

Floya Anthias

Translocational Belonging, Identity and Generation: Questions and Problems in Migration and Ethnic Studies

Abstract

I will consider some central ways in which belonging and identity have been understood in the context of transnational migration. The paper critiques a number of approaches that relate to the identity formation and social location of migrants and their descendants. The paper also discusses the notion of intersectionality as a heuristic device. It develops an approach that understands transnational belonging as a complex process relating to social processes and outcomes of differentiation, and in terms of the intersectionality of social locations. The paper argues that we could usefully displace the identity problematic with a focus on 'translocational positionality'.

Introduction: beyond methodological nationalism

Concern with identity and belonging is a central facet of much research on ethnicity and migration and on youth. In addition, we have seen an increasing focus on identity issues from states who regard the retention of diverse identities as synonymous with the failure to integrate, and therefore as an impediment to 'social cohesion' and integration. This is not only linked to the role of ethnic markers which become both visible and challenging in a globalising world, but also to the regulatory regimes of modern states and coalitions of power among states. These set up new frontiers and borders, which depend on categorizing desirable and undesirable persons and groupings. The impetus lies in the threat from 'hostile' identities, embodied both in the war against terror but also in fears of unskilled, dependent migrants, asylum seekers and refugees whose culture and ways of life are seen to be incompatible or undesirable within Western societies, and the fear of social breakdown and unrest attached to these. Current debates on multiculturalism and social cohesion (for example in the UK: see Yuval Davis, Anthias and Kofman 2005) are examples of this.

However, only minorities are generally seen to have ethnic identities, while the majority enjoy national identity (which of course is problematic). Therefore, it is important to interrogate how issues of identity and belonging have been addressed in relation to the migration process and particularly with reference to the descendants of migrants.

Much analysis is underpinned by methodological nationalism (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). This involves the assumption that the nation state, rather than the transnational sphere, is the unit of analysis. For example, much of the focus on issues of migrant assimilation, on the one hand, or cultural crisis, on the other, paradigmatically assumes the nation state form. If we accept that migrants are now transnational actors instead of merely national ones who have transferred from one national boundary to another, then we also need to move away from notion of identity as tied to a fixed place and in terms of 'assimilation', to a fixed and unitary societal core. This also problematises the notion of generation, as I shall argue later.

In this paper I will interrogate a number of different ways in which minority identity and belonging have been discussed. I will look critically at the concepts of identity that under-

pin much of the account of migrant incorporation. I will also argue that the analytical primacy given to identity in these discussions turns our attention away from issues relating to other social spaces, such as those of class and gender, and away from the importance of meaning and context as parameters of social life.

I want to first of all start with a discussion of the transnational context of migration today. Migrants and their children (and grandchildren) live their lives across borders (particularly in the context of transmigration and commuter migration) and in ways which include a range of experiences of people, beliefs, practices and participation around the world. Those living in London, for example, have lives which are impacted on not only by their own, or their parents' countries, but also by those of their friends and relations who have migrated to other countries, as well as the global connections and images found within their society of residence. People negotiate different sets of social relations – for example and particularly – in terms of gendered norms and practices and in terms of how they should behave. This has both positive and possibly negative effects in terms of social advancement and disadvantage, for example depending on their social milieu and its structures of opportunities and exclusions. These negotiations are linked to social class, gender and racialisation processes, which in turn link with the resources they can marshal, such as forms of human and social capital, language and so on (although ethnic resources are not always forms of social capital but may be negative, Anthias 2007).

It is important to note that the so-called second generation is not a unitary category and is fractured by social differences of gender, class and racialisation as well as different opportunities and exclusions which relate to international, national and local policies and institutions. They are themselves impacted on in transnational and translocational contexts, often in contradictory ways. For example, gender values will vary in terms of what is expected and rewarded and what is criticised and disallowed in a range of different contexts (there may be a difference between the expectations and norms of parental culture and the host society, for example).

In addition, it is important to consider the spatial, political and economic location as contextual and temporal, and its influence on forms of negotiation, incorporation and exclusion. In terms of inequality, it is important to remember its global dimensions. This means that the position of a second generation in different countries will differ in terms of the location of the country of settlement in the global landscape of inequality and power.

Traditionally, the incorporation of migrants and their children has been seen as linked to the countries of destination and their structures of exclusion and inclusion, as well as to the cultural tendencies of the migrants themselves. Little attention has been paid to the ways in which migrants are constituted as ethnic, class and gendered subjects already in their countries of origin and the continuing importance of bonds with it as well as other countries where their relatives and friends have migrated.

It is clear that migrants and their children, to a different extent and in different ways, continue to have links with homelands and other destinations, for example in terms of voting, marrying and communicating (through the use of ethnic media, telephones, and the internet, as well as travel). In addition, some have connections to political organisations, send remittances, both economic and cultural, and help to uphold cultural activities or support families and village communities back home, for example through diasporic village associations that pump money into villages and communities in the homeland, as in Cyprus (Anthias 1992).

