in a country of origin. The Vancouver school of researchers have examined this in regard to Hong Kong emigrants to Canada ahead of the “hand-over” of the territory to the Peoples Republic of China (Ley and Kobayashi 2003). Strategic citizenship could also be driven by a desire to access better or different standards of education for children. This form of citizenship is seen as problematic insofar as the migrants do not develop a strong symbolic attachment or nationalist loyalty. Citizenship can thus become a commodity: “a marketable item with price tags” (Ip et al. 1997:363), and Ley’s (2003:428) critical examination of the Business Migration schemes in Canada provides
compelling evidence for that. Other evolving terms used to describe the attachments of legal transnationals have included: strategic citizenship, strategic transnationalism, and “flexible citizens”, the latter drawing on Ong’s foundational use of that term to describe Chinese “migrants” in the USA (Ong 1999:3):

transnational Chinese subjects, those most able to benefit from their participation in global capitalism celebrate flexibility and mobility … such figures as the multiple passport holder … the “astronaut”, shuttling across borders on business; “parachute kids”, who can be dropped off in another country by parents on the trans-Pacific business commute … . flexibility, migration and relocations … have become practices to strive for, rather than stability (Ong 1999:19).

This of course has far reaching implications for the concept of citizenship itself, which historically was tied to a single national affiliation. However, other research has indicated that the notion of instrumentality has become somewhat exaggerated, and that transmigrants continue to be involved in local (and national) participation, loyalty and attachments (Foner 2001; Waters 2003). Nonetheless, Ip et al.’s (1997) three-part categorization facilitated a much more fulsome focus on matters of identity and culture than did that by Portes et al. (1999). Vertovec’s categorization identified six research themes for transnational research. These included: global or cross-national networks (diasporas, networks); global subjectivities, consciousness and perspectives (world citizens); hybrid styles and fashions and global media (especially youth sub-cultures); economic interactions (transnational corporations, remittances, small yet global family businesses); political transnationalism (international NGOs, diaspora politics), and; the emergence of new spaces of migration – transnational social fields (with an interest in the new nodes and localities within such fields). The latter picked up on the work of Pries (1999; 2001) and Glick Schiller et al. (1992:1; 1999) who referred to new social fields, or social spaces, of transmigrants that were cross-border and multi-national.

Transmigrants … move back and forth between different places and develop their social space and everyday life, their work trajectories and biographical projects in this new and emerging configuration of social practices, symbols and artefacts that span different places (Pries 2001:21).
Vertovec’s broader encapsulation of the field reads like a response to those attempts to narrow the field of transnationalism. Here I am thinking of Portes et al., whom Vertovec (1999:448) identified as having an economic emphasis. Crang et al. (2003) were more overt in their judgement, worrying about Portes et al.’s attempt to “discipline” the field. There is an undercurrent, within the work of Portes et al. (1999:218,233), of cynicism towards the work of cultural studies, and poststructuralist theory.

Crang et al. (2003:440) pointed to a contradictory tendency within the programmatic statements on transnationalism. On the one hand there is broad recognition that the work undertaken in the field has been extremely good, including rich ethnographic work, and investigative political economies of considerable depth. At the same time, there have been constant calls for grounding of research, and for the gathering of (certain) empirical data. These betray disciplinary prejudices for certain types of work. Nonetheless the field has developed some trajectories and absences that are briefly reviewed towards the end of this paper.

A Transnationalism Paradigm

The reference to world citizens, to new forms of movement and communication (or at least old movements at higher rates), and to transnational fields, has certain appeal. Mitchell (1997:101) observed that the term possesses a transgressive quality associated with the illicit sense of (less mediated) border crossings. Others in the field have described it as a new imaginary, superior to the term “migration studies” (Crang et al. 2003:439) or even globalization (Conradson and Latham 2005:227). Transnationalism and international migration have “troubling effects” on both sending and receiving societies (Castles 2000:271,279). Vertovec (1999:459) concluded that transnationalism had its greatest utility as an umbrella concept, not necessarily a narrow descriptor of certain activities, or even certain social fields, or perspectives. Indeed, this is closest to the argument that I want to articulate: transnationalism as paradigm.

