Transnational Entrepreneurs:
The Emergence and Determinants of an Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation[1]

WPTC-01-05

by
Alejandro Portes
Princeton University

William Haller
Princeton University

Luis E. Guarnizo
University of California – Davis

February 2001

[1] The data on which this paper is based were collected as part of the Comparative Immigrant Enterprise Project (CIEP), supported by grants from the National Science Foundation (SBR-9796286), Ford Foundation (960-0527 and 1005-0122), and Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. We thank Steven Vertovec, members of the Transnational Communities Seminar at Oxford University (Summer 2000) and anonymous reviewers of this journal for their comments and suggestions. Responsibility for the contents is exclusively ours.

Transnational Entrepreneurs:
The Emergence and Determinants of an Alternative Form of
Immigrant Economic Adaptation

ABSTRACT

The recent literature on immigrant transnationalism points to an alternative form of economic adaptation of foreign minorities in advanced societies, based on the mobilization of their cross-country social networks. The phenomenon has been examined mainly on the basis of case studies that note its potential significance for immigrant integration into the receiving countries and for economic development in the countries of origin. Despite their suggestive character, these studies consistently sample on the dependent variable, failing to establish the empirical existence of transnational activities beyond a few descriptive examples and their possible determinants. We address these issues on the basis of a survey designed explicitly for this purpose and conducted among selected Latin immigrant groups in the United States. Although immigrant transnationalism has received little attention in the mainstream sociological literature so far, it has the potential of altering the character of the new ethnic communities spawned by contemporary immigration. We examine the empirical existence of transnationalism on the basis of discriminant functions of migrant characteristics and seek to establish the relative probabilities of engaging in this kind of activities based on hypotheses drawn from the past literature. Implications of our results for the sociology of immigration, as well as broader sociological theories of the economy are discussed.

The recent literature on transnationalism has highlighted a number of long-distance ties established between both corporate and popular actors in response to the forces of globalization. Such ties are of an economic, political, and cultural nature. At the grassroots level, examples

found in the literature include unconventional alliances, like those linking Third World employees of giant multinationals subjected to miserable working conditions with First World activists bent on shaming these corporations out of their sweatshop practices. Evans (2000) has recently made a plea for the potential power of popular transnational alliances of this sort to subvert the economic and cultural order imposed in all countries by global capitalism. Yet, to the present, such episodes are exceptional and pale by comparison with the seemingly inexorable growth of immigrant populations. While less newsworthy than the visible but uncommon successes of transnational activist alliances[1], the continuous rise of international migration in the modern world holds the potential of building social fields across national borders that are thicker, more resilient, and, in the long run, more capable of affecting change.

"Transnational fields" is the term coined in the immigration literature to refer to the web of contacts created by immigrants and their home country counterparts who engage in a pattern of repeated back-and-forth movements across national borders in search of economic advantage and political voice (Portes 1999; Vertovec 1999; Glick Schiller 1999). Initially, such contacts may be purely economic and involve just the country of origin and that of destination. Yet, as they develop over time, they come to encompass cultural and political aspects and, in certain cases, to involve actors located in a number of nations (Guarnizo and Smith 1998; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2000). Transnational fields are not an entirely new phenomenon since precedents can be found as far back as the trading diasporas of the middle ages (Curtin 1984; Cohen 1997). Similarly, the literature on European immigration to the United States at the turn of the twentieth century features numerous examples of sustained cross-border contacts of an economic and political character (Foner 1997; Piore 1979). What is novel at present is defined by three features:

First, revolutionary innovations in transportation technology and electronic communications that facilitate easy, cheap, and fast contacts across long distances. No matter how motivated, transnational political activists or transnational entrepreneurs of the early twentieth century could not sustain the volume nor engage in the near-instantaneous exchanges made possible by the new technologies (Roberts *et. al*. 1999; Levitt 1997, 2000).

Second, the intense level of contact made possible by these technologies and the seemingly growing number of immigrants and their home country counterparts involved in them. Ceasing to be exceptional, transnational activities may become common and even normative, at least in some communities described in the recent literature (Glick Schiller and Fouron 1999; Popkin 1999).

Third, the increasing involvement of sending country governments seeking to promote and guide the transnational initiatives and investments of their respective diasporas. This growing official attention reflects the weight acquired by transnational fields and, in turn, promotes them (Landolt 2000; Smith 1998; Guarnizo and Smith 1998). Forms taken so far by this official activism are summarized in the following section.

The problem for the sociology of immigration is whether the weight of existing evidence justifies coining a new term and opening a new field of inquiry. The phenomenon of transnationalism was initially identified by a team of ethnographers who described it as follows:

> We define transnationalism as the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origins and settlement…An essential element is the multiplicity of involvements that transmigrants sustain in both home and host societies. We are still groping for a language to describe these social locations. (Basch *et al.* 1994:6).

This puzzled attitude is comprehensible when confronted with a phenomenon that, at first, strains the imagination. The improbable spectacle of people of modest means criss-crossing the globe

and making use of technologies that were formerly the preserve of powerful corporate actors defies conventional expectations as to the role of labor immigrants in the world economy. The unconventional character of these practices has also led to scholarly skepticism about their scope and real significance. Sociologists have not been at the forefront of studies of transnationalism and some have voiced fears that they represent just one more addition to the faddish rhetoric of globalization – stronger in grand pronouncements than in hard facts (Waldinger 1998).

Such skepticism is healthy and its objections must be addressed before transnational fields can be admitted as an integral part of the sociological research agenda. A key part of the problem is that the available studies consistently sample on the dependent variable; that is, they present detailed accounts of transnational activities but neglect their obverse, namely the number of immigrants who are *not* involved in them. Some of these studies are quite insightful, and we present a sample of them in a following section. However, by themselves they are insufficient to establish the empirical distinctness of the phenomenon. This paper addresses the problem on the basis of a survey conducted explicitly for this purpose. It asks whether transnationalism can be effectively distinguished from other forms of immigrant adaptation and, if so, what are its determinants.

Economic Transnationalism

Transnational fields described in the existing literature include political, social, and cultural linkages as well as those of an economic type (Guarnizo *et. al*. 1999). The following analysis focuses on transnational economic activities for two reasons: first, the impossibility of examining all the diverse forms of the phenomenon in a single paper and, second, the predominance of transnational entrepreneurship in the case studies reported in the literature.

Hence, if the term identifies a distinct phenomenon at all, it should emerge most clearly in the economic realm.

Sociological research on middleman minorities and, particularly on ethnic enclaves, have made clear that the economic prospects of immigrants do not hinge exclusively on their conditions of employment in host-country labor markets, but also on their chances for *self-employment.* Immigrant entrepreneurs have been found to do better economically than their waged co-ethnics and to maintain this advantage even after controlling for human capital characteristics (Portes and Zhou 1999; Logan, Alba, and McNulty 1994; Wilson and Martin 1982). The literature on ethnic enclaves have focused primarily on domestic conditions, that is of the immigrant communities themselves and on their relations with the host society. Although references have been made to connections with the home country for such groups as the Koreans (Light and Bonacich 1988), the main focus has remained the contextual and individual variables that allow enclave entrepreneurs to succeed in their local environment.