The children of migrants have diverse relations, which are dependent on their embeddedness within a range of structures and relations (in both the country of residence and the homeland) and their own trajectories. This will affect the extent to which they visit their parent's homeland and develop attachments which spur them on the path of return (there is a growth in research on second generation returnees: see for example Christou 2006; Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). The skills and resources such children have will be less mono-cultural than those of children who have not experienced the migration of their parents. However, they may also experience different constellations of asymmetry and exclusion compared to children who have no experience of transnational migration within their families.

Transnational connections help us to understand that at different times and in different contexts people engage and organise differently and their aims as well as related strategies will differ. There is not only one set of pathways (Werbner 1999), but multiple ones. This is particularly important in terms of recognising that prioritising ethnicity is itself problematic. People connect and engage not only in ethnic ways (indeed the saliency of ethnicity will vary contextually and situationally) but also in terms of other social categories and social relations, for example those of class, gender, age, stage in the life-cycle and political beliefs and values, as well as trans-ethnically.

The whole notion of generation, which purports to make a clear distinction between groups on the basis of those who migrated originally (first generation migrants) and their children (the second generation) is problematised if we focus on the continuing transnational connections of both categories. The generational binary, thereby, becomes less significant in terms of sociological understanding (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004). A generational perspective often retains a national paradigm for understanding migrant adaptation and incorporation, seeing the processes purely in terms of those encountered in the country of settlement and other influences linked to what have been accumulated in *the past* in their countries of origin. The continuing interaction and relations to these is either simply missing or under-explored.

Variation in the experiences of different generations should not be analysed only in terms of 'where they were born'. Instead, the differences that exist socially within migrant populations and their descendants may be linked to stages in the life cycle and age. Moreover, political and eco-

conomic changes taking place over time may affect people differently at different stages of their lives. If people are seen to inhabit transnational spaces (like multicultural cities where global goods and cultures meet) as well as having continuing bonds with homelands and other localities, this makes it easier to see what is shared by migrants from different ethnic origins. These transnational spaces, particularly in cities, are also shared by those of the dominant ethnic group in the state, albeit in different ways (it is important to relate to the asymmetrical power and economic resources here). These differences are not only connected to ethnicity or the migration experience (or different migrant generations), but also to class, gender, and life cycle.

However, for those who are embedded transnationally, there are two sets of social relations, arrangements and expectations (say around gender, sexuality, and behavioural norms—particularly for migrant women and younger migrants) that impact upon their lives (see Anthias 1998b). This is particularly the case for gendered norms and practices. These will vary depending on the destination of migrants (for example, the position of Cypriot migrants is differently structured in the UK, America and Australia, Anthias 2006).

In addition, the migration process influences homelands themselves, converting them into transnational spaces where goods, cultural ideas and values flow: this is reinforced by the phenomenon of return migration (which can also produce contradictions and tensions between returnees and those who stayed at home and never migrated). Operating across borders are also political groups, media forms as well as educational programmes that tie countries together (Anthias 1992).

To what extent is this discussion of transnationalism relevant for the second generation? Alba and Nee (2003) question the transnationalism of the second generation, as do Portes and Rumbaut (2001). However, some of the parameters (such as language fluency in mother tongue, or retaining beliefs and values) these writers have used overemphasise their role in forging social connectedness. Young people can continue feeling connections despite failing these criteria (Anthias 1992, 2006; Christou 2006; Georgiou 2006). Also, at different stages, people can connect in variable ways: work, marriage and having children are particularly salient points for reinforcing social connections with one's ethnic origin (Fouon and Glick Schiller 2001; Kibria 2002). Ethnicity is an important resource for gaining work, for economic support and for child care (Anthias 1992). Some differences are also dependent on the class and social resources of parents (Rumbaut and Portes 2006), familial structure (Anthias 1992) and racism (Back 1996).

The assimilation problematic

Having explored ideas about transnationalism I want to turn now to some of the dominant ways in which youth or second generations have been theorised. Firstly we can identify a focus on assimilation and segmented assimilation, par-

ticularly prominent in American scholarship of ethnicity and migration. Assimilation approaches tend to see migrants as essentially adapting to the society of reception and achieving full embeddedness and social mobility within it. Whilst social and cultural factors, linked to ethnicity and race, are seen as important, some argue that the impediments attached to these have been over-stated (e.g. Perlmann and Waldinger 1997). Segmented assimilation approaches, on the other hand, argue that there are several ways in which migrants and their descendants become incorporated, ranging from becoming fully mobile and integrated to becoming downwardly mobile (for example, see Portes and Zhou 1993; Rumbaut and Portes 2001). This is linked to class position, strategies of adaptation and difference in cultures and traditions, with some being able to select those aspects that they find most valuable to them. Some will reject their own ethnic group, whilst others experience a generation gap between their parents and themselves (these strategies are referred to as selective, consonant and dissonant acculturation).