Exorcising the Ghost of Assimilation

One of the areas where the paradigmatic strength of transnationalism is most obvious, and where it has been oft-mentioned, is its strong concordance with the dual and multiple attachments of migrants. Earlier
thinking, and policy-making, on immigrant settlement and incorporation followed a long-established Chicago School tradition of assuming that immigrants would over time gradually adopt the dominant culture of the society where they had settled, and that the culture of the origin would dissipate. Mitchell summarised the assumption well: “In this view, migrants bring their culture with them and, after their arrival, become relatively less or more assimilated to the prevailing cultural norms of the new national territory” (Mitchell 1997:103).

In part this was premised on a circumstance in which international emigrants rarely tended to return. In the context of Irish emigration to North America, Australia and New Zealand this was referred to in shorthand as “gone for good” (Handlin 1973). As Pries (1999:3) noted, the movements were overwhelmingly unidirectional. The scope for return migration was influenced by economic fortunes, proximity and geopolitics, and the stronger its potential (or even its myth) the more inhibited was assimilation (Cohen and Gold 1997:376). Early commentators on transnationalism noted how the Chicago School assimilation theory was increasingly hard to apply in contemporary times (Glick Schiller et al. 1992:1): “theories of assimilation and ethnic pluralism are insufficient because they espouse a container concept of space – adaptation of immigrants within nation-states” (Faist 2000:200). The limits of Chicago School concepts included the inability to reconcile cultural maintenance by immigrants as anything other than a short-term evil or an enduring pathology (Dunn 1998).

Assimilation theory became even further complicated by the emergence and/or expansion of the transnational activities introduced earlier. Routine communication and return visitation to a country of origin are likely to retard assimilation. A series of researchers have commented on the multiple memberships and loyalties that transnationalism gives rise to (see Kastoryano 2000:308). Even the “transnational discontents” recognised the problems with the assimilation model (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004:1180,1186, 1193). Portes et al. (1999:227-9) referred to this as one of the key theoretical challenges posed by transnationalism. I would turn that around slightly, and argue that the notion of “transnationals” dispenses fundamentally with assimilation, defeating a problematic assumption that has currency in most settler societies. Friesen et al. (2005:391) referred to the local New Zealand impacts of a New Delhi announcement by the Indian
Government in 2003 that dual citizenship would become available. Interestingly, the statement revealed how the aim was to encourage a broad Indian identity and attachment, but the government also insisted that those in the diaspora must maintain their loyalties to the nations where they were resident. This transnational legal pronouncement can not be adequately theorised within the traditional and unidirectional understanding of migration and assimilation. The idea of assimilation has been a long-time shadow upon population geography and migration studies. In most settler societies assimilation remains a dominant philosophy (Kymlicka and Norman, 2000:16), and it is strongly manifest in public opinion (Dunn et al. 2004:416-8). A transnationalism paradigm thus exorcises a ghost that continues to haunt immigration theory, policy and politics.

*Theorising the Relation Between Movement and Identity*

The other interesting aspect of transnationalism is the way that it fundamentally embraces movement and identity. Migration researchers have known for some time that movement and identity are fundamentally linked. Of course, place (especially sedentariness) and identity are also linked. But movement, and especially migration, has a fundamentally important relation with cultural change (Baldassar 2001). O’Connor’s (2005) work on Irish-Australians in Melbourne has revealed the fundamental cultural roles of migration, providing new senses of the Other and the primary recognition of the Self (their own culture hitherto not “seen” before their own migrancy (see also Struver 2005). Shia Iranians in Sydney, Vancouver and London talked to McAuliffe (2005) about visiting Iran to “discover their identity” or “roots”. Movement is important to culture. The Vancouver based geographer, Dan Hiebert stated that in a transnational age: “Identities are formed by movements as much as they are by the long-term relationship between people and place that is usually celebrated by geographers” (Hiebert 2000:39).