The concept of transnationalism opens a new dimension in the study of immigrant economic adaptation because it focuses explicitly on the significance of resilient cross-border ties. The concept may be regarded as an extension of the existing literature on entrepreneurship, but with a focus on international networks, rather than exclusively domestic ones. While past economic and sociological theories would lead us to focus exclusively on labor market outcomes or local small business as paths for mobility, the concept of transnationalism targets explicitly the cultivation and development of activities spanning national borders. To the extent that such activities are successful, they may allow immigrants to fulfill their economic targets without undergoing a protracted process of acculturation; as expected in the past (Warner and Srole 1945; Jasso and Rozensweig 1990).

Transnational enterprise has a second important dimension, namely its bearing on the economic development of sending countries. In the past, many sending nations regarded their emigrants as little more than defectors (Roberts *et. al.* 1999; Smith 1994). At present the increase of migrant remittances, investments, and technological innovations linked to the transnational field has caught the attention of the respective sending governments. Many small countries in the periphery of the developed world have effectively become "exporters of people", as the remittances and investments of their emigrants have come to exceed the sum total of these countries' commodity exports (Guarnizo 1994; Glick Schiller 1999; Levitt 2000). The development prospects of these nations may become inextricably linked to the activities of their respective diasporas.

Recent activities of Third World countries in pursuit of the potential benefits of transnationalism are a defining feature of the phenomenon since, at no time in the past, have so many governments implemented deliberate policies to further it. These policies have taken various forms ranging from the creation of a specialized ministry or government department in Haiti and Mexico, the granting of the right to vote in national elections in Colombia, and new legislation allowing the election of representatives of immigrant communities abroad to the national legislatures in Colombia and the Dominican Republic (Guarnizo and Diaz 1999; Levitt 2000; Smith 1998). As these initiatives take hold, they make increasingly untenable an approach to economic development focused exclusively on domestic policies. National development plans of sending countries have started to incorporate the respective expatriate communities and the transnational fields that they are in the process of creating.

To summarize, transnational entrepreneurship lies at the intersection of immigrant enterprise, a phenomenon described at length in the sociological literature, and the broader field

of transnationalism which includes political and socio-cultural activities as well. Figure 1 portrays these relations. Transnational entrepreneurship has potential significance for the course of immigrant economic adaptation to the receiving societies and for the development of sending nations. It also bears directly on sociological theories of the economy, insofar as the rise of this form of entrepreneurship depends directly on long-distance social networks. This should make the phenomenon worthy of attention by sociologists especially in a period where the forces promoting international migration show no sign of abetting and the size of the immigrant population continues to increase (Massey *et. al*. 1998; Rumbaut 1996).

Figure 1
Types of Activities in Immigrant Communities

Type of Activity	*Location*	
	Domestic	Cross-border
Economic	Wage work; self-employment in local enclaves	**Transnational Enterprise**
Political	Local ethnic mobilizations; participation in host country electoral campaigns	Membership in home country political parties; participation in hometown civic committees and political campaigns
Socio-cultural	Local ethnic festivals; participation in host country associations and cultural events	Regular performances by home country artistic groups; participation in hometown cultural festivities and civic celebrations

Evidence from the Field: Ethnographic Studies

Research documenting the existence of transnational enterprise has consisted so far of ethnographic material drawn from immigrant communities and their respective sending

countries. The following three examples illustrate the types and scope of transnational activities uncovered through this methodology:

In their study of the large Salvadoran immigrant populations of Los Angeles and Washington DC, Landolt and her associates discovered a "vibrant entrepreneurial community embedded in a web of social relations" (Landolt *et. al.* 1999:296). The study identified four types of transnational enterprises. *Circuit* firms are involved in the transfer of goods and remittances across countries and range from an array of informal international couriers, known as *viajeros*, to large formal firms, such as El Gigante Express, headquartered in Los Angeles. *Cultural enterprises* rely on their daily contacts with El Salvador and depend on the desire of immigrants to acquire and consume cultural goods from their country. Salvadoran newspapers are readily available in Los Angeles and Washington DC, as are cds and videos with the latest musical hits.

Ethnic enterprises are small retail firms catering to the immigrant community which depend on a steady supply of imported goods, such as foodstuffs and clothing from El Salvador. Finally, *return migrant microenterprises* are firms established by returnees to El Salvador that rely on their contacts in the United States. They include restaurants, video stores, auto sales and repairs, laundromats, and office supplies. Summarizing their findings on this last type of enterprise, the authors conclude that:

> Typically, the idea for a microenterprise originates with the migrant's experience in the United States, and the investment capital comes from the migrant's personal savings. Given the precarious and often low rentability of their business ventures, expansion and maintenance costs often force the entrepreneur to seek wage work in the United States on a regular basis. (Landolt *e. al*. 1999:299)

A similar pattern is detected by Itzigsohn and his associates in their study of the Dominican immigrant communities in the Washington Heights area of New York City and in Providence, Rhode Island. These researchers also uncovered a number of informal transnational couriers operating between the U.S. and Dominican Republic; the proliferation of stores selling imported Dominican foodstuffs, music, and newsprint in New York and Providence; and the rapid growth of remittance agencies, known locally as *financieras*. A new business innovation are transnational firms that accept immigrants' cash and deliver durable goods such as appliances and business machinery to their kin and partners in the Dominican Republic. This assures migrants that their money is used as intended and not squandered by needy relatives. Return migrant firms in the capital city of Santo Domingo also include an array of businesses based on examples found in the United States and on investment from wage labor abroad. They include video stores, laundromats, car detailing, home delivery of fast food, and computer software stores (Itzigsohn *et al.* 1999).

The residential construction industry in the Dominican Republic has become transnationalized through its increasing dependence on immigrant demand. Construction and real estate firms regularly advertise in the immigrant press in New York City. Entire residential neighborhoods in Santo Domingo, particularly in the eastern portion of the city close to the airport have been built with the expatriate community in mind. Reflecting the growing importance of remittances and investments, the Dominican government has facilitated the election of a representative of the New York immigrant community to the national Congress and appointed an immigrant as its consul in New York City. In official parlance, Dominican immigrants are no longer "absent" (*ausentes*), but only "temporarily abroad" (Itzigsohn *et. al.* 1999).

A third example with a unique cultural twist is provided by Kyle's (2001) study of the Otavalan indigenous community in the highlands of Ecuador. Traditionally, the region of Otavalo has specialized in the production and marketing of clothing, developing, and adapting new production skills since the colonial period under Spain. During the last three decades or so, Otavalans have taken to travelling abroad to market their colorful wares in major cities of Europe and North America. During the same period, semi-permanent Otavalan enclaves began to emerge abroad. Their distinct feature is that members do not make their living from wage labor, but from the sale of goods brought from Ecuador. They maintain a constant communication with their hometown in order to replenish supplies, monitor their *telares* (textile shops), and buy land. The back-and-forth movement required by their trade has turned Otavalans into a common sight, not only at Quito airport but also in street fairs in New York, Paris, Amsterdam, and other First World cities (Kyle 1999; 2001).

These and other studies have documented the phenomenon of immigrant transnationalism and its significance. They have also approached the magnitude of the phenomenon through such indicators as the volume of remittances, the number of real estate acquisitions, and the growth of air travel and telephone contacts (Diaz-Briquets and Weintraub 1991; Guarnizo 1994). However, this qualitative research has not been able to establish transnational entrepreneurship as a distinct path of economic adaptation, nor to examine its potential determinants.

The occasional activities of immigrants across national borders such as the sending of remittances and periodic trips and telephone communications are not fundamentally different from those that earlier immigrants undertook and, hence, do not justify the coining of a new term (Foner 1997). It is the conduct of a primary business pursuit that requires regular contact across national borders for its operation that constitutes the truly novel phenomenon for it marks a sharp

break from past expectations about the economic behavior of immigrants. This path is illustrated, but not quantified in the ethnographic literature. We address the question on the basis of surveys conducted among three immigrant nationalities in the United States.

Data and Method

Data for this analysis come from the Comparative Immigrant Enterprise Project (CIEP), a collaborative study conducted jointly by universities in the east and west coasts and which included detailed informant interviews in targeted communities, followed by a survey of adult household heads in each of them.[2] The survey collected data on 1,202 adult heads in areas of immigrant concentration in New York City; Washington DC; Los Angeles; and Providence, Rhode Island. Respondents were identified via two sampling strategies: First, a two-stage cluster random sample of dwellings in selected census tracts was drawn: city blocks served as primary sample units (PSUs) and were selected at random. Within each PSU a systematic random sample of dwellings was conducted with a fixed *nth* sampling fraction. This method insured identical probabilities of selection for eligible households situated in blocks with different immigrant concentrations (Kish 1967:151-161).

Since entrepreneurs represent a relatively small proportion of the general population, the survey was supplemented by a sample of immigrant entrepreneurs based on informant leads obtained in the project's first phase. Although this supplementary sample is not statistically representative, the use of multiple leads to locate eligible respondents guarantees sufficient diversity in terms of economic sector and size of firms.[3]

Colombian, Dominican, and Salvadoran immigrants were the target nationalities. They were intentionally selected for several reasons. First, they are all sizable immigrant groups,

comprising three quarters of a million persons each in 1996 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1999). Second, they are less well-known than larger nationalities, such as Mexicans, who have been extensively studied in the past (Suarez-Orozco 1998; Massey *et. al.* 1987). Third, their contexts of exit and reception are sufficiently diverse to provide a basis for comparing different types of economic adaptation. Dominicans are primarily economic immigrants who come escaping difficult conditions at home, while maintaining close ties with their families and communities. Over time, Dominican immigration has become increasingly diversified – encompassing professionals as well as rural laborers – and clustering in the Washington Heights area of New York City and in smaller cities in the New York – Boston corridor (Levitt 1997; Itzigsohn *et. al.* 1999).

Salvadorans, in contrast, represent a political emigration coming to the United States to escape a violent civil war at home. Denied asylum by U.S. immigration authorities, most Salvadorans subsisted as illegal immigrants in low-paid menial jobs. Most of the earlier arrivals were refugees from the countryside – small farmers and rural laborers who, despite difficult conditions of resettlement in the United States, managed to retain strong ties with their communities of origin. Over time, the educational and occupational composition of the group diversified, and its legal situation improved. Salvadorans cluster primarily in central city areas of the Southwest, mainly Los Angeles. Over the years, they also drifted east establishing another large concentration in Washington DC and its suburbs (Repak 1995; Mahler 1995; Landolt *et. al.* 1999).

Colombians are a more recent immigrant group that has grown rapidly because of increasing political and drug-related violence at home. Most Colombian immigration originates in cities and contains a sizable proportion of university-educated professionals. On the other

hand, ties with home communities are weaker than among other nationalities that originate in tightly-knit rural areas. Several past studies report that the stigma associated with the drug trade and the perennial suspicion that others may be involved lead Colombians to be distrustful of each other and less willing to engage in cooperative activities (Guarnizo *et. al*. 1999; Diaz 1997). For the same reason, Colombian immigrants are more dispersed than other groups, with few identifiable areas of concentration. The principal cluster is found in the Jackson Heights area of Queens, New York with secondary clusters in Los Angeles and Miami.

The CIEP study targeted these nationalities in order to create variance in experiences of exit and incorporation expected to affect immigrant economic activities; the sample design also provides sufficient variance on individual and family characteristics to examine their effects on different types of entrepreneurship, net of national origins. The survey was initiated and completed during 1998 in the following areas: Washington Heights (Manhattan) and Providence, Rhode Island for the Dominican sample; central Los Angeles, Adams Morgan (Washington DC) and selected Washington suburbs for the Salvadoran sample; and Jackson Heights, Queens (New York) for the Colombian Sample.

A significant body of research has already distinguished between wage workers and entrepreneurs among immigrants and pointed to the high propensity for self-employment among certain foreign minorities (Light and Rosenstein 1995; Light and Bonacich 1988; Waldinger *et. al.* 1990). As shown in Figure 1, the literature on transnationalism points to a further distinction between entrepreneurs involved in purely local business pursuits and those that require extensive cross-border contacts. If this distinction holds, the three categories should be empirically distinguishable on the basis of various individual characteristics, as well as their level of

involvement with the respective home countries. We use discriminant analysis to test this proposition.[4]

The analysis does not seek to demonstrate causality, but only the existence of different paths of economic adaptation. The null hypothesis is that no such systematic differences exist and, hence, that cases of immigrant transnationalism reported in the literature are exceptional. Only to the extent that an identifiable transnational path can be determined to exist does the question of its possible determinants become relevant.

Results

a. Discriminant Analysis

The discriminant function equation can be written as follows:

$$D_{ij} = \underset{ik}{\Gamma} C_{jk}\, 0_{ik}$$

Where: D_{ij} is the group centroid for each group *i* in discriminant function *j*. C_{jk} are standardized canonical function coefficients. 0_{ik} are mean values in an array of *k* predictors for each *i* group.

We differentiate three categories among predictors: “individual demographic characteristics” include age, sex, and nationality; “adaptation characteristics” include U.S. citizenship, U.S. monthly income, and perceptions of discrimination against one’s group; and “ties with the home country” include economic as well as political and social relations. The Appendix presents measurement characteristics of all variables. Wage workers include all salaried persons in the sample without any significant self-employment activity; entrepreneurs are respondents identified by others and by themselves as being primarily involved in

independent business activities. They were further differentiated according to whether these activities were exclusively local or required regular contacts across national borders. This tripartite division yields a maximum of two discriminating functions.

The analysis in Table 1 shows that the first function is dominant, accounting for 88 percent of common variance. The second function, although much smaller, is also significant and reveals several important differences between the groups. A look at the centroids in the first function shows that it mainly differentiates between the category of wage workers, for whom the coefficient is negative, and entrepreneurs, for whom coefficients are positive in both categories. However, transnationals are situated far more to the right in the canonical function space, indicating that the function is primarily defined by them.

The structure matrix of variable-to-function correlations portrays transnational enterprise as defined by sex (males) and associated with both higher incomes and U.S. citizenship. This last finding, which may appear anomalous, is readily explained by the greater ease for international travel and contacts that citizenship and a U.S. passport make possible. Hence, economic transnationalism is not defined by greater resistance to naturalize, as may have been surmised given the nature of these activities, but is actually linked to citizenship acquisition.

The remaining coefficients show that this path of adaptation is firmly anchored in regular contacts of the most diverse sorts with the home country. In contrast with other immigrants, in particular wage workers, transnational entrepreneurs are significantly more likely to participate in charity associations, civic committees, and sports clubs with ties to their sending country. They are also much more inclined to invest in it, to visit their hometowns for local celebrations, and take part in home country politics. Transnational entrepreneurship is thus defined not only by narrow economic links, but by the cultivation of a diversified web of cross-border contacts.