There are some problems with this approach. We can identify questions about the retention of ethnicity (on the one hand) and questions about structural social mobility on the other hand, which are at times seen as antithetical. Both these aspects have strong normative dimensions. The notion of 'assimilation' assumes a core centre of universal values in the 'society'. It assumes that the normal and desirable path is to 'assimilate' at the cultural and structural level without taking into account the diverse and differentiated nature of social relations. It does not valorise the existence of diverse values which produce the social landscape and thereby ignores the specific experiences which may construct ethnic bonds as forms of coping and managing some of the disadvantages of being denoted as a minority, and the experiences of racialisation and othering that are at times involved. Secondly, the assumption that assimilation is normal and desirable is an example of methodological nationalism in that it does not address issues of social progress from the point of view of the homeland. For example, it has been assumed in this line of research that class questions relating to all migrants can be treated equally. However, it may be that downward mobility, experienced for example by Poles in Britain, may not be considered in the same way in relation to Poland (see for example Eade et al. 2006).

The assimilation problematic is also descriptive rather than explanatory. Explanation often resorts to culturalist models. There is the problem of typologies used, for example, determining who counts as second generation, who counts as a member of an ethnic group, and so on. Such definitions should not be based on common sense or dominant assumptions about who can be placed where on the ethnic map. The other problem of ethnic typologies is that they ignore cross-cutting differences of class and gender within 'groups'. Moreover, these typologies cannot deal with differential inclusions or exclusions. For example, migrants and their descendants may integrate on one level (say, in the labour market) but not on other levels (cultural acceptance or political incorporation)

or vice versa. The assimilationist approach, moreover, does not concern itself directly with broader issues of social participation and citizenship.

The issue of 'cultural crisis'

Another way in which the 'second generation' have been analysed is in terms of so-called identity crisis, sometimes referred to as the 'between two cultures' approach. The second generation are seen to inhabit a cultural no man's land leading to identity crisis, which is sometimes used to explain youth crime. The assumption here is that young people require a given and unitary identity along ethnic or national lines and if they are translocated, finding themselves in a world where the culture of their parents and that of the wider society are not identical, this leads to problems. However, there are certain unfounded assumptions in this position. One is that people need a coherent ethnic identity. Another is the emphasis on conflicts between cultures. These can be much exaggerated, because there are as many commonalities between so-called cultures as there are differences, and the differences may not always be significant. Therefore, we have to look at the contexts. Many young people are able to bracket off areas of difference and assume situational and coping strategies (for example, hiding some of their friendships or interests). There is also an assumption that identity issues only relate to ethnicity. However, all youngsters face identity issues; indeed, all individuals relate to dimensions of social life such as gender, class and so on, which determine selfhood. The pathologising of second generation youngsters in the assimilationist debate asks them to choose one or the other identity in a binary way.

Intergenerational conflict approaches are also part of this framework with the view that generations are at loggerheads over values and practices. However, taking a step back from the notion of generational differences which can be facilitated by the recognition of other dimensions of difference, as well as the importance of life cycle and political beliefs, helps us to unpack some of the essentialising ways in which the 'second generation' has been researched.

There are certainly forms of ethnic organisation that impact on the young (and other less powerful groups within so-called ethnic communities) which testify to the power of male elders. The political project of traditional leaders or 'elders' often includes preserving the cultural identity and traditional values of the young (such as religious beliefs and practices, and those relating to sexual activity), as well as controlling women. There are also distinctive cultural norms that relate to the migration trajectory as well as a strategy of social advancement. The latter relates to values attached to education, social capital emanating from ethnic networks, material resources, knowledge and communication, transferable skills and competencies, human capital, and so on. But none of these factors can be encapsulated by the notion of 'culture', which is stretched too much, on the one hand, but also used to signify particular 'cultural contents' on the other. Culture, how-

ever, can be seen as a resource or a form of software for dealing with the social world (see Anthias 2001 for a discussion of the problem of 'culture'). But this means that culture is not 'fixed': culture adapts and changes in different contexts. There is a danger in those culturalist explanations, which treat culture in terms of fixed contents, reifying and homogenising 'ethnic' culture.

Critiquing identity

In recent debates, it has been widely recognised that identity is indeed a slippery concept. Not only has it been over-inflated to incorporate too much – an argument made by Brubaker and Cooper very convincingly (2000) – but it has come to say "both too much and too little" (for a development of this argument, see Anthias 2002). It says too much in the sense that there are a range of different elements that are incorporated, often rather carelessly, under its ambit. The concept of identity can cover on the one side notions of the 'core self' or the 'aspirational self' (e.g. Erikson 1968) and on the other side notions of how people are identified by objective measures, like country of birth or primary language. The notion also covers identification processes (with others or 'groupings of others') and relates to the construction of collectivities and identity politics (both of which insert the political into the arena of identity formation). From another point of view, identity can be seen as a question of claims and/or attributions. It can be related to a number of dimensions, which are narrational and performative (Anthias 2002 as well as experiential, representational and organizational (for a developed analysis of the latter formulation relating to social categories of identity, see Anthias 1998a).

On the other hand, the concept can tell us too little because it does not flag central questions of structure, context and meaning and therefore cannot fully attend to the conditions of the existence of, or the production of the different elements under examination (assuming that they have been unpacked effectively). It also asks too much: that individuals be able to demonstrate in some form 'who they are' and 'who or what they identify with' in a coherent and stable manner. The decentering of subjectivity via poststructuralist theory has provided a challenge to such projects. Research on a variety of youngsters has also shown some of the problems of attempting to find 'who people say they are' (compare Phinney 1990 with Les Back 1996; see also Anthias 2002; Rattansi and Phoenix 1997). Part of my argument is that the focus on identity sets us on a false trail. The focus on identity has involved a retreat from issues of structure, and even where it is not used in terms of ideas of choice or agency, there is a tendency to treat it as a possessive attribute of individuals or groups rather than a process.

The problem of 'groupism' (Brubaker 2004) in discussions of identity refers to the assumption that identity derives from being a member of group. A group is conceived of as a thing rather than as something hailed or being 'made' (grouping in the active sense might be a better formulation). Groups are

seen as homogeneous: gender, class and other categories are also seen as groups instead of processes or social relations. Moreover, there is often a conflation between identity and culture. Identity is used co-terminously with the maintenance of traditions and customs. This is problematic partly because behaving in ways that conform to an ethnic pattern (as recognised by researchers or the subjects themselves) and participation within an ethnic context can be instrumental, rather than expressive of identity.

Narratives that contain references to identity or 'identity talk' (collected for example by researchers) use available interpretive repertoires, ways of talking and thinking that are subject to regulatory practices. These resources can be mobilised for different ends and therefore have political dimensions. It is also important to focus on context, place and time. Discursive repertoires can be imposed by researchers, for example when they ask questions such as 'who are you?' and 'where do you belong?' Moreover, dis-identification in narratives may be as important as identification (see Skeggs 1997).

Identity is a site of struggle, relating to strategies of power, recognition, representation and redistribution. Moreover, how people label themselves does not always tell us much about their practices. For example, I may say I do not label myself as Cypriot but spend most of my time with other Cypriots. Or alternatively, I may say that I am Cypriot but have little connection to other Cypriots.

Most importantly, belonging is relational but not exclusivist as we can 'belong' in multiple ways. Different identities co-exist within one person (such as being both British and South Asian; member of an ethnic group and a member of a particular social class or gender). Identities also have a performative aspect related to social participation and action, and to systematic repetitions of actions. Belonging is gendered and classed (I will discuss the importance of an intersectional framework later). It involves affectual or emotional aspects; feeling 'at home', memories, ties, and so on. It also involves sharing core moral values, which are not necessarily culturally specific ones; not all moral values signal belonging to a cultural community. In many cases, identity claims are linked to religious or political values and practices. In this sense, identity is not just a matter of what is generally referred to as 'ethnicity'.

Claiming belonging is a political act and to claim belonging is to claim access to resources of different types. Identity claims themselves can be political strategies for representation (and exclusion), and involve discourses and practices of power and struggle. For example, there is struggle over who belongs and over the criteria used to define belonging. This includes cultural criteria, legal entitlement (as in nationality), religious faith, or appropriate behaviour, which is particularly important in terms of gendered norms within ethnic groups. A person may identify with a group but not feel that she or he 'belongs' in the sense of being accepted or being a full member. Alternatively, one may feel accepted and as 'belonging' to a group, but may not fully identify with it, or have split allegiances.

There is also the question of the situationally salient nature of identity (I am British in the classroom but Cypriot at home). But 'identity' is a process. We take up positions depending on context, meaning, 'interest', values, goals and projects. These intersect with the narratives and discourses we have available (as regulatory regimes) to make sense of these locations.

Identity and belonging are about boundaries but also about hierarchies which exist both within and across boundaries. But boundaries are never fixed; they are forms of political practice. Constructions of ethnic difference pay no attention to differences of class, gender, age, political persuasion, and religion. Such identities always crosscut each other. People hold different identities simultaneously and belong to different categorizations depending on context, situation and meaning. This brings me to the debate on intersectionality, to which I will now turn.

Intersectionality

My argument is that discussions of migrants and their descendants have been marred by an exclusive and fairly essentialised focus on 'identity' in terms of ethnic identity, and very little attention has been paid to the mutual constitution of different parameters or axes of difference.

Intersectionality argues that it is important to look at the way in which different social divisions inter-relate in terms of the production of social relations and in terms of people's lives. In earlier debates, particularly in the Marxist feminist concern with gender, different social divisions were understood to be connected, with one of them determining the others (for a review, see Anthias and Yuval Davis 1992). This reductionist model found currency in debates on 'race' and class, and gender and class, in which gender and 'race' were determined by class. Gender and 'race' were treated as epiphenomena, as super-structural elements built upon the real foundation of class relations. A further (and opposite) formulation was in terms of ideas about a triple burden faced by ethnic minority women. Here class, gender and 'race' inequalities were treated as separate, but were seen as being experienced simultaneously. This position can be criticized as being too mechanistic and entailing an additive model of the oppression of gender, race and class. Intersectional approaches have tried to move away from this additive model by treating each division as constituted via an intersection with the others (e.g. Anthias 2002, 2005; Anthias and Yuval Davis 1992; Collins 1993, 1998; Crenshaw 1994; McCall 2001). In this way, classes are always gendered and racialized and gender is always classed and racialized, and so on.

There are clearly rather different foci within the 'intersectionality' framework, but there is not enough space to consider these in all their complexity here. However, the political and policy dimensions raised by intersectionality are important, as this approach leads to an interest in the production of data or policy research which cross-references divisions within formulated groups. However, the very act of already presupposing groups per se as useful classificatory instruments, as

opposed to groups that are positioned in a particular relation to the state (e.g. focusing on Eastern Europeans rather than working class or poor migrant women who are located in British society in a particular way) has the danger of placing too much emphasis on the origin, regional background, or religion of the migrant and not enough on a shared terrain of disadvantage.

There are certain pitfalls in trying to look at processes of disadvantage emanating from the conjuncture between two or more different categorizations or identities such as those combining race and gender or race, class and poverty/unemployment/exclusion. The danger here is the production of infinite numbers of categories through combining the categories together. This position may also assume the distinctive categories to be pure forms. Furthermore, there is the danger of race, class and gender becoming taken for granted as categories for social analysis.

A specific danger in the notion of intersections is found in constructing people as belonging to fixed and permanent groups (e.g. ethnic, gender and class groups) which contribute, in a pluralist fashion, to their determination. This undermines the focus on social processes, practices and outcomes as they impact social categories, social structures and individuals. This is further complicated by the fact that groups exist at the imaginary or ideational level as well as at the juridical and legal level. Therefore, the membership of people in groups is important in terms of attributions of membership and the consequences that flow from these attributions. For example, being labeled as a member of a national or racialized group may affect how one sees oneself as well as ideas of belonging and otherness. This may have an important role in determining forms of social engagement and participation and in the construction of claims about belonging that may be vehicles for a range of political, cultural and economic resource struggles.

One could argue that the focus on intersectionality does not go far enough in its deconstructionist project. Looking at the concrete experiences and positions of subjects in terms of a multiplicity of identities, like black working class women or white middle class men, may be useful. However, a range of social processes, and the multiple situational elements that produce social outcomes, are excluded from consideration. These outcomes cannot be encapsulated by sex/gender, race/ethnicity and class and their intersections. They raise broader issues of social organization and representation.

It could also be argued that the focus on intersectionality can go too far, leading to the failure to identify systematic forms of oppression. If we say that each individual has a unique position in terms of the triad of gender, race and class (e.g. Collins 1993: 28) and that each person is simultaneously an oppressor and oppressed (ibid.) we risk the steady disappearance of systematic forms of subordination and oppression.

Despite the difficulties of the notion of intersections, there is a core which I believe is central to theorizing identities. I do not think we can refer to intersectionality as a theory in and of itself, because there are too many different ways in which the idea of crosscutting social relations around gender, ethnic-

ity and class, amongst others, can be taken further. However, the idea of intersectionality as a heuristic device (see Anthias 1998a) makes it a useful starting point in making possible certain questions and bringing them to the foreground for investigation.

Ethnicity/nation, gender and class involve processes pertaining to economic, political and social interests and projects, and to distinctive and variable forms of social allegiance and identifications, which are played out in a nuanced and highly contextual fashion. These may construct multiple, uneven and contradictory social patterns of identity and belonging (as well as domination and subordination). In other words, issues of intersectionality raise questions about how to theorize social divisions, identities and inequalities in a more holistic or integrated way, which moves beyond it being a tool for feminist concerns alone. Such implications undermine identity politics and also raise more general questions about wider frameworks for integrating approaches to inequality. They problematize the view of inalienable and primary boundaries relating to the categories of ethnic and national phenomena and reinsert the role of crosscutting allegiances of gender and class as well as, potentially, a range of other social constructions.

If belonging is constructed in an intersectional way in relation to a range of boundaries such as those of class, gender and so on, the contradictory processes are as important as the symmetries experienced. We all belong to different constructions of boundaries and are subjected to the hierarchies involved in the different categories of difference and identity. These categories construct (or interpellate) population groupings and often denote inalienable characteristics of those who are deemed to belong to them, as well as constructing forms of identification or dis-identification (see Skeggs 1997). This does not mean, however, that such categories are themselves products of relations which can be assigned to categorical formations: categories and articulations of gender, for example, are produced by broader sets of relations that are embedded within the complex interstices of the social, and the concurrent production of other social categories, such as class and ethnicity.