The relation between movement and identity has been poorly conceptualized, with the exception perhaps being the Chicago School. A transnationalism paradigm opens up new opportunities to theorise more deeply on the relation between movement and identity. Of course, in all of this, a focus on communication must come to rival our interest in movement.
Holistic Theorising of Movement

Transnationalism offers renewed holistic vistas for migration and population studies. One could advance an argument that within population studies there has been a creeping compartmentalization of the study of movement. Research on immigration has become detached from emigration, and certainly from internal migration and mobility. Return migration has become a separated field of inquiry. There was no sense of such separation within Zelinsky’s (1971) mobility transition, which embraced seven key forms of movement. What is more, Zelinsky engaged with the prospects of communication, and how that would effect movement. Indeed, there is a sense that some migration theorists have embraced transnationalism in part to assuage the intellectual separation of international emigration and circular forms of movement (see Vertovec and Cohen 1999). For example, Ley and Kobayashi’s (2003) work on return migrants from Canada to Hong Kong overtly discussed these movements as occurring within a transnational field, as did Waters’ (2003) work on the so-called astronaut movements. In other words, transnationalism has been seen as a paradigm in which different forms of mobility can again be addressed holistically.

It is also the case that in settler societies like Australia the focus of migration research in the last few decades has been overwhelmingly upon immigration. This has come at the expense of interest in internal movement (permanent and not), and also return migration. Exceptions to this have been the work of Burnley, Hugo and Bell. In New Zealand, the work of Lidgard, Ho, and Bedford also bucks that master trend. Of course, the research emphasis upon permanent immigration in Australia and New Zealand and other countries was undertaken for entirely an understandable reason – the massive settler immigration programs from the 1950s to the 1980s (although migration forms and research emphases in Western Europe were quite different, see Castles and Kozack 1973). However, this research emphasis neglects increasingly important forms of movement, including temporary migration: “there has been a massive increase in global population movement and an increase in the complexity of the types of movement – permanent and temporary, legal and undocumented, forced and voluntary, work and non-work related, etc. In Australia much thinking about international migration remains anchored in a paradigm of
movement that applied in the four decades following the Second World War, which focused almost entirely on permanent settlement” (Hugo 2004:i).

A transnational paradigm would re-integrate the research trajectories of emigration, immigration, temporary movement and visitation. It could also, Zelinsky-like, reintegrate movement and communication.

**Critiques of the Transnationalism Paradigm**

Some of the critics of the emergent field of transnationalism have already been mentioned (Foner 1997; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004; Walton-Roberts 2005). In broad, five identifiable arguments have been advanced. Firstly, it has been pointed out that many of the activities that have been cast as transnational have been in operation for a long time, many for centuries. Foner (1997; see also Smith 2001) outlined how the contemporary migration, settlement and communication of certain cultural groups was strongly similar to that of decades before, and even previous centuries: “Transnationalism is not new, even though it often seems as if it were invented yesterday” (Foner 1997:355).

Portes *et al.* (1999:219) therefore posed the question of whether there was any point in coining new terms for analysing old movements, hence their aforementioned attempt to limit the definition of transnationalism. However, the above criticism pre-supposes that the extant theory and policy frameworks for analyzing immigrant movement, settlement and identity were satisfactory. As I outlined earlier, regarding the assumptions of unidirectional movement and assimilation, I am not convinced that the extant paradigm was satisfactory.

A second critique of transnationalism concerns the nature of the movements that are usually studied, and whether they are more appropriately referred to as inter-national movements. Waldinger and Fitzgerald’s (2004) argument is that most of the subject matter of transnational research concerns dual identities, and communication and movement between two countries. They have argued that the term transnationalism should be reserved for discussions of identity and movements that are above or beyond nations (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004:1178, 1181). A third criticism is the observation that much of the activities studied are actually translocal, between a village in one place and
a suburb in another, and not transnational (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004:1182). For example, Velayutham and Wise (2005) refer to the strong ties between Tamil Indians in Singapore and the specific villages where they or their families originated. The attachment to Indian-ness, and even Tamil, was an inferior consideration to village and caste identity. However, these movements and attachments nonetheless involve movements across borders, and in conceptual terms it matters little whether the attachments and movements involve only two or multiple nation-states.

A fourth criticism, from Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004:1188-90, 1191-2), was their observation that the current level of transnationalism is highly dependant upon the tolerance of nation-states and civil societies. They point to the restrictions on movement and communications that can quickly be generated in times of international conflict and tension. Moreover international movements are highly influenced by geopolitical relations. Finally, Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004) expressed concern at the public consumption of transnationalism, and especially the political effects from normalising multiple national loyalties. Dual or multiple loyalties are still received suspiciously in most countries and by most people: “In a world of mutually exclusive nation-states … persons with foreign attachments are open to question, and all the more so when the relevant nation-states coexist on less than friendly terms” (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004:1192).

Transnationals can easily become the despised “enemies within” or the “traitors abroad”. A current example is the circumstance of Arab and Muslim-Australians, who perceive themselves the brunt of new terror laws and police actions, and are disparaged in media and in government rhetoric (Islamic Council of New South Wales 2004; Klocker and Dunn 2003). However, it is not at all clear that the myths of assimilation did much to confront this sort of nationalist-based political intolerance. Indeed, a transnational paradigm – in which dual and multiple national loyalties are normalized – may be a long-term remedy.

The carefully considered critiques of transnationalism, by the abovementioned discontents, were important reminders of the similarities between immigrants and transmigrants. The discontents justifiably took issue with the definitional distinctiveness, or lack thereof, between previous and contemporary movement and communication, and the state reactions to it. However, none of this definitional correctness assuages the extant
limitations in traditional migration theory, policy and politics. Transnationalism retains its greatest merit as a troubling concept, and as a paradigm.

**Population Studies and Transnationalism: Ways Forward**

Work in the mould of transnationalism has not been without faults and preoccupations. It is important to briefly recount these here, ahead of a final advocacy on the virtue of the concept as a paradigmatic device (see Dunn 2005 for a detailed examination of these concerns). Four sets of gaps and pre-occupations can be identified. Firstly, there is a concern that transnationalism research has exaggerated the degree of mobility and agency in contemporary population movement. There remain a series of costs on mobility, and this continues to make access to international movement highly uneven. Moving is expensive and troubling, and it is still difficult to get bodies across national borders. Again, the crossing of borders is easier for some bodies than others. Nation-states have clung on to their powers over borders, and they remain important to assisting with migrant settlement. And peoples’ mobility continues to be embedded within places and networks. Secondly, work on transnationalism has tended not to engage with the darker sides of contemporary movement. A pre-occupation with agency and mobility, as just reviewed, has been linked to a celebratory emphasis. Yet transmigrants are still migrants, and most require settlement assistance of some sort, and many face racialised barriers, discrimination, and cultural hierarchies of privilege, as many migrants before them have. These experiences are likely to be an important influence on belonging (experiential transnationalism, and legal) and on movement and communication (relational transnationalism). Thirdly, during the first ten years of this emergent field of transnationalism there was an understandable emphasis on the technological developments that have enabled or facilitated new and more frequent international movement and communication. However, these technologies do not explain why transnationalism occurs. Most of the discussion of the drivers of transnationalism has focused on economic maximization. Yet, there are a host of affective drivers of transnationalism that also require examination. Nostalgia, patriotism and political conviction are important drivers of political transnationalism. Other important drivers of return migration
(retirement, burial), and of visitation and communication include obligation, guilt, love and other emotions. These drivers of transnationalism are deserving of further research. Finally, a recognized emphasis within the field has been the grounded and everyday examination of transnationalism. However, while the work has been well grounded, including excellent ethnographies and political economies, there has been a tendency to study migrant groups, and those known to be transnational. This has meant that there has been a research emphasis on ethnic minorities within settler societies. There has been a corresponding lack of work on transnationalism among non-minorities and on “ordinary” spaces. One way forward is to include grounded analyses of transnationalism among longer resident migrant groups, the so-called invisible migrant groups, and also non-migrants. Similarly, there has been scant work at all on the links between transnationalism, however defined, and indigenous people, their cultures and their specific claims to citizenship.

My presumption is that the geographical and population studies impulse is to accept much of what I have outlined above, I think. My observations regarding the continued friction of distance, the potency of nation-states, and the need for grounded observations and empirical data, will be received with little opposition. My more radical suggestion is that population and migration studies should adopt the transnationalism paradigm as their own. Other disciplines have passing interests in the matters discussed above, including sociology, cultural studies, anthropology as well as globalization studies. However, it is in population and migration studies that the paradigm has the most to offer, particularly in the holism it offers. Bearing in mind the limitations of the field to date, and thinking through the ways forward that assuage those, the transnational paradigm promises to enliven population studies.
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