Table 1
Discriminant Analysis of Immigrant Economic Adaptation, 1998

	Canonical Discriminant Functions	
	I.	*II.*
Eigenvalue	.518	.069
Percent of Common Variance	88.2	11.8
Wilk's Lambda	.616	.935
Chi Square (degrees of freedom)	478.856 (38)#	66.193 (18)#
Variable/Function Structure Matrix[1]		
Demographic:		
Age		.19
Sex (Male)	.26	
Nationality: Colombian[2]		.60
Nationality: Salvadoran		-.62
Adaptation:		
Perceived Discrimination in U.S.	.20	-.24
U.S. Citizen	.35	.21
U.S. Monthly Income	.45	.20
Ties with Home Country:		
Hometown Associations	.53	
Charity Associations	.62	
Political Organizations	.35	.45
Sport Clubs	.45	
Attends Hometown Celebrations	.32	
Owns/ Invests in Real Estate	.24	
$ Sent for Hometown Projects	.46	
$ Sent for Political Campaigns	.29	.48
Group Centroids:		
Wage/Salaried Worker	-.534	-.006
Domestic Entrepreneur	.443	.615
Transnational Entrepreneur	1.156	-.224
N[3]	1001	

[1] See Appendix for description of variables. Insignificant canonical correlations omitted.
[2] Dominican is the reference category.
[3] Cases with missing data excluded. Computation of model with imputed missing data does not significantly alter results.# $p < .0001$

The second function also deserves comment because it differentiates domestic entrepreneurs from the rest of the sample. The group centroid for domestic entrepreneurs is strongly positive, while those for the other categories are both negative. The critical variable here is national origin, with Colombian immigrants being far more likely to engage in purely domestic forms of enterprise (and, by extension, to avoid transnationalism) and Salvadoran immigrants far less likely to do so. The pattern mirrors past ethnographic findings about the weakness of home country ties among Colombians and their relative strength among former Salvadoran refugees (Guarnizo and Diaz, 1999; Landolt 2000). The structure matrix also reveals that immigrants whose businesses are exclusively domestic tend to be older and to have severed most ties with their sending countries. They do not invest there or visit home communities during annual celebrations, nor do they become involved in civic committees operating in their countries.

The single exception is participation in politics and contributions to party organizations at home. This result reflects the heavy presence of Colombians among non-transnational entrepreneurs. Having cut most ties with their home communities and avoiding any kind of economic involvement with them, Colombians seem to rely on party politics as the sole means to maintain some sort of presence at home (Diaz 1997). Overall, results from this analysis lend support to conclusions from the earlier ethnographic literature: transnationalism *is* a distinct path of immigrant economic adaptation. Its profile involves a diverse web of cross-country ties and, while not the modal path among the three groups studied, it has been adopted by a substantial number of immigrants. Discriminant analysis does not demonstrate causality, but the empirical distinctness of specified categories. Having established transnational entrepreneurship as one such category, it is appropriate to inquire about its determinants.

b. Who are the Transnationals?

Before presenting these causal results, it is important to supplement the preceding analysis with direct evidence of what transnational entrepreneurs actually do. Results from the CIEP survey show that transnational enterprise is not limited to just a few lines of businesses, but includes a fairly broad range of sectors. Table 2 presents a breakdown of economic activities linking immigrants with their countries of origin by types of economic adaptation. These results support those from the prior analysis by showing that transnational entrepreneurs consistently engage in activities requiring regular cross-border contacts far more frequently than other immigrants. Such activities range from importing or exporting goods to managing firms with paid employees in the country of origin.

Table 2 also presents a distribution by economic sectors of all firms in the survey. Relative to purely local immigrant businesses, transnational firms are underrepresented in personal services (housecleaning, gardening, hairdressing, etc.) and overrepresented in telecommunications and business services (public relations, management consulting, computer software). This profile reflects the more dynamic character of transnational firms: they both rely on new communication technologies and become directly involved in them as service providers to the immigrant community and home country markets. In contrast, traditional immigrant enterprise is more likely to organize services that, like office cleaning, landscaping, and house repairs, make use of cheap immigrant labor to meet local demand.

Table 2

Activities Linking Immigrants to Their Home Countries by Type of Economic Adaptation

Activity	*Employee/ Wage Worker %*	*Domestic Entrepreneur %*	*Transnational Entrepreneur %*	*Total %*
Imports Goods from Abroad[1]	8.2	9.9	31.9	13.9
Exports Goods[1]	6.5	8.9	18.1	9.5
Invests in Business in Home Country	5.9	11.7	26.4	11.5
Invests in Real Estate in Home Country	20.7	28.2	41.9	26.7
Has Been an International Courier[2]	10.1	8.3	23.6	12.9
Hires at Least One Employee in Home Country	0.0	30.8	42.2	
Frequency of Business Travel Abroad:				
At least twice per year	7.1	17.3	28.4	13.8
Six times or more per year	0.9	6.1	14.6	4.9
N	742	180	276	1198
Sector of Firm[2]				
Construction		3.4	3.7	3.6
Manufacturing		6.9	10.2	9.5
Retail Sales		27.6	34.3	32.8
Credit, Finance, Real Estate		10.3	8.4	8.7
Personal Services		24.3	9.3	12.4
Telecommunications/ Business Services		10.3	25.0	21.9
Health Services		6.9	5.6	5.8
Legal Services and Accounting		6.8	3.5	4.3
Others		3.5	--	1.0
		100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] Occasionally or regularly.
[2] Totals based on number of immigrant firms.
Source: CIEP, 1998

Determinants of Transnational Entrepreneurship

a. Theory

We approach the question of potential determinants of economic transnationalism on the basis of several hypotheses based on past sociological theorizing that are testable with project data. From the sociological literature on entrepreneurship, we draw gender, marital status, and human capital as significant predictors. Past research consistently indicates that married males are overrepresented among entrepreneurs; gender, by itself, has proven by far the strongest predictor of ethnic entrepreneurship in several past studies (Portes and Jensen 1989; Light and Gold 2000). Human capital, in the form of years of education and years of U.S. residence, has also been found to play a significant role in immigrant business success. We reason that transnational entrepreneurship is even more likely to depend on these characteristics, as it involves greater risks and complexity.

Based on earlier qualitative research, some authors also hypothesize that immigrants who experience downward occupational mobility during their early years of resettlement should be motivated to engage in transnational enterprise as a means to restore their status and incomes (Landolt 2000; Ballard 2000). In addition to individual characteristics, contextual factors should play a significant role in the choice of one or another form of economic adaptation. From recent theorizing in economic sociology, we draw three notions that appear relevant.

First, social networks are likely to play a significant role based on their size, breadth, and scope. Other things being equal, we expect that individuals with more extensive and diversified networks will be in a better position to initiate and sustain transnational enterprise (Kyle 1999; Levitt 1997; Ballard 2000). Second, embeddedness is also reflected in socially expected durations of migration (SEDs) and can affect the probability of engaging in these activities.

Socially expected durations is a concept originally coined by Merton (1984) to designate the normative temporality of social events. Norms prescribing the proper length of exchanges, rituals, and other collective activities can exercise a decisive influence on their course, either through the self-motivated behavior of individuals socialized in these norms or through social pressure from others.

Roberts (1995) has recently applied Merton's concept to Mexican immigration, proposing that the relative absence of entrepreneurship in this group is due to strongly enforced SEDs prescribing the temporary character of the journey and, hence, the imperative to return and invest any savings at home. Following his lead, we reason that immigrants whose families expect them to return after a certain period abroad (temporary SEDs) will be more likely to engage in transnational activities than those whose departure is seen as definitive. By its very nature, the transnational path helps preserve closer ties with kin and communities left behind than other forms of economic adaptation.

Lastly, contexts of exit and reception of particular immigrant nationalities can also be expected to affect their adaptation. For example, immigrants who come individually and resettle in dispersed physical locations are less likely to become transnational entrepreneurs than those whose departure was caused by a major traumatic event affecting an entire nation and who resettle in close proximity to each other (Landolt 2000; Gold 2000). The comparative nature of the CIEP data allows us to test for these hypothesized differences.

Summarizing this discussion, we expect the probability of transnational enterprise to be affected by demographic variables, in particular age and marital status, to increase with education and professional experience, and to be more common among immigrants who experienced downward occupational mobility in the past. Social factors affecting and framing

the experience of immigration can also be expected to play a significant role. These range from the size and scope of immigrants' social networks to normative expectations concerning the duration of their journey and, finally, the specific historical context in which their movement is embedded.

b. Findings: Predictive Models

There are two ways of conceptualizing the relative probability of transnational entrepreneurship: first, in relation to all other forms of economic adaptation combined; second, in relation to the dominant category of wage employment in the host labor market. We consider both options through logistic models with different reference categories and compute the actual net probabilities associated with significant predictors through the method proposed by Petersen (1985).[5] Measurement characteristics of predictor variables are presented in the Appendix.

Table 3 presents the results. The first significant finding is that, as predicted, immigrant businesses of any kind are primarily the business of married males since both sex and marital status bear strongly on the pursuit of this economic path. This result is no different from that reported consistently in the literature on immigrant entrepreneurship, except that the gender effect is much stronger on the probability of transnational than domestic enterprise: males are about twice more likely to become transnational rather than purely domestic entrepreneurs.

Measures of socio-economic status – higher education and professional/executive occupational background – also have the predicted effects, increasing the probability of business pursuits. As predicted, these effects are stronger on transnational than on purely domestic enterprise, suggesting that only the more educated and skilled immigrants may be in a position to succeed in business ventures requiring cross-border ties.[6] Based on model coefficients, a

Table 3
Determinants of Transnational Entrepreneurship among
Colombian, Dominican, and Salvadoran Immigrants, 1998

Predictors[1]	*Probability of Transnational Entrepreneurship (Logistic Regression)*			*Probability of: Transnational Entrepreneurship (Multinomial*			*Domestic Entrepreneurship Regression)*		
	Coef.	Z	7^2	Coef.	Z	7^2	Coef.	Z	7^2
Age	.015	n.s.		.009	n.s.		-.019	n.s.	
Sex (Male)	.882	4.8***	.19	1.056	5.5***	.23	.649	3.5***	.11
Marital Status (Married)	.435	2.4*	.09	.617	3.3**	.13	.728	3.7***	.12
Number of Children	-.074	n.s.		-.057	n.s.		.046	n.s.	
Years of Education	.119	6.3***	.02	.138	6.9***	.03	.070	3.2**	.01
Prof/Exec Occupation	.974	3.5***	.21	1.189	4.0***	.27	.730	2.4*	.12
Years in the U.S.	.031	2.5*	.01	.054	4.0***	.01	.073	5.3***	.01
Downward Mobility[3]	-.248	n.s.		-.292	-2.0*	-.05	-.135	n.s.	
SED of Migration[4]	.244	n.s.		.355	2.0*	.07	.379	2.04*	.06
Network Size	.080	4.8***	.01	.100	5.6***	.02	.066	3.5**	.01
Network Scope[5]	.026	n.s.		-.079	n.s.		-.537	-2.5*	-.06
Nationality:[6]									
Salvadoran	.924	4.4***	.20	.815	3.7***	.17	-.423	n.s.	
Colombian	-1.717	-5.9***	-.18	-1.886	-6.2***	-.19	-.669	-2.5*	-.07
Constant	-5.413			-5.798			-3.581		
Chi Square (Degrees of Freedom)		247.54 (13)***					375.79 (26)***		
Pseudo R^2		.215					.188		
Area under ROC curve		.80							
N[7]		1097.					1097.		

[1] See Appendix for full description of variable measurement.
[2] Increase/decrease in the probability of becoming an entrepreneur per unit change in each predictor, evaluated at the mean of the sample's distribution.
[3] Ratio of occupational status in the country of origin to status of the first U.S. occupation.
[4] Socially expected duration of migration. A higher value indicates families' expectation of return.
[5] Ratio of number of network members outside the city of residence to locals.
[6] Dominicans are the reference category.
[7] Missing data excluded.
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
n.s. = non-significant

married male with a college education and a professional background has a 57 percent greater probability to become a transnational entrepreneur on average; the figure increases to 75 percent in the multinomial model, when wage workers are the reference category.

Years in the United States play a positive role on both types of businesses. The positive coefficient indicates that engagement in transnational activities is not a reflection of recency of arrival, since it actually increases over time. Recent immigrants are probably too insecure and inexperienced to try their hand at any kind of independent business. In addition, and contrary to our initial hypothesis, the experience of initial downward mobility does not motivate immigrants to become transnational entrepreneurs. Our mobility indicator consists of the ratio of the last occupational status in the country of origin to the first in the United States (see Appendix). Higher scores thus signify greater downward mobility and are expected to have a positive effect on transnationalism. The corresponding coefficients are actually negative. The multinomial logistic coefficient reaches statistical significance, indicating that each point drop in occupational status in the United States *reduces* the probability of transnationalism by 5 percent on average.

Rejection of this hypothesis suggests that, contrary to early qualitative results, it is not the experience of occupational failure or barriers created by labor market discrimination that lead immigrants to become transnationals. Added to the positive effect of years of U.S. residence and the fact that U.S. citizenship is a defining feature of transnationalism (Table 1), these findings lead to the conclusion that the transnational route is open mainly to immigrants who have established a secure foothold in the host society. While those experiencing serious downward mobility may be motivated to follow the same route, they lack the experience, resources, and legal stability to succeed at it.

The CIEP survey includes data on attributes of the respondents' networks, including their size, density, breadth, and multiplexity. Earlier model specifications (not shown) indicate that the key characteristic of immigrant networks affecting entrepreneurship is their size. Business owners have more numerous social ties than wage workers and transnational entrepreneurs have more than domestic ones. As shown in Table 3, the social network effect is very strong with each additional contact increasing the probability of transnational enterprise by a net 2 percent or double its effect on purely domestic enterprise. A second relevant characteristic of social networks is their scope, defined as the ratio of the number of extra-local contacts (outside the city of residence) to purely local ones. The effect of network scope on domestic entrepreneurship is significant, but negative. Each unit increase in the ratio of outside-to-local contacts *reduces* the probability of engaging in this form of economic adaptation by 6 percent. This finding reinforces the view of domestic enterprise as an economic path engaged by immigrants whose ties do not reach beyond the local community.[7]

SEDs of migration are operationalized in the CIEP data by an item asking whether respondent's family and kin "definitely expected" him or her to return home after a period in the United States. This measure yields only weak support for our hypothesis for two reasons. First, the item is retroactive and, hence, subject to selective recall. Second, though positive, the SED effect does not reach significance in the logistic model. The multinomial coefficients show why this is the case: the same positive and significant effect is evident for both types of immigrant enterprise. Hence, whatever influence normative durations of migration have, it applies to immigrant firms in general. This, of course, weakens the theoretical rationale linking expected durations of migration specifically to transnationalism. We conclude that while the SED

hypothesis is important, the evidence is too weak to conclude that it represents a key determinant of transnational economic action.

With Dominicans as the reference category, results in both models confirm the sharp differences between the three immigrant nationalities compared. Other things being equal, Salvadorans are almost 20 percent more likely to engage in transnational business activities, while Colombians are about equally less likely to do so. Both coefficients are very strong, indicating the resilience of national differences after controlling for other factors. These results agree with what is known about the contexts of exit and reception of each group: Salvadoran transnationalism is strongly supported by bonds of solidarity forged during the country's civil war and by the less-than-hospitable reception encountered by these would-be refugees in the United States. In contrast, Colombian transnational ventures are hampered by continuing violence and political strife at home and by the widespread atmosphere of distrust in the immigrant community, reflecting the pervasive influence of the drug trade.

The models in Table 3 do an acceptable job in explaining different paths of immigrant economic adaptation. The figure of 80 percent under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of the logistic model indicates a fairly good fit, since ROC ranges from 0.50 (indicating no predictive power) to 1.00. The same conclusion is drawn from the likelihood ratio chi squares and pseudo R^2 coefficients.

c. Findings: Interaction Effects

In this section, we examine selected interaction effects as a means of refining the previous additive modes. The influence of gender and marital status, noted previously, suggest that their interaction (i.e., "male/married") may significantly increase the probability of transnationalism.

Further analyses (not shown) indicate that this is not the case: the interaction adds nothing to the predictive power of the two variables taken separately. Other interaction effects prove more fruitful, as they clarify the nature of the observed national differences. These findings are presented in Table 4. Because of high collinearity, it is impossible to consider all interaction effects simultaneously. Instead, the table presents separate models that incorporate selected interactions between individual characteristics and national origin.

The multinomial coefficients reveal that Salvadoran transnationalism is the preserve of the more educated members of that community and those with greater time in the United States. With these interactions controlled, the original positive effect of Salvadoran origin on the probability of transnational entrepreneurship becomes negative. The same interactions have little bearing on domestic enterprise (results not shown), strengthening the conclusion that the transnational path of adaptation is only followed by an elite sector of this immigrant group. These survey results clarify the meaning of Salvadoran transnationalism in a manner that escaped previous ethnographic research. While earlier studies correctly noted the bonds of solidarity forged by the Salvadoran civil war, they failed to note that only the more secure and advantaged members of this immigrant community are able to transform such ties into viable economic ventures.

For Colombian immigrants, the addition of the same interactions has the opposite effect. The original negative influence of Colombian origin on transnationalism disappears when these interactions are controlled. Results indicate that the more education Colombian immigrants have, the longer their residence in the United States, and the stronger their social networks, the *less likely* they are to engage in transnational business. Hence for this immigrant group,

transnational enterprise is a marginal path unlikely to be followed by its better established and more advantaged members.

By the same token, these findings qualify conclusions reached previously on the basis of additive effects by showing that the character of transnational enterprise can vary significantly among nationalities: not always are the more educated and occupationally experienced migrants more inclined to pursue transnational enterprise. In the absence of a socially supportive context, skilled immigrants may be more inclined to pursue upward mobility through conventional labor market means, rather than seek advantage in cross-border ventures requiring sustained contact with their home country.

Conclusion

This paper has accomplished several tasks. First, it has shown that the hypothesis of transnational enterprise as a distinct path of adaptation of recent immigrants is empirically tenable, supporting prior ethnographic research on the topic. Second, it has documented the nature of transnationalism with data showing its immersion in a web of cross-country relations, its economic consequences, and its presence in a range of economic sectors. Third, it has demonstrated that this path is not for everyone since it depends on individual human capital endowments, the size and reach of their social networks, and their contexts of exit and reception. Fourth, it has shown that the significant bearing of human capital and network size on the onset of transnationalism can vary according to the same contextual factors associated with particular national origins.

Table 4
Multinomial Logistic Regressions Showing Nationality Interaction Effects on the Probability of Transnational Entrepreneurship, 1998

Predictors		*I*			*II*	
	Coef.[1]	*Z*	7[2]	*Coef.*[1]	*Z*	7[2]
Age	.016	n.s.		.011	n.s.	
Sex (Male)	1.100	5.5***	.24	1.082	5.5***	.24
Marital Status (Married)	.582	3.0**	.12	.605	3.2**	.12
Number of Children	-.078	n.s.		-.062	n.s.	
Years of Education	.071	2.6**	.01	.149	6.6***	.03
Prof/Exec Occupation	1.061	3.3**	.23	1.383	4.0***	.31
Years in the U.S.	.023	n.s.		.079	4.4***	.01
Downward Mobility[3]	-.265	n.s.		-.317	-2.1*	-.05
SED of Migration[4]	.366	2.0*	.07	.368	2.0*	.07
Network Size	.081	3.4**	.01	.130	5.9***	.02
Network Scope[5]	-.113	n.s.		-.070	n.s.	
Nationality:[6]						
Salvadoran	-2.605	-3.4**	-.21	.876	3.8***	.19
Colombian	-1.538	5.0***	-.17	1.466	n.s.	
Interactions:						
(Salvadoran) (Years in US)	.096	3.4**	.02			
(Salvadoran) (Education)	.125	3.0***	.02			
(Salvadoran) (Prof/Exec)	.558	n.s.				
(Salvadoran) (Network Size)	.049	n.s.				
(Colombian) (Years in US)				-.059	-2.4*	-.01
(Colombian) (Education)				-.079	-2.0*	-.01
(Colombian) (Prof/Exec)				-.266	n.s.	
(Colombian) (Network Size)				-.088	-2.3**	-.02
Constant	-4.178			-6.534		
Chi Square						
(Degrees of Freedom)		403.10 (34)***			397.91 (34)***	
Pseudo R^2		.20			.20	
N[7]		1097			1097	

[1] Multinomial logistic regression coefficients. Effects other than those on transnationalism are omitted.
[2] Increase/decrease in the probability of transnational entrepreneurship per unit change in each predictor, evaluated at the mean of the distribution. Insignificant effects omitted.
[3] Ratio of occupational status in the country of origin to status of the first U.S. occupation.
[4] Socially expected duration of migration. A higher value indicates families' expectation of return.
[5] Ratio of number of network members outside the city of residence to locals.
[6] Dominicans are the reference category.
[7] Missing data excluded.
* p <.05
** p <.01
*** p <.001
n.s. = non-significant

While the study of transnationalism is still novel in Sociology, the concept has taken other fields by storm, to the point of suggesting that all or most contemporary immigrants have become involved in these kinds of activities (Appadurai 1990, 1993; Basch *et. al.* 1994). Our results call for caution since they indicate that only a minority of immigrants are regular participants in these enterprises. As noted previously, many other migrants engage in cross-border activities on an occasional basis, but these actions hardly justify the coining of a new term since they are no different from what earlier immigrant groups did. It is the emergence of an entrepreneurial core committed to cross-border transactions on a regular basis that represents the truly novel development. Our findings show that such a core exists, that it possesses a distinct socio-economic profile; and that it still represents a minority of the respective immigrant populations.

This last conclusion may be qualified by the existence of other forms of transnationalism. As shown in Figure 1, the field as currently defined includes political and socio-cultural activities as well. It is theoretically possible that these forms engage larger numbers of immigrants. A more important qualification is that the limited number of core economic transnationals do not fully reflect their actual significance. By its very character, transnational enterprise pushes other members of the immigrant community in the same direction, facilitating more intense cross-border contacts and providing role models to follow. Like the process of immigration itself, which starts with a few "pioneers" from sending areas and cumulates over time (Massey 1987; Massey, Goldring, and Durand 1994), transnationalism is likely to expand because of its economic advantages and its declining risks, once innovators have shown the way. The development of these activities would consolidate the emergent social fields straddling national borders.

Economic sociologists should take note of the critical role of long-distance networks in the development of these fields and their possible unanticipated effects. Though not started in deliberate opposition to the dominance of multinational capital, grassroots transnationalism holds the potential of contesting its power. That power is ultimately based on the premise that capital is able to range global, as opposed to the relative immobility and localism of labor. By turning the latter into an equally footloose and flexible actor, transnational enterprise can give new purchase in the global economy to people of modest means, partially reversing their role as mere sources of wage labor. As noted at the start, the success of immigrant transnationalism does not depend on the voluntary actions of activists (Evans 2000). It is driven instead by the very logic of advanced capitalism as it imports masses of migrant workers from less developed countries and then exposes them to the requisite technologies to bridge national borders with ease.

The sociological study of these phenomena is still in its infancy. In addition to parallel research on political and cultural forms of transnationalism, there is a need for longitudinal data to establish more firmly the determinants of transnational enterprise. Our findings show that these activities are mostly restricted to males and to more educated and skilled immigrants. The likelihood that they will extend in the future to females and to persons of more modest origins is an open question. Similarly, little is known about the transmission of this form of enterprise across generations. It is not clear whether transnationalism is exclusively a "first generation" form of economic adaptation or whether it can be passed from parents to children. A range of possibilities exists – from the extinction of transnational enterprise once it has fulfilled its economic role for the original immigrants to its continuation across generations. The latter possibility would, of course, call into even greater question conventional models of immigrant

assimilation. Such issues should prompt greater sociological attention to the character and evolution of the phenomenon of transnationalism than has been the case in the past.

End Notes

[1] For examples of these successes, see Evans (2000).

[2] Johns Hopkins University, Brown University, and University of California-Davis. In 1998, the project's headquarters was moved to the Center for Migration and Development at Princeton University.

[3] The deliberate oversampling of entrepreneurs means that their proportion in the CIEP data is not an accurate estimator of their relative presence in the target immigrant communities. The purpose of the study was not to estimate the proportion of the self-employed among these groups since this information is readily available from Census publications or can be estimated from the Census PUMS tapes (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1993; Portes and Zhou 1999). Instead, the project sought to examine the characteristics and determinants of entrepreneurship, transnational or otherwise, in comparison with the rest of the immigrant population.

[4] Discriminant analysis is an appropriate method when the goal of the analysis is to test the empirical identifiability of mutually exclusive categories that have been posited theoretically, but whose existence has not been established. The method is also useful in providing a descriptive profile of these categories on the basis of the set of empirical measures defining the discriminant functions. The maximum number of such functions is one minus the number of specified categories. See Morrison (1967); Norusis (1990).

[5] For multinomial regression models, Petersen's method is modified to take into account the multiple categories of the dependent variable. See Greene (1993).

[6] A second interpretation, suggested by one of this journal's readers is that more educated and skilled immigrants may be more hampered by U.S.-style discrimination in their efforts to reestablish themselves and, hence, will be more motivated to resort to transnational activities. It is not possible with the data at hand to fully test this interpretation, although we note that the additive effect of downward mobility in the multinomial model in Table 3 is negative. In other words, initial downward mobility in the U.S. decreases, rather than improves the likelihood of engaging in transnational entrepreneurship.

[7] The cross-sectional character of the data prevents us from establishing the extent to which network size and composition are a consequence of different types of entrepreneurship. One of this journal's readers called our attention to this plausible reverse effect. However, it is unlikely that the effect runs entirely in this direction. In other words, it is most implausible that

transnational entrepreneurs start with no networks and that the latter only emerge as an outgrowth of their activities. A more likely path which agrees with the existing ethnographic evidence, is that transnational entrepreneurs begin with sizable networks which are subsequently expanded with the development of these activities. Full clarification of this reverse causal relation requires additional longitudinal evidence.

References

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration." *International Migration Review* 31:826-74.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2:1-24.

_____. 1993. "Patriotism and its Futures." *Public Culture* 5:411-429.

Ballard, Roger. 2000. "The South Asian Presence in Britain and its Transnational Connections." Paper presented at the International Workshop on Transnational Research, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the Economic and Social Research Council (U.K.), Oxford University, July.

Basch, Linda G., Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Post-Colonial Predicaments, and De-Territorialized Nation States*. Langhorne, PA: Gordon and Breach.

Diaz, Luz M. 1997. "Comunidades Transnacionales: El Caso Colombiano." Paper presented at the seminar on Comparative Research on International Migration. Santo Domingo, D.R. March.

Cohen, Robin. 1997. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press.

Curtin, Philip D. 1984. *Cross-cultural Trade in World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diaz-Briquets, Sergio and Sidney Weintraub. 1991. *Migration, Remittances, and Small Business Development, Mexico and Caribbean Basin Countries*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Evans, Peter. 2000. "Fighting Marginalization with Transnational Networks: Counter-hegemonic Globalization". *Contemporary Sociology* 29:230-241.

Foner, Nancy. 1997. "What's New about Transnationalism? New York Immigrants Today and at the Turn of the Century." *Diaspora* 6:355-375.

Glick Schiller, Nina. 1999. "Transmigrants and Nation States: Something Old and Something New in the U.S. Immigrant Experience." Pp. 94-119 in *Handbook of International Migration, the American Experience*, edited by C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz, and J. DeWind. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____, Fouron 1999. 'Terrains of blood and nation: Haitian transnational social fields, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* #2, March: 340-66.

Gold, Steven J. 2000. "Transnational Communities: Examining Migration in a Globally Integrated World," Pp. 73-90 in *Rethinking Globalization(s): From Corporate Transnationalism to Local Intervention,* edited by Preet S. Aulakh and Michael G. Schechter. London: Macmillan, Ltd.

Greene, William H. 1993. *Econometric Analysis* 2nd Edition. New York: MacMillan.

Guarnizo, Luis E. 1994. "Los 'Dominican Yorkers': The Making of a Binational Society". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 533:70-86.

_____ and Luz. M. Diaz. 1999. "Transnational Migration: A View from Colombia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:397-421.

_____, Arturo I. Sanchez, and Elizabeth M. Roach. 1999. "Mistrust, Fragmented Solidarity, and Transnational Migration". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:367-396.

_____ and Michael P. Smith. 1998. "The Locations of Transnationalism." Pp. 3-34 in *Transnationalism from Below*, edited by M. P. Smith and L. E. Guarnizo. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Itzigsohn, Jose, Carlos Dore, Esther Hernandez, and Obed Vazquez. 1999. "Mapping Dominican Transnationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:316-339.

Jasso, Guillermina and Mark D. Rozensweig. 1990. *The New Chosen People: Immigrants in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kish, Leslie. 1967. *Survey Sampling*. New York: Wiley.

Kyle, David. 2001. *The Transnational Peasant: The Social Construction of International Economic Migration and Transcommunities from the Ecuadoran Andes.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1999. "The Otavalo Trade Diaspora: Social Capital and Transnational Entrepreneurship." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:422-446.

Landolt, Patricia. 2000. "The Causes and Consequences of Transnational Migration: Salvadorans in Los Angeles and Washington D.C." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, The Johns Hopkins University.

_____, Lilian Autler, and Sonia Baires. 1999. "From 'Hermano Lejano' to 'Hermano Mayor': The Dialectics of Salvadoran Transnationalism". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:290-315.

Levitt, Peggy. 1997. "Transnationalizing Community Development: The Case of Migration between Boston and the Dominican Republic". *Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 26:509-526.

_____. 2000. "Transnational Migration and Development: A Case of Two for the Price of One?" Working Paper, Center for Migration and Development, Princeton University.

Light, Ivan and Edna Bonacich. 1988. *Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los Angles 1965-1982*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____ and Steven J. Gold. 2000. *Ethnic Economies*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

_____ and Carolyn Rosenstein. 1995. "Expanding the Interaction Theory of Entrepreneurship." Pp. 166-212 in *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage.

Logan, John R., Richard D. Alba, and Thomas L. McNulty. 1994. "Ethnic Economies in Metropolitan Regions: Miami and Beyond." *Social Forces* 72:691-724.

Mahler, Sarah J. 1995. *American Dreaming, Immigrant Life on the Margins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. 1987. "Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:1372-403.

_____, Rafael Alarcon, Jorge Durand, and Humberto Gonzalez. 1987. *Return to Atzlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____, Luin Goldring, and Jorge Durand. 1994. "Continuities in Transnational Migration: An Analysis of Nineteen Mexican Communities." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:1492-533.

_____, Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1998. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millenium*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Merton, Robert K. 1984. "Socially Expected Durations: A Case Study of Concept Formation in Sociology." Pp. 262-86 in *Conflict and Consensus*, edited by W.W. Powell and R. Robbins. New York: The Free Press.

Morrison, D. J. 1967. *Multivariate Statistical Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Norusis, Marija J. 1990. *SPSS Advanced Statistics User's Guide*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Ostergaard-Nielsen, Eva. 2000. "Turkish and Kurdish Transnational Political Mobilization in Germany and the Netherlands". Working Paper, Center for Migration and Development, Princeton University.

Petersen, Trond. 1985. "A Comment on Presenting Results from Logit and Probit Models." *American Sociological Review* 50:130-131.

Piore, Michael. 1979. *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popkin, Eric. 1999. "Guatemalan Migration to Los Angeles: Constructing Transnational Linkages in the Context of the Settlement Process." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:267-289.

Portes, Alejandro. 1999. "Globalization from Below: The Rise of Transnational Communities". Pp. 253-270 in *The Ends of Globalization: Bringing Society Back In,* edited by D. Kalb, M. van der Land, R. Staring, B. van Steenbergen, and N. Wilderdink. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

_____ and Leif Jensen. 1989. "The Enclave and the Entrants: Patterns of Ethnic Enterprise in Miami Before and After Mariel." *American Sociological Review* 54:929-49.

_____, Min Zhou. 1999. "Entrepreneurship and Economic Progress in the Nineties: A Comparative Analysis of Immigrants and African Americans." Pp. 143-171 in Frank D. Bean and Stephanie Bell-Rose, eds., *Immigration and Opportunity: Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Repak, Terry A. 1995. *Waiting on Washington, Central American Workers in the Nation's Capital*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Roberts, Bryan R. 1995. "Socially Expected Durations and the Economic Adjustment of Immigrants." Pp. 42-86 in *The Economic Sociology of Immigration*, edited by A. Portes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____, Reanne Frank, and Fernando Lozano-Asencio. 1999. "Transnational Migrant Communities and Mexican Migration to the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:238-266.

Rumbaut, Rubén G. 1996. "Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in Contemporary America." Pp. 21-42 in *Origins and Destinies*, edited by S. Pedraza and R. G. Rumbaut. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Smith, Michael P. 1994. "Can You Imagine? Transnational Migration and the Globalization of Grassroots Politics." *Social Text* 39:15-35.

Smith, Robert C. 1998. "Mexican Immigrants, the Mexican State, and Transnational Practice of Mexican Politics and Membership." *LASA Forum* 24:19-24.

Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo. 1998. *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1999. *Profile of the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1997*. Current Population Reports, Special Studies #P23-195. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

_____. 1993. *The Foreign-Born Population in the United States* Series 1990 CP-3-1. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Vertovec, Steven. 1999. "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22:447-462.

Waldinger, Roger. 1998. "Comment." Presented at the International Conference on Nationalism, Transnationalism, and the Crises of Citizenship, University of California-Davis. April.

_____, Howard Aldrich, and Robin Ward. 1990. *Ethnic Entrepreneurs, Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wilson, Kenneth and Martin, Allen (1982) 'Ethnic enclaves: a comparison of the Cuban and Black economies in Miami'. *American Journal of Sociology,* 88: 135-60.

APPENDIX

Variables Used in the Analysis

		Mean	Median	Standard Dev.	Range
Endogenous:					
Immigrant Economic Adaptation, %					
1	Transnational Entrepreneur	23.0			
2	Domestic Entrepreneur	15.1			
3	Wage or Salary Worker	61.9			
Exogenous:					
Sociodemographic					
Age	(in years)	41.02	40.00	10.96	72.00
Sex		0.55	1.00	0.50	1.00
1	Male				
0	Female				
Marital Status		0.55	1.00	0.50	1.00
1	Married				
0	Not married				
Number of Children		3.33	3.00	1.80	9.00
Nationality, %					
1	Colombian	25.9			
2	Dominican	34.8			
3	Salvadoran	39.4			

	Mean	Median	Standard Dev.	Range
Prior Status				
Years of Education	11.05	9.00	5.33	20.50
Country of Origin Occupation 1 Professional/Executive 0 Other	0.23	0.00	0.42	1.00
Adaptation				
Years in the U.S. Year of CIEP survey minus year of arrival in U.S.	15.08	14.00	8.50	51.00
Downward Mobility Ratio of status of country of origin occupation (1-5) to first U.S. occupation (1-5)	1.17	1.00	0.84	4.80
U.S. Citizen 1 Yes 0 No (or no answer)	0.36	0.00	0.48	1.00
U.S. Monthly Income ($)	1,918.23	1,500.00	2796.60	30000.00
Ties with Home Country				
Socially Expected Duration (SED) Of Migration 1 Family expected R to return permanently 0 Family expected R to stay (or other)	0.45	0.00	0.50	1.00

	Mean	Median	Standard Dev.	Range
Hometown Associations	0.11	0.00	0.32	1.00
1 Participates regularly				
0 Participates occasionally or does not participate				
Charity Organizations	0.14	0.00	0.35	1.00
1 [Same as above]				
0				
Political Organizations	0.10	0.00	0.30	1.00
1 [Same as above]				
0				
Sports Clubs	0.08	0.00	0.27	1.00
1 [Same as above]				
0				
Attends Hometown Celebrations	0.06	0.00	0.23	1.00
1 Attends regularly				
0 Else				
Owns/Invests in Real Estate	0.09	0.00	0.28	1.00
1 Invests regularly				
0 Else				
Sends Money for Hometown Projects	0.09	0.00	0.29	1.00
1 Yes				
0 Else				
Sends Money for Political Campaigns	0.06	0.00	0.24	1.00
1 Yes				

0 Else

	Mean	Median	Standard Dev.	Range
Social Networks				
Size of Respondent's Network (number of ties)	9.82	9.00	5.56	31.00
Scope of Respondent's Network	0.75	0.69	0.64	12.92
Ratio of non-local contacts to local contacts				