It is important that belonging, in relation to a person's position and positioning, is seen as multiply experienced (bearing in mind the critique of 'multiple identities'). This means that it is difficult to construct persons in a uniform or unitary way in relation to different dimensions of social inclusion and belonging. However, this does not mean taking a radical relativist position that refuses the primacy of certain social relations of disadvantage in specific conjunctures in a time-space framework (such as those of racialization, gender or class). We also need to steer the concept of intersectionality away from the idea of an interplay of people's group identities in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, racialization and so on, and to see intersectionality as a process. It is a social process related to practices and arrangements, giving rise to particular forms of positionality for social actors. I have introduced the terms 'translocation' and 'translocational positionality' to aid in specifying a form of intersectional analysis, as noted above.

Translocational positionality: shifting the focus from unitary 'identity'

Whilst the notion of intersections has drawn a great deal of response particularly amongst European and North American feminists, it has not been taken up by social scientists more broadly. Intersectionality has thus too often been seen as a feminist rather than a broader analytical frame.

In introducing the focus on social divisions as parameters relating to boundaries and hierarchies and as ontological spaces (see Anthias 1998a), and the notion of translocational positionality, I have tried to work towards a complex recognition of hierarchical relations, which has wider theoretical resonance. In this section I want to focus on the notion of 'translocational' as a heuristic device and not just as a neologism, particularly in terms of the intersectional understandings of identity and belonging.

Firstly, there is a focus on locations rather than a focus on groups, which is related to the notion of social spaces. These social spaces exist within a hierarchically organized social structure and endow people with forms of inclusion and exclusion and forms of enablement and disadvantage. In other words, locations relate to the stratification systems of a society within a contextual and chronographic context – they inhabit a 'real time and place' context. Locations do not automatically translate to forms of identity or consciousness: they provide organizational, experiential, intersubjective and representational spheres (see Anthias 1998a) whereby narrations about identity and belonging function as ways of making sense of the social place that is inhabited and constructed. These narrations, in turn, provide a representational form within which experiences are placed and therefore mutually affect those experiences.

The concept of translocational positionality (Anthias 2001, 2002) seeks to capture a number of aspects of our modern world in contrast to the idea of diasporic identity as hybridity, which has dominated the field. It is useful as an accompaniment to the notion of intersectionality and seeks to avoid problems of thinking of the links between social divisions (such as gender, ethnicity and class) as being about 'groups'. It is also wary of constructing an endless array of sub-categories of disadvantage or advantage, although the latter has been less of a concern for intersectionality approaches. If social locations can be thought of as social spaces defined by boundaries on the one hand and hierarchies on the other hand, then we are forced to think of them in relation to each other and also in terms of some of the contradictions we live in through our differential location within these boundaries and hierarchies. The notion of 'location' recognizes the importance of context, the situated nature of claims and attributions and their production in complex and shifting locales. Within this framework, difference and inequality are conceptualized as a set of processes, and not as possessive characteristics of individuals.

A translocational positionality is structured by the interplay of different locations relating to gender, ethnicity, race and class (amongst others), and their at times *contradictory*

effects (Anthias 2002). Positionality combines a reference to social position (as a set of effectivities: as outcome) and social positioning (as a set of practices, actions and meanings: as process). That is, positionality is the space at the intersection of structure (social position/social effects) and agency (social positioning/meaning and practice). The notion of 'location' recognizes the importance of context, the situated nature of claims and attributions and their production in complex and shifting locales. It also recognizes variability with some processes leading to more complex, contradictory and dialogical positionalities than others. The term 'translocational' references the complex nature of positionality faced by those who are at the interplay of a range of locations and dislocations in relation to gender, ethnicity, national belonging, class and racialization. Positionality is about more than identification as it is also about the lived practices in which identifications are practiced or performed as well as the intersubjective, organizational and representational conditions for their existence (Anthias 1998a).

This framework helps us to think of lives as located and of our identities as always relational to our location, both situationally and in terms of the ways in which the categorical formations of boundaries and hierarchies produced in relation to gender, ethnicity and class (amongst others) impact us within a time and space context. This not only denotes the complexities of hierarchy, but allows particular privileging of any categorical formation (such as gender or class) at a specific conjunctural level, rather than in any essential or given way. It thereby avoids the problems of thoroughgoing relativism as well as static models of social location. The notion of intersectionality has suffered from both these possible problems by treating the effectivities at the intersections of each category as equivalent, thereby refusing to allow for systematic forms of oppression emanating from the dominance of particular social relations (relating to, say, racism or sexism), whilst recognizing that racism or sexism are embedded in relations which are mutually constitutive. A 'translocational' approach treats lives as located across multiple but also fractured and inter-related social spaces. Narratives and strategies of identity and belonging are relationally produced (in terms of both commitment and struggle). They are situational, temporal and subject to different meanings and inflections. The notion of translocational moves away from the idea of cross-cutting groups, which characterizes much of the discussion of intersectionality and enables a focus on wider social processes in a space and time framework.

Moreover, it flags potentially contradictory social locations much more than either hybridity or intersectional frameworks have done so far. It attends to the ways in which the complex articulation of the ontological spheres of gender, ethnicity and class (see particularly Anthias 1998a) can lead to an enhancement of disadvantage through mutually reinforcing and contradictory mechanisms. There may be amplifications of disadvantage via the interplay of the different discourses, practices and regulatory regimes relating to categories like gender and ethnicity. On the other hand, these may produce highly contra-

dictory and uneven processes of advantage and disadvantage, or exclusion and inclusion. This may help to understand how intersections of social relations can be both mutually reinforcing (as is the case for those subject to class, gender and racialization subordinations, such as some migrant working class women) and contradictory (for example, racialized men may be in a position of dominance within forms of ethnic organization, particularly in relation to women or the young). In the first case, social divisions amplify practices of subordination, while in the second case, social divisions lead to highly contradictory processes. Both, however, have implications for the production of forms of positionality and identity (Anthias 1998a). An important research agenda is to chart how systematic amplifications of disadvantage, on the one hand, and more uneven and contradictory ones affect people's positionality and social engagement. This approach is married with the view that notions of belonging and identity, which may be found in the narratives of migrants and their descendants, are better thought of as 'narratives of location' rather than just 'identity talk' (see Anthias 2002 for a development of this approach).

My research on young Greek Cypriots (Anthias 2002 and Anthias 2006) set out to explore the relationship between the ways young people identified themselves in collective terms and their experiences of exclusion and racialization. I do not have the space to fully present the gendered and classed nature of the narratives, but there is a strong distinction in the ways young women and men related to their sense of social place and the specific role that gender took within the framework of particular ethnic and class locations.

Stories of spatial movement and location/dislocation of different kinds appear in these narratives. These form an important part of the construction of the familial narrative: these stories that are being perpetually recycled within the family and by the collectivity as a whole in its social reproduction and its cultural practices. In the construction of narratives of location/dislocation, moreover, local meanings and categorizations are in play, not just national ones.

'Belonging' was often relayed as a distancing from what one was not, rather than a clear affirmation of what one was. Being British was defined in legalistic terms rather than as an emotional identification. There was much talk about the importance of 'rights' to citizenship.

Many youngsters defined their location as one of 'difference' to the hegemonic 'other'. However, there is a very located sense of Cypriotness that includes the importance of the family, behavioral characteristics of Cypriots such as their jobs, networks and practices, and where Cyprus is located in the Mediterranean, i.e. the geo-political context. The narrative on identification is about spatial and social location, embedded in a lifestyle with access to opportunities and resources.

Whilst it is commonly thought that young people from minority groups are 'between two cultures' or alternatively, able to produce hybridities, what most of the Cypriot youngsters experienced was an 'in-between' location vis-à-vis being White and being Black, rather than a cultural in-betweenness.

However, in a highly context-related way a range of cultural idioms were brought together, drawing on their experiences within their families and in the wider spheres of society. They drew on the collective stories and understandings about ethnicity and 'race' in Britain, which have generally worked with fixed binary notions. They were too White and European to be Black, but too 'foreign' to be White. On the other hand, their narratives were always located; about things that happened to them, about what was said to them, about their relationships with others, rather than about their sense of identity. Overall, a strong sense of difference was the most notable theme in the narratives in relation to 'belongingness'. Terms like 'them and us' abounded, as well as 'how things are done differently': relationality and comparison were important elements in the narratives.

This was generally not accompanied by a strong sense of identity if that is seen as a question of a coherent notion of where the person belonged. It was therefore expressed more in terms of differentiating oneself from what one was not, which was less ambivalently presented. Also, there was rather a discontinuous moving backwards and forwards between categories like White, European, Greek and Cypriot, which functioned more as explanations for the experiences they had, or as descriptions of lifestyle (such as determined by strong family bonds) rather than forms of proclaimed identity.

Concluding remarks

I have attempted to show central problems with some of the frameworks used in ethnic and migration studies, particularly when exploring the so-called 'second generation'. Reviewing the intersectionality framework, I have argued that it is vital to consider the links between social relations, particularly those that produce structures of differentiation and identification and structures of exclusion and inclusion. This promising perspective requires, even further, the development of more integrated social theorizations of unequal power relations within our globalising world.

I have presented the concept of 'translocational positionality' both as an adjunct to intersectionality and as an alternative means for thinking through some of the issues raised by the concepts of identity and belonging that are have been tied to a centered notion of individuals and suffered from what Brubaker has termed 'groupism' (Brubaker 2004). The notion of translocational positionality relates to the shifting locales of people's lives in terms of movements and flows. Moreover, it focuses on the complex and often contradictory articulation of different facets of social location and emphasizes the importance of context, meaning and time in the construction of positionalities.

In terms of implications for researching the second generation, such a framework asks us to interrogate narratives that use the notion of identity to see how these articulate social relations and locations. It also asks us to see these expressions as part of the process of becoming and negotiation rather than

as expressing fixity. These articulations may themselves be strategies of dealing with difference and social location, emanating from the visibility of difference and, for their part, making difference visible in space and time.

I have also argued that there are intra-generational as well as inter-generational differences and that class, racialisation and gender differences are central in analyses of the descendants of migrants and their prospects in life. A nuanced understanding of belonging, a central issue in our modern times, requires a shift from focusing on 'groups', identities and culture. Instead, it asks us to look at the role of processes and outcomes of social relations and narrations, representations and practices. These processes have affective, experiential, practical/performative and political dimensions and cannot be reduced to 'identity'.

Bibliography

- Alba, R and V. Nee (2003) *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Anthias, F. (1992) *Ethnicity, Class, Gender and Migration: Greek Cypriots in Britain*, Aldershot: Avebury Press.
- Anthias, F. (1998a) 'Rethinking Social Divisions: Some Notes towards a Theoretical Framework', *Sociological Review* 46 (3): 506–535.
- Anthias, F. (1998b) 'Evaluating Diaspora: Beyond Ethnicity?', *Sociology* 32 (3): 557–580.
- Anthias, F. (2001) 'New Hybridities, Old Concepts: The Limits of Culture', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (4): 617–641.
- Anthias, F. (2002) 'Where Do I Belong? Narrating Collective Identity and Translocational Positionality', *Ethnicities* 2 (4): 491–515.
- Anthias, F. (2006) 'Researching Society and Culture in Cyprus: Displacements, Hybridities and Dialogical Frameworks', in Y. Papadakis et al. (eds.) *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History, an Island in Conflict*, New York: Indiana University Press.
- Anthias, F. (2007) 'Ethnic Ties: Social Capital and the Question of Mobilisability', *The Sociological Review* 55 (4): 788–805.
- Anthias, F. and Yuval-Davis, N. (1992) *Racialised Boundaries – Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*, London: Routledge.
- Back, L. (1996) *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture*, London: UCL Press.
- Brubaker, R. (2004) *Ethnicity without Groups*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, R. and Cooper, F. (2000) 'Beyond "Identity"', *Theory and Society* 29 (1): 1–47.
- Christou, A. (2006) *Narratives of Place, Culture and Identity: Second Generation Greek Americans*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Collins, Hill P. (1993) 'Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection', *Race, Sex and Class*, 1 (1): 25–45.
- Collins, Hill P. (1998) 'Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Nation: Some Implications for Black Family Studies', *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 29 (1), 27–36
- Crenshaw, K. (1994) 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence Against Women of Color', in M. A. Fineman and R. Mykitiuk (eds.) *The Public Nature of Private Violence*, New York: Routledge
- Eade, J, S. Drinkwater and M. Garapich (2006) *Class and Ethnicity, Polish Migrants in London*, Research Report for the RES-000-22-1294 ESRC project, Cronem, University of Surrey and Roehampton University.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968) *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, New York: Norton.
- Fouon, G and N. Glick Schiller (2001) 'The Generation of Identity: Redefining the Second Generation within a Transnational Social Field', in H. R. Cordero-Guzmán, R. C. Smith and R. Grosfoguel (eds.) *Migration, Transnationalization, and Race in a Changing New York*, New York: Temple University Press.
- Georgiou, M. (2006) *Diaspora, Identity and the Media: Diasporic Transnationalism and Mediated Spatialities*, New York: Hampton Press.
- Kibria, N. (2002) *Becoming Asian American: Second Generation Chinese and Korean American Identity*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. (2004) 'Conceptualising Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society', *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1002–39.
- Mannheim, K. (1929/36) *Ideology and Utopia*, (transl. L. Wirth and E. Shils), London: Routledge.
- McCall, L. (2001) *Complex Inequality: Gender, Class and Race in the New Economy*, New York: Routledge.
- Miles, R. (1993) *Racism after Race Relations*, London: Routledge.
- Perlmann, J. and R. Waldinger (1997) 'Second Generation Decline? Children of Immigrants, Past and Present: a Reconsideration', *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 893–922
- Portes, A and R. Rumbaut (2001) *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rumbaut, R. and A. Portes (2001) *Ethnicities: Children of Immigrants in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rumbaut, R. and A. Portes (2006) *The Second Generation in Early Childhood, New Findings from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study*, Migration Information Source, <http://www.migrationinformation.org>
- Portes, A. and M. Zhou (1993) 'The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants among Post 1965 Immigrant Youth', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530 (1): 74–96.

- Phinney, J. (1990) Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research, *Psychological Bulletin* 108 (3): 499–514.
- Rattansi, A. and A. Phoenix (1997) ‘Rethinking Youth Identities: Modernist and Postmodernist Frameworks’, in J. Bynner, L. Chisholm and A. Furlong (eds.) *Youth Citizenship and Social Change in European Contexts*, Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Werbner, P. (1999) ‘Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds’, *Social Anthropology* 7 (1): 17–35.
- Wimmer, A. and N. Glick Schiller (2002) ‘Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences’, *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301–334.
- Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F. and Kofman, E. (2005) ‘Secure Borders and Safe Haven and the Gendered Politics of Belonging: Beyond Social Cohesion’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (3): 513–535.

Author

Floya Anthias

Professor of Sociology and Social Justice
Roehampton University
London, UK
f.anthias@roehampton.ac.uk