

FEMINIST INTERPRETATIONS OF MIGRATION:

A SOUTHERN ARIZONA CASE STUDY

By

MARIANA MANRIQUEZ

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Bachelors Degree with Honors in

Political Science

The University of Arizona

M A Y 2 0 0 1 6

Approved by:

Professor V. Spike Peterson
School of Government and Public Policy

Abstract:

There is a tendency in academic literature regarding Mexican migration to the United States, to refer to migrants solely as workers hoping for economic mobility, and denying any other form of subjectivity. Furthermore, scholars who deal with the Mexican diaspora in the United States offer accounts that refer to simplistic one-way processes of assimilation, denying how Mexicans and Mexican-Americans are involved in establishing binational and bicultural spaces of expression and survival. To address these limitations, feminist scholars offer powerful analytical tools to explore the ways in which migrant subjects are involved in the management of their identities through the creation of symbolic and material (socio-cultural, political and economic) linkages that transcend national boundaries. This study draws on the theoretical frameworks provided by Patricia Zavella (2011), Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) and V. Spike Peterson (2010), to describe the migratory experience of five women who emigrated from Mexico to the United States between the years of 1977 to 2004 and now reside in Southern Arizona. Furthermore, this study links an overall increase in Mexican migration to the United States to the (re)structuring of the global political economy through neoliberal policies.

Introduction:

My personal interest in conducting this study emerges from my desire to understand my own experience as a Mexican immigrant, and to simultaneously situate my experience within a collective context. Feminist theories of migration, proved to be a fruitful conduit for this desire. I believe this stems from their ability to situate private feelings within the public sphere, and by its commitment to advance theories that aim to understand the complexity and fluidity of our identities. Furthermore, feminist theories of migration provided me with critical conceptual frameworks that aided me to understand the symbiosis between our language, ways of thinking and the materiality of our worlds.

Maintaining the feminist commitment to make the personal political, this study is divided into four major segments. The first, aims to situate contemporary patterns of Mexican migration to the United States to the current (re) structure of the global political economy through neoliberal policies, particularly the enactment of NAFTA. This section, also aims to provide a historical context to my study. The second segment, deals with a synthesis of

Borderland Theories as provided by Patricia Zavella (2011), and Gloria Anzaldua (1987). Borderland Theories theorizes the manner in which migrant subjects construct symbolic and material spaces of expression, agency and survival that are situated in binational and bicultural settings. The third, is concerned with conceptualizations of theories of global householding, which connects the neoliberal regime to transnational gendered and racialized divisions of labor. Finally, the last segment presents my case study through the analysis of the interviews I conducted of five Mexican immigrant women residing in Southern Arizona. My choice to employ qualitative methods, speaks to my willingness to describe the migratory experience not as the accumulation of quantitative data (e.g: statistical figures of patterns of Mexican immigration) but rather as sublime expressions of subjectivity.

Mexican Migration to the United States After NAFTA

The North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA) involving Canada, United States and Mexico was passed in 1994. Among its idealized promises was that NAFTA would result in the creation of Mexican jobs, and therefore alleviate Mexican immigration to the United States. Time told otherwise, and consequent years after its enactment Mexican immigration to the United States dramatically increased. To explain the connection between NAFTA, the neo-liberal policies it operationalized and the increase in Mexican immigration that results, an analysis that reveals the restructuring of Mexico's economy after NAFTA is necessary. Furthermore, this analysis should not remain solely material. In order to further understand the contradictions and socio-political implications of

NAFTA, it is equally important to investigate and analyze the neo-liberal ideology that justified and legitimized its enactment.

NAFTA, as the neoliberal policy par excellence

Needless to say, Mexico is not the first or last country to engage in economic and political restructuring from a 'state-lead' economy to market-oriented economic strategies. Rather, Mexico is one of a number of 'developing countries' that engaged and continues to engage in the neoliberal wave of policy reform. The neoliberal era for developing countries emerged with the imposition of the Washington Consensus in the 1980s propagated by elite international agencies, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, who promoted trade and capital liberalization as mechanisms to secure a path to development and modernization. Mexico's engagement in neoliberal restructuring did not commence with the enactment of NAFTA. It is difficult to trace with absolute chronological precision Mexico's deep involvement in neoliberal economic restructuring, nevertheless there are key events that signal the economic and ideological foundation for NAFTA and further neo-liberal policies and even neo-liberal political regimes, as one may characterize the presidency of Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994) and current president Enrique Peña Nieto (2012-). Mexico's entering to the General Trade Agreement (GATT) in 1986 characterizes a major event in Mexico's history of economic liberalization. As part of the agreement, Mexico had to restructure its economy in the form of deep and systematic liberalization of trade and substantial reduction of tariffs, in order to further 'open' Mexico's economy to the rest of the global market. In 1992, Mexican president Carlos Salinas de Gortari, U.S president Bill Clinton and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney ratified the North-American Free Trade

Agreement. Its core emphasis was that commercial engagement between the three nations under a free trade and liberalized environment would produce fruits of modernization and development, in colloquial terms it promised to 'raise all boats'. Specifically for Mexico, which was the only 'developing' country in the agreement, it framed a package, which embraced neoclassical economic models of income determination, and promoted mechanisms of structural adjustment, trade liberalization, withdrawal of state participation in the economy, privatization of state assets and the promotion of market norms as a means to transform and develop (Schmidt, Gruben, 1992). According to the neoliberal discourse embedded in NAFTA, by adopting the aforementioned economic and political (re)-configurations, Mexico would be on its way to accelerated economic growth and prosperity. These assumptions are made upon deep and dangerous neglect of Mexican history, and the limited neoliberal paradigm that reduces the conception of 'development' and 'prosperity' to the application of instrumentally 'rational' techniques and therefore marginalizes other ways of thinking that are concerned with the well-being of individuals and workers, with land and social dislocations and environmental degradation. Not surprisingly, trade unions, environmental groups and civil society organizations were not invited to the negotiations of NAFTA. Furthermore, unlike times of colonialism, where economic and political subjugation was rather visible and recognizable as violent 'top-down' coercion, under neoliberalism, economic and political oppression is clothed under the euphemisms of modernization, industrialization and economic development. Here, the concept of 'governmentality' from Michel Foucault proves to be informative: governmentality refers to neoliberal governance as a discursive field in which exercising power is 'rationalized' (Lemke, 2002). In the case of the

formulation of NAFTA, it constructs the problem of ‘Mexican underdevelopment’, which can only be solved through economic liberalization and greater integration into the global market. Moreover, the subordination of society and politics to the ideological postulates of neoliberalism constructs not only an economic dependency, characterized by the centrality of US capital investment in determining Mexico’s economic future, but in addition it constructs the manner in which politics are going to be conducted, or which actors, sectors and ways of thinking are going to be valorized. Since this paper is concerned with the intersection between NAFTA and Mexican migration, or rather how did NAFTA fail to fulfill the promise of alleviating Mexican immigration to the United States, the following sections intend to reveal re-configurations of the Mexican economy propagated by NAFTA, that resulted in increased migration pressures.

Agricultural Liberalization and Emigration: Displacement of Mexican Farmers

One of the most discussed and significant factors contributing to the increasing Mexican immigration to the United States is the agricultural liberalization that occurred under NAFTA, which prompted the displacement of millions of Mexican farmers who found themselves unable to compete with U.S. farm subsidies and mechanized grain exports. Agricultural liberalization happened through various processes of structural economic reconfigurations. For instance, under NAFTA, Mexico lifted agrarian tariffs and privatized ‘ejidos’ -- communal land for agriculture, distributed to indigenous farmers after the Mexican revolution. Note that the privatization of the ‘ejidos’ not only had economic repercussions for Mexican farmers, but also ideologically and symbolically dismantled one of the most important legacies of the Mexican revolution, which

emphasized campesino empowerment. Hypocritically, and parallel in time to Mexico's agrarian liberalization, the United States heavily subsidized its agricultural operations and entities, affecting small Mexican farmers who in turn were unable to compete with the U.S agricultural industry. Bill (2010) concludes that prior to NAFTA, Mexico had 8.1 million agricultural jobs; by 2006 the number of agricultural jobs was reduced to 6 million. Loss of employment triggered internal migration to urban areas and external migration to the United States.

NAFTA, Maquilas and Migration

Maquiladoras have been a substantial part of Mexico's international trade involvement. In 1965, the first maquiladora enactment was passed, and it allowed U.S industries to position themselves in Mexico with incentives of reduced import duties and decreased Mexican governmental control. By the time of the enactment of NAFTA, maquiladoras were well positioned in Mexico, nevertheless NAFTA allowed the proliferation of maquiladoras. The presence of maquiladoras tends to be controversial. Neoliberal discourses and 'free-trade' advocates tend to justify them by stating that maquiladoras brings jobs to Mexico that otherwise would be non-existent. This familiar claim assumes that 'temporary', 'monotonous', 'and 'low-wage' jobs are better than no jobs, and that no alternative job-enhancing measures exist. One of the assumptions of NAFTA is that 'modernization' brought by maquiladoras would increase jobs, raise wages, reduce consumer prices and elevate the Mexican standard of living (Manning, Butera, 2000). This in itself is problematic, as one of the principal incentives for foreign investment is that U.S maquiladora owners 'enjoy' liberalization policies that allowed them to maximize their profits by relying heavily on cheap labor. Most often, maquila jobs are

temporary and pay extremely low wages; Mexican workers tend to partake in a maquiladora jobs to finance their trip to the United States to seek better living wages. Furthermore, the particular employment dynamics of maquiladoras often transform household formations (see discussion that follows) and variously contribute to the increasing pressure to immigrate to the United States: creating binational households or households headed by single women in Mexico (More 2000, Tiano 1994; Chavez 1992). In addition, women are increasingly employed in maquiladora jobs. Landau (2005) states that 70% percent of maquiladora workers are women. V. Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan, in *Global Gender Issues in the New Millennium* (2010), reflect on the gendered and racialized divisions of labor fomented by neoliberalism, in which gendered, ethnic and racialized stereotypes contribute to the ‘flexibilization’ of work in the global south, where women work in ‘low-skilled’ jobs, which are often devalorized and poorly paid, as neo-liberal policies demand and shape workers who are often non unionized. As a result of these working conditions, Mexican women are beginning to emigrate to the United States and the global north, challenging the previous overall pattern of predominately male migration.

Conceptualizing Borderland Theories

Dominant theoretical frameworks that analyze migration tend to remain within economic approaches that reduce the migratory experience to a simple desire for upward mobility, or due to loss of employment. Further, descriptions of the Mexican diaspora in the United States are typically described as a linear one-way process of transition, settlement and assimilation. The classic assimilation theory, assumes that Mexican migrants, and subsequent generations solely engage, or aspire to engage in assimilation processes that

require absorption within mainstream society. Such processes include speaking English, experiencing Anglo conformity or losing ethnic identifiers (Zavella, 2011). Dominant approaches, which explain these processes either as desired or inevitable, tend to neglect or obscure the ways in which assimilation processes and the hegemonic ideology that guides it constitute power relations. The assimilation experience of Mexican migrants, or rather the experience of the Mexican diaspora, cannot be reduced to a simplistic one-way process of assimilation, but rather it includes complex negotiations of identity, ‘in-between’ feelings and engaging in activities that transcend national and cultural boundaries. For instance, the popular usage of Spanglish by Mexican migrants reveals not an exchange of one language for another but rather the construction of a linguistic space that captures a synergy of both languages. Further, not only are Mexican migrants being influenced or ‘absorbed’ by mainstream culture and identity, but in addition mainstream culture is being reorganized and redefined as a response to Mexican influence.

As a response to the limitations of mainstream accounts of migration, proponents of borderland theories intend to offer critical frameworks and theoretical tools that better reveal the complexity of migrant subjectivities, and the social, political and cultural spaces of ‘in-betweenness’ in which they navigate and are able to express their identities.

Borderland theories expose power structures underpinning the cultural and socio-political order imposed by U.S imperialism and critically question the narrow paradigms that tend to operate in dichotomies and therefore neglect instances of fluidity. Borderland theories provide an epistemic space, and as a consequence a political space, for Mexican migrants to develop new constructions of knowledge and interrogate hegemonic historical accounts. Within this epistemic space of resistance, migrants question and challenge

hegemonic efforts to control the subjectivity of 'others' and articulate identity subjectivities that are better aligned with migratory experiences and detached from essentialisms and ethnocentrism. Prominent proponents of borderland theories Gloria Anzaldúa and Patricia Zavella develop illuminating conceptualizations that help reveal the manner in which Mexican migrants construct their own subjectivity and form spaces of expression and resistance, and at the same time how hegemonic discourses related to racialization and migration shape Mexican-migrant identities and sometimes threaten their existence. The following conceptualization of borderland theories draws primarily from Gloria Anzaldúa's "mestiza consciousness", which describes how migrant subjects feel situated in cultural, social or cultural borderlands, as well as Patricia Zavella's conception of 'peripheral vision' which illuminates negotiations and power relations involved in a strategic bifocal point of view.

Rethinking and Reimagining Space: Conceptualizations of Borderland Theories

Thinking about Mexican migration to the United States evokes images of the border, whether it is the Rio Bravo, the Sonoran Desert or the long car lines at the San Diego-Tijuana border. The discourse of Mexican migration pays close attention to the geographical and physical space of the border. For instance, securitization of the border is often referred in neoliberal security discourses, which through the racialization and criminalization of migrants demands tougher measures of militarizing the Mexico-US border. Human rights activists who stress a more humane treatment of migrants, expose the manner in which militarization of the border has pushed migrants into harsh desert terrains, causing the death of thousands of migrants. Paradigms dedicated to migration

investigate the manner in which migration not only implies the mobilization from one place to another but also results in the creation of transnational spaces. Scholarship that interprets migration through a transnational lens investigates how migrants construct and engage in economic, political and social circuits that transcend national boundaries. Transnational scholars believe that not only the process of migrating across borders is crucial for understanding migration, but in addition the manner in which migrants retain connections to their home countries, via different technological tools that enable travel, communication and the transfer of capital. Scholarship that explores transnational circuits and the social fields that connect the country of origin and the country of settlement is informative to the migrant discourse, however it also remains limited. As Patricia Zavella (2011) notes, transnational scholarship emphasizes circuits or transnational relationships that require regular and sustained contacts. Borderland theories address this limitation and explore the manner in which transnational subjectivities maintain connection to their country of origin even if they lack the means to travel to Mexico or do not have contact with kin. Furthermore, borderland theories conceptualize the border and transnationalism not solely as a territorial boundary enclosed by a definition of nationhood, but explore the symbolic space of the border. As Gloria Anzaldua describes, “ The border is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary” (Anzaldua, 1987, p. 25).

Peripheral Vision

Mexican migrants and transnational subjects define their identities by engaging in social, cultural and economic activities that are situated across national boundaries. Further, migrants often express and articulate their identities through migrant nationalisms, which

embody and reflect a strong cultural and national pride towards their country of origin. It is crucial to note that migrant nationalisms are not monolithic and cannot be described as a consistent and unified political and cultural expression. Rather, migrant nationalisms vary depending on historical context and complex cultural and socio-political transnational relationships and interactions. Nevertheless, transnational subjectivities refer to migrant nationalisms, to maintain linkages to their country of origin. Examples include fund- raising activities in support of various political, religious or cultural campaigns (Zavella, 2011). Further, migrant nationalisms depend on the available state discourses of Mexico and the United States. Roger Rouse (1991) posits that the construction and management of migrant nationalisms are dependent on a 'dual frame of reference', which he describes as the capacity to see the world through different lenses. I argue, however that transnational subjects not only see the world through various perspectives, but rather that their world or reality is constructed via these multiple lenses. Patricia Zavella expands on the conception of the 'dual frame of reference' and develops the notion of 'peripheral vision' to express 'the power relations involved in a strategic bifocal point'. Zavella explains how through peripheral vision, migrants are aware that life depends upon the variances of the linked economies and polarized politics regarding Mexican immigration to the United States. Patricia Zavella (2011) argues that the poor and working class are more dependent on and affected by peripheral vision, as they are more propense to economic, social, political vulnerabilities in a globalized world. Further, peripheral vision evokes and expresses the sentiment often felt by transnational subjects that one is neither from here nor there, not at home anywhere: *Ni de aqui ni de allá* (Neither from here nor there).

Mestiza Consciousness

Mexican migrants and persons of Mexican origin residing in the United States not only have sentiments of ‘not feeling at home anywhere’, but they also may feel situated in ‘between spaces’: between languages, places and cultures. To conceptualize complex feelings of ‘in between’, Gloria Anzaldua expresses the notion of ‘mestiza consciousness’, feeling situated in socio-cultural borderlands. It is through the ‘mestiza consciousness’ that operates within borderland spaces or ‘in between’ feelings that transnational subjects are able to construct their own system of values and practices that then gives cultural and political meaning to their existence and reality. The mestiza consciousness is then a response and act of resistance to hegemonic and normative constructions that through power relations construct social, cultural and racial boundaries. Further, ‘mestiza consciousness’ goes beyond racialized and nationalized dichotomies or apparent contradictions and mutually exclusiveness and expresses complexity and fluidity. As Gloria Anzaldua (1987, p.549) states: “Living between cultures results in ‘seeing’ double, first from the perspective of one culture, then from the perspective of another. Seeing from two or more perspectives simultaneously renders those cultures transparent.” Mestiza consciousness or being situated in borderland spaces can be understood as the enactment of a ‘transnational/migrant/Mexican-Americans’ epistemology, that through the mindfulness of possible contradictions and possibilities of various cultural frames of references encounters its own meaning of culture. Anzaldua expresses the capacity of transnational subjectivities to “accommodate mutually

exclusive, discontinuous, inconsistent worlds” as *La Facultad*, or the “capacity”. It is with this *facultad*, that Mexican migrants and Mexican Americans are able to negotiate, formulate and articulate the complexities and different facets of their identities.

Global Householding Theories

Feminist interpretations of migration, such as borderland theories as proposed by Gloria Anzaldúa and Patricia Zavella offer counter-hegemonic scholarship that intends to connect ‘intimate’ spaces of identity formation to political, economic, social and cultural transformations and (re) configurations. Further, informing the discourse of migration, global householding theories offer illuminating literature that situates households as a site of power, and then investigate the manner in which households are being altered and transformed in the context of migration, and in intersection with the global political economy. The importance and brilliance of global householding theories rests upon critical observations of the linkages between households and global (re)positioning propagated by neoliberal policies. Global householding theories challenge orthodox notions that problematically divide the ‘domestic’ sphere of households from the ‘public’ sphere of the state and the market. Furthermore, by articulating said connections, proponents of global householding theories expose the manner in which neoliberalism reproduces gendered *and* racialized divisions of labor, transforms households and reproduces class and geopolitical inequalities. Global householding theories can inform analyses of migration, as they offer an epistemic space that offers a critical exposé of gendered and racialized inequalities, and offer multidimensional informative descriptions of the manner in which households are being reconfigured transnationally.

Households as a site of power

Before positing why households matter politically, and presenting them as a site of power, it is crucial to note that households differ from normative notions of family, as they may include non-kinship members and do not necessarily assume that household members live within the same residency. Further the term 'householding' refers to the continuous process of social reproduction occurring in all life phases and beyond the family (Douglass, 2006). Positioning 'households' and 'householding' in the global context, then refers to how these processes expand, and are being altered in intersection with economic *and* socio-political transformations. Households are central to the state, for it is within the 'domestic sphere' where citizens are first created. Referring back to Zavalla's conception of 'peripheral vision', citizen formation within households gets further complicated in the context of migration, where transnational subjects have as reference two nations and therefore two national cultures, or are situated in the borderlands of both. The market is also dependent on households, as they create socialization of 'labor' and reproduce and socialize consumer culture. In brief, the production of citizens, workers and consumers happens within households, not to say that it does not occur elsewhere. However, households are central for they are typically where socialization first occurs.

Most often households are associated with and responsible for social reproduction.

Social reproduction refers not solely to meeting basic necessities of food, housing, health etc. but also includes providing emotional caregiving for children, intimate partners or other dependent members of the household. Further, social reproduction includes the

socialization of children, via ideological codes and religious, cultural and political belief systems as well as into gendered and racialized identities (Peterson, 2010). Gendered ideological codes and divisions of labor within households assign most (if not all) responsibilities of social reproduction to women, where their work despite being central to economics, politics and culture is rendered invisible, informal and rarely even paid.

Gendered and Racialized Divisions of Labor

Patriarchal constructions of gender roles are not restricted to the assignment of women into the ‘domestic sphere’ of social reproduction, and men into the ‘public sphere’ of politics and the workforce, but rather they extend beyond the household and into the workforce itself, constituting complex linkages among gendered and racialized divisions of labor. Further, gendered divisions of labor are dependent upon hierarchical ideological and language coding of formal-informal and productive-reproductive labor, where the former is masculinized and valorized over the latter which is feminized, and thereby devalorized. The ‘feminized labor’, then refers to the devalorization of labor that is considered ‘women’s work’ usually pertaining to extended social reproduction such as cleaning, services and care giving and performed by both men and women who are usually of low economic status, migrants and people of color.

Furthermore, the feminization of work not only results in ideological hierarchies but also translates and materializes into low-paying jobs, which perpetuate structural economic and political inequalities. Recent decades of neo-liberal economic- and political (re)structuring have complicated and further sustained divisions of labor. Complicated, because contrary to previous history, more women are increasingly entering the workforce, in some ways challenging strict gender role notions. However, as gendered

hierarchies and processes of devalorization remain intact and are further promoted, the absorption of women into the workforce rarely translates into more egalitarian environments and circumstances. As Peterson (2010) notes, the ‘feminization of work,’ refers to the simultaneous increase of women into the workforce, and the worsening of labor conditions, promoted by the neoliberal rhetoric of flexibilization and deregulation. Further, as gender roles and codes are still in place, women entering the workforce does not mean that they transfer ‘social reproduction’ for public labor or that ‘men’ are now going to partake more generally in social reproduction, but rather it often means that they have to perform both, significantly increasing their workload. Furthermore, processes of social reproduction are being continually challenged by neoliberal policies, which limit and restrict social welfare provision to households and place greater responsibility on women.

Global Circuits of Care: Connecting global householding to migration

Proponents of global householding theories (Peterson 2010; Koffman 2012) expose the gender politics of social reproduction and note the intersection between social reproduction and globalization through the emergence of the transnational care economy. Increasingly more women are migrating from the global south to the global north, to seek better working conditions and more lucrative pay. In the case of Mexican migrants to the United States, in 2013 (United Divisions Population Division, 2013) women constituted 51% percent of the overall migrant population.). Most often, migrant women find employment associated with domestic labor and care giving jobs. This can be attributed in part to the ‘care-deficit’ of the global north, where ‘affluent’ women of the global north enter the workforce and often transfer social reproductive and care tasks to migrant

women. Further, the privatization of social reproduction entails that as neoliberal policies reduce and limit welfare provision, social reproduction is being privatized and reassigned to racialized identities. Further, the transfer of care and social reproductive labor involves power relations between women from the global south and women from the global north. Enhenreich and Hoshchild (2003), conceptualize this transfer as ‘emotional imperialism’, where ‘love’ and ‘care’ are being traded in unequal terms. Furthermore Kofman (2012) explains how the provision of reproductive labor by migrants for wealthier professional women in turn shapes “ the ability and modality of migrants to reproduce their own families.” Peterson (2010) further notes that, as migrants provide care away from home, they are subject to isolation, cultural pressures and parenting guilt. Sustained by gendered and racialized divisions of labor, *and* power dynamics of (neo) imperialism, the transnational care economy continues to reproduce racialized/ethnized hierarchies and structural economic inequalities.

Description of Methodologies:

I conducted five interviews of Mexican women immigrants currently residing in Southern Arizona. I was particularly interested in interviewing women, in order to explore the intersectional experience of being an immigrant and being women of color. I previously knew all of the five participants either from childhood or from my current employment at the Student Union at the University of Arizona. The five participants were born in Mexico and had immigrated to the United States between the years of 1977 to 2004. Their ages ranged from 39 to 62. Their education levels ranged from none to some years of college. Two of the participants currently reside in Nogales, Arizona while the other three reside in Tucson, Arizona. Four of the participants indicated that they were

currently married, while one participant stated she had gone through a divorce and now is single. All of the five participants had from 2 to 5 children and two had grand children. All research participants identified as Mexican rather than other terms (e.g. Hispanic, Latino or Chicano). Without exception, each woman contacted agreed to be interviewed. Furthermore, I suggested that we could stop recording at any time or that they could decline to answer any question. The interviews took from one to one-and-one-half hours. To protect the identity of the participants, I use a different name from theirs. The interviews were conducted mainly in Spanish, however the interviewees often code-switched between Spanish and English to reveal the complexity of meaning. Part of the transcription of the interviews, involved my own translation of the information provided from Spanish and Spanglish to English. I employed my own questionnaire entitled “Feminist Interpretations of Migration: A Southern-Arizona case-study” A significant portion of the questions employed were extracted from the questionnaire entitled “Immigrant Mothers with Citizen Children” by authors Rosi Andrade, Stevens Sally and Eithne Luibheid (2010) as part of the Southwest Institute for Research on Women (SIROW). All three authors granted me permission to use parts of their questionnaire. The questionnaire employed during the interviews was divided into different sections regarding language usage, reproductive and child health, rituals and heritage, political participation, demographics, employment and quality of life.

In collecting what amounted to verbal descriptions of the migratory experience of these women, my overarching purpose was to use feminist theories of migration as purposed by Patricia Zavella (2011) and Gloria Anzaldua (1987) in order to explore the experience of Mexican women immigrants as transnational subjects who are situated in material and

symbolic bi-national and bicultural settings. I also refer to the work of V. Spike Peterson (2010) in order to highlight the manner in which these women are embedded in global households and transnational circuits of care. Furthermore, even though the interviews dealt primarily with the migratory experience of these women *after* their arrival in the United States and their reasons for emigrating were not greatly discussed, I make note that three of the five participants immigrated to the United States after 1994. This information correlates with data in my literature review; in particular, that Mexican immigration to the United States greatly increased after the implementation of the North-American Free Trade Agreement (1994), which is connected to neoliberal (re) structuring of the global political economy. Furthermore, it is crucial to address the power dynamics embedded in an interview setting, and therefore the qualitative information that I am going to provide based on the life stories of the participants should be read critically. For this, I agree with the observations presented by Patricia Zavella (2011) regarding her own experience of using interviews as a methodological tool: “Life histories should be read critically because they are based on memories and are representation where subjects present situated knowledge in a particular context in relation to their own sense of self and my presence” (Zavella, 2011 p.19). Nevertheless, I consider any attempt at reconstruction of memories, as a significant step for migrants to participate in the self-construction of identity

The Case Study

Dominant theoretical frameworks that intend to describe the Mexican diaspora in the United States tend to refer to a simplistic one-way process of assimilation, characterized as the absorption within mainstream society through various processes including speaking English, experiencing Anglo conformity or losing ethnic identifiers (Zavella,

2011). To address this limitation, feminist migrant scholars have developed literature that addresses the complexity and fluidity of migratory experiences. Rather than undergoing one-way processes of assimilation, Mexican immigrants are often situated in binational and bicultural settings (Zavella, 2011), engage in complex negotiations of identity (Anzaldúa, 1987) and participate in political, economic and social reproduction of transnational linkages (Zavella 2011, Peterson 2010). In this study, I refer to the migration theories proposed by these scholars to focus on the migratory experience of five Mexican migrants who currently reside in Southern Arizona.

Giving that all of the five participants live in close proximity to the physical border with Mexico, their unique migratory experience is characterized by continuing travels to their country of origin. As described by Flora who immigrated from Chihuahua, Mexico to Nogales, Arizona in the year of 2006:

The fact that I live in the border –well it allows me to go to Mexico often and I do so often. I like to go, especially when they have cultural events. I like the celebrations they do for Mexico’s independence I feel lucky for that --- you know? I know that other people can’t go to Mexico often, either because they are too far away or because they don’t have papers.

In a similar vein, Veronica who emigrated from Nogales, Sonora to Nogales, Arizona in the year of 2005, describes her weekly travels to Mexico:

I go to Mexico [Nogales, Sonora] every Wednesday to hang out with my friends at the coffee shop just to hang out with them, just to catch up with them – I also visit my cousin almost every week, she gives me professional massages for free so of course I try to go there as often as possible.

Herminia, who immigrated to Tucson, Arizona in the year of 2000, describes how she often travels to Mexico in order to engage in transnational commerce:

I go to Nogales, Sonora to buy things like Mexican candies and also, lotions, and then I take them here to sell them at the swap meet, I also have family down there –every time I go to buy my things, I go visit my family.

Conceptualizing Symbolic Borderland Spaces

Borderland theories of migration not only address the body movements of migrants to their country of origin, but also in addition extend the definition of border as a territory enclosed by definitions of nationhood, and address the symbolic spaces of the border (Zavella 2011, Anzaldua 1987). In order to give organization to this study, I refer to linguistic and cultural processes. For instance, the frequent usage of Spanglish by the participants of my study reveals the construction of a linguistic space that captures a synergy of both languages, in other words, the participants did not specify an exchange of Spanish to English but rather expressed that they often switch between the two, as expressed by Veronica:

At home, I speak Spanish; well no, not really – I mix English and Spanish my daughter speaks to me in English, I respond in Spanish or I say something in English and then she responds in Spanish. That's really how we speak, you can say our official language is Spanglish.

Andrea, who emigrated from Nogales, Sonora to Tucson, Arizona in the year of 1977 describes how she often translates to her co-workers at her employment as a cook at the University of Arizona:

At my work, if we are dealing with food, I speak in English...but between my comrades I speak Spanish, but for example, because I am the one that speaks better English among all my co-workers, the chef often asks me to translate.

Aside from establishing a linguistic space that transcends single language boundaries, migrant subjects form cultural spaces, often within the migrant community in which they

are able to navigate and express their identity. It is through the construction of a system of values and practices that migrant subjects are able to give cultural and political meaning to their existence and reality (Anzaldúa, 1987). Flora, a 48 Mexican immigrant expressed the following:

I often search what the community is doing, if they are having celebrations, I try to find where they are, and I go, I celebrate my culture with members of my community. I celebrate with my community because my kids are older, and now they feel more from here so they don't want to go with me to those events with me. Especially the ones at the church.

In a similar note, Andrea described to me how she often organizes Mexican celebrations for Christmas at her home and invites friends, relatives and members of her community:

During Christmas seasons, I organize *posadas*, like we used to do them in Mexico, I have music and everything, I invite everyone; the Mexican people that work here [student union at the University of Arizona] I invite them all, and then, they bring people and there is a lot of people, people I have never seen. We all have fun, I am sad cause I could not organize one last year, I am too tired now, and there is not enough money.

Transnational subjects often refer to migrant nationalisms, which embody and reflect a strong cultural and national pride towards their country of origin (Zavella, 2011). As described by Lupita Osuna, who immigrated to Tucson, Arizona from Cd. Obregon in Sonora, Mexico:

Of course I feel very proud of being Mexicana, a 100%, it forms part of my identity, of who I am. Being here [U.S] coming from over there [Mexico] plays a big role in my life.

Flora, noted the following regarding her perception of her Mexican identity:

It's something that is not expressive [visually]. What I mean is that I am not wearing traditional Mexican attire everywhere, but I believe that my Mexican identity is more like how I think, how I was raised and my system of values...because I came here when I was already old so I was already molded you see? – perhaps for my children who came here when they were younger, for them is different.

Furthermore, Patricia Zavella (2011) posits that the construction and management of migrant nationalisms are dependent on a 'peripheral vision,' which refers to the capacity to see the world through different perspectives. Further, peripheral vision evokes and expresses the sentiment that one is neither from here nor there, but rather is situated in-between cultural borderlands that acquire their own meaning. Herminia, expressed the following regarding the complexity of her cultural identity:

I am very proud of who I am, of being Mexican, it forms everything I am you know? —I am always telling that to people, you know how I am. But at the same time, I am very proud of coming here, I am proud of all of my accomplishments. It is very weird, but I think my life is now here in Tucson. I feel very comfortable, here I have people that help me all the time, I have my friends, I have my connections here. I think I found my identity and maturity here [Tucson]. In Mexico, I only have one friend and I love her dearly, but I think we think different now. I think it is weird, now that I think about it, that a place can change you like that, but I guess I never had tried to put it in words.

Further, Zavella (2011) explains how through peripheral vision, subjects are aware that life depends upon economic and political linkages regarding Mexican immigration to the United States. Andrea expressed the following:

I am always watching the news, to see what is happening in Mexico. But I also watch the news from here, to see what's happening. Especially to see what migration reforms are they going to pass, it's important to note. Is something that us [migrants] have to be always be informed about is something that is in our concern, even though it does not affect me that much anymore, I still like to know because of all my relatives.

La Facultad: The Capacity to accommodate different meanings

Anzaldúa (1987) expresses the capacity (or *La Facultad*) of transnational subjects to accommodate apparent mutually exclusive, discontinuous and inconsistent worlds. It is within this capacity or space that Mexican migrants are able to negotiate, formulate and articulate the complexities and different facets of their identities. In the following

quotation, Flora describes her participation in mainstream U.S culture, which reveals her capacity to strategically accommodate different cultures:

Thanksgiving for example, I celebrate it because well you know, is about being with family, I mostly celebrate because of that, is not that I believe in it. I do it mostly, to be with my family, for example: my grandson comes and because he was born here. and his parents did not teach him to celebrate things from my Mexico, well he likes things like the Easter bunny and things like that, things that for me personally don't have any meaning but I still do it –so how would you describe it? Do I celebrate it or not? I celebrate it but not for me, I celebrate it for him. The Mexican things, that I celebrate for me, is more of a spiritual connection.

Similarly, Veronica describes:

I don't promote American festivities for my kids, those festivities promote themselves, in schools, in their surroundings, they already know them, so it's not that I promote them but rather I join my kids in their festivities. Things that you celebrate here [U.S] and don't celebrate over there [Mexico] now I do, it was through my kids that I had become more like they are here.

Analogous to the descriptions provided by Flora and Veronica, Andrea describes how she accommodates different cultures through her identity as a grandmother:

I celebrate [U.S.] things to be with my family...why? Because my grandchildren, they love to be with me, so those celebrations are not that I feel a passion for them, is mostly to be with my grandchildren. Everyone comes to my house, and that's actually what I want -- to be with my grandchildren.

Re-configuring notions of Household

Theories of global householding, as proposed by V. Spike Peterson (2010) note the manner in which normative notions of households are being transformed, and the composition of households are being reconfigured in transnational settings. Transnational households then include those households in which social reproduction (e.g. meeting basic necessities, emotional caregiving, socialization of children etc.) transcends national boundaries. To reflect the establishment of transnational households, I provide the

following quote by Flora who explains how she engages in capital transfers to help her mother and sister who reside in Mexico with their survival:

Every month, I send money to my mother and sister, about one hundred dollars to two hundred dollars per month. I also try to send them clothes, my sister is disabled and my mother is really old now so they really need my help. I am not there, so I try to send them money, I don't want them to struggle.

Further, Andrea describes how she engages in transnational linkages of care:

All the family of my husband, they live in Mexico. but they come here often [Tucson] and we help them, and when I go there [Mexico] they help us as well. We help each other, I also send them money every now and then, when I can.

Further, transnational households not only include the establishment of economic linkages to sustain social reproduction across national boundaries, but in addition include the socialization of children via ideological codes within a bicultural/binational context:

Flora, described the following:

You come here [U.S] and you try to do everything like you did back home, the way you arrange your house, the way you cook things, the way you think, you try to maintain your home like in Mexico but in another country.

Flora, in addition expressed her frustration to maintain what she deemed appropriate socialization with her grandson given cultural differences between the two:

I cannot promote the values I want to, to my grandson. I simply can't, we have a lot of difficulty communicating with each other, he does not speak Spanish and I don't speak English. He tells me that I have to learn English, but I tell him the same thing about the Spanish, it is my biggest dream that I could teach him at least just a couple words, even a couple sentences. I wish he liked the food I prepared, but he always prefers nuggets over my soup.

Although not quite expressing frustration, Herminia similarly notes how performing socialization of her children is different from her own experience as a child, given the bicultural setting in which she socialized her own children:

Only one of my kids was born in Mexico, the rest [two more] were born here, even though they were born here they all speak Spanish because I taught them, and I also taught them my values, you know, the ones my parents instilled in me, and they are similar to me in a lot of ways, but also there are some differences. For example, the oldest one he is very independent, he always tells me that his choices belong to him and things of that nature, I think that kind of thinking he got here, that kind of thinking is really emphasized here.

Global Circuits of Care

Global householding theories challenge orthodox notions that dichotomize the ‘domestic’ sphere and the ‘public’ sphere’, and refer to the intersection between social reproduction and neoliberal (re) structuring of the global political economy through the emergence of the transnational care economy, which continues to reproduce gendered and racialized divisions of labor, as social reproduction is being transferred to migrant women.

(Peterson 2010; Koffman 2012). Of the five women I interviewed, three worked as cooks for the University of Arizona, one worked as a housekeeper for a nursing home, and one worked selling auto parts. In describing what she does at work, Flora who works as a domestic worker for a nursing home, notes how her employment is an extension of what she does in her own household:

I am a housewife and a housekeeper, meaning I work for my house and then I work for another house. I clean, I cook, and all for not speaking English, because there are opportunities for mobility at that job but me because I don’t understand the language, that’s where I am going to stay.

Vero, who works as saleswomen for auto-parts, expressed resistance to participating in the care-economy, in expressing her reluctance to work as a cook she expressed

preference for 'masculine' work, which refers to the socially constructed perception of women as 'care-givers':

I like men's work, previously I worked in home-depot too. I had a job as a cook once, but I didn't like it, that type of work I don't like. It's like being in my own house cooking, I felt that it was a continuation of what I do here at my home.

As gendered roles continue to remain intact, women entering the workforce does not translate into more egalitarian conditions between gendered identities, but rather most often means that women have to perform both domestic social reproduction and public labor (which for racialized identities most often means participating in the care economy), significantly increasing their workload. Herminia expresses the following:

I don't have enough energy to do every time, when I work I do have energy because I just woke up but once I get home I don't have the same energy and I have to give food to my kids, and I have to iron my husband's uniform and stuff like that. I don't feel I have enough energy; I am divided between working and being a mom.

Analysts of global householding, refer to the 'feminization of work' to note how androcentric ideologies render 'women's work' not valuable, and therefore materializes in low-paying jobs. Further, the 'feminization of work' refers to the simultaneous increase of women in the workforce and the worsening of labor conditions promoted by the neoliberal rhetoric of flexibilization and deregulation (Peterson, 2010). Lupita, who works as a cook at the University of Arizona, expresses the following regarding her weekly wage:

I don't feel I have enough money, I am struggling month by month, I basically live paycheck to paycheck and that's even with my husband's pay. I can't imagine without it, I feel like things have gotten worse, you can't live with the minimum wage anymore.

Similarly, Andrea noted:

I don't feel very secure at my work right now, even though I have been a permanent worker for twenty years, I have that fear, I try not to get depressed about it or that I don't show it at my home. I try so that that insecurity does not overcome me and defines my existence.

Furthermore, Peterson (2010) notes how processes of social reproduction are being continually challenged by neoliberal policies, which limit and restrict social welfare to households. Lupita described her situation with access to healthcare:

If you earn a little bit more than minimum wage, a penny more, the government does not give you anything, and even less when it comes to health, right now any type of insurance is very expensive. If you have the opportunity to have a job that gives you one, then you are set, but if not, insurance is very expensive even the ones that the government gives you. Or you pay insurance or you eat—you know what I mean?

Conclusion

I want to clarify that my intent in using the aforementioned feminist theories of migration, as the center of my analysis, is not to 'confirm' or 'test' the qualitative data extracted from the interviews. Rather, the theories serve as lenses that give the descriptions provided by the participants, different comprehensive meanings. In other words, it was through the conceptual tools offered by Patricia Zavella (2011), Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) and V. Spike Peterson (2010) that I was able to observe in my data the different ways in which migrants construct spaces of expression and economic survival in binational and bicultural settings. Furthermore, the fact that the theories used proved to be a fruitful framework of analysis served to corroborate that instances of complexity and fluidity of meaning are central to the migratory experience. The collected descriptions and the analysis formulated reveal that migratory experiences are not monolithic and that diversity exists pertaining to each subject. However, collective themes can also be observed, for instance, all subjects revealed that they participate in political, economic

and social linkages across national boundaries, but the manner in which each participant materializes these linkages or gives them meaning differs for each of them. I hope that this study not only offered a description of the migratory experience of Mexican and Mexican-American women living in Southern Arizona, but that it also provided a space for my participants to articulate the ways in which they express and experience their complex and fluid subjectivities.

Appendix

1. Questionnaire: Feminist Interpretations of Migration: A Southern Arizona

**Feminist Interpretations of Migration: A Southern Arizona
Case Study
Intake Interview Assessment**

PD: PRELIMINARY DATA

RESPONDENT ID#:

Date of Interview: ___ ___ / ___ ___ / 20 ___ ___
month day year

Start Time: ___ ___ : ___ ___ (military time 24 hour clock)
hour minute

LANGUAGE MATRIX	English		Spanish		Other: ___		Other: ___	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
What languages do you know?	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
How comfortable are you speaking _____?	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> Very comfortable 1 Comfortable 2 Neither comfortable Or uncomfortable 3 Uncomfortable 4 Very uncomfortable 5 </div>							
Can you read/write?	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Have you studied?	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0

Are you interested in enrolling in ESL/ Adult Education classes?	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
--	-----	-----	-----	-----

Language of Interview: Spanish / English / Bilingual (please circle)

Interviewer _____
Initial

Edited

_____/_____

Initial

Date

Data Entered

_____/_____

Initial

Date

LANGUAGE SETTING MATRIX	English	Spanish	Other: ____
In what language do you primarily communicate at home?			
In what language do you primarily communicate at your employment site?			
In what language do you primarily communicate in governmental or other public institutions? E.g. Hospitals, church, school			
In what language do you primarily communicate in recreational settings? E.g. Movie theaters, entertainment venues			
Are you interested in enrolling in ESL/ Adult Education classes?			

Not at all Slightly Moderately Considerably Extremely

1. How comfortable do you feel speaking Spanish in public settings?

1 2 3 4 5

2. How comfortable do you feel speaking English in public settings?

1 2 3 4 5

REPRODUCTIVE AND CHILD HEALTH

1. How many times have you been pregnant? ____

2. Are you pregnant now? Yes 1 If yes, how many months? ____
 No 0

3. How many children did you give birth to? ___ ___
4. How many children under the age of 18 are in your care? ___ ___
 (including children that are not your biological children)

RITUALS AND HERITAGE

<u>Applicable</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Slightly</u>	<u>Moderately</u>	<u>Considerably</u>	<u>Extremely</u>	<u>Not</u>
1. How proud do you feel of your Mexican heritage? _____	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. How comfortable do you usually feel claiming your Mexican heritage to strangers? _____	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Do you consider your Mexican heritage to be a significant influence on your identity? _____	1	2	3	4	5	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	9
4. Do you consider your immigrant status to be a significant influence on your identity? _____						
5. Which (if any) religion do you identify yourself with? _____						How strongly?

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not applicable</u>
1. Do you celebrate Mexican national festivities? e.g. Mexican Independence day	1	2	3	4	5	9

2. Do you celebrate U.S-national festivities?
e.g. 4th of July, Thanksgiving

1 2 3 4 5 9

3. Do you celebrate in Mexican culture festivities?
e.g. Day of the dead, Reyes magos

1 2 3 4 5 9

4. Do you celebrate U.S cultural festivities?
e.g. Halloween,

1 2 3 4 5 9

5. Do you encourage your children to engage in Mexican festivities?

1 2 3 4 5 9

6. Do you encourage your children to engage in U.S festivities?

1 2 3 4 5 9

7. Do you travel a significant distance to celebrate Mexican festivities?

1 2 3 4 5 9

8. Do you travel a significant distance to celebrate U.S festivities?

1 2 3 4 5 9

FESTIVITIES SETTING MATRIX	Home-Family members	Home-Friends	Community members	Other: _____
With whom do you celebrate most Mexican festivities?				

With whom do you celebrate most U.S festivities?				
--	--	--	--	--

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

1. Do you belong to a union, or other labor rights organization? Y
N

How extensive is your participation in this organization?

2. Do you belong to any activist-humanitarian organization? Y
N

How extensive is your participation in this organization?

3. Are you eligible to vote in Mexico? Y N

How often do you vote?

4. Are you eligible to vote in the United States? Y N

How often do you vote?

	<u>Always</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Not applicable</u>
1. How often do you seek media information regarding Mexican politics?	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. How often do you seek media information regarding U.S politics?	1	2	3	4	5	9

3. How often do you seek media information regarding immigration relationship between U.S-Mexico 1 2 3 4 5 9

4. Have you participated in public demonstrations or engaged in other political activity regarding Mexican socio-political issues? Y N

What?

Where?

5. Have you participated in public demonstrations Or engaged in other political activity regarding U.S socio-political issues? Y N

What?

Where?

6. Have you participated in public demonstrations or engaged in other political activity regarding U.S-Mexico political issues? Y N

DEMOGRAPHICS

Next, I would like to ask you some demographic questions about yourself.

1. Where were you born? Country _____
State _____
City _____

2. What is your date of birth?
Month ____ ____
Day ____ ____
Year 19 ____ ____

3. How long have you been in the U.S.? _____ mos _____ years

4. What is your citizenship status? _____ (**USE ORANGE CARD**)

5. Which of the following best describes you? (**CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER**)

Hispanic/Latina/Mexicana	1
White (not Hispanic/Latina/Mexican)	2
Native American (Specify tribe) _____	3
Black	4
Asian	5
Black/White	6
Black/Hispanic	7
Black/Native American	8
Native American/White	9
Native American/Hispanic	10
Hispanic/White	11
Other (Specify _____)	12

6. Which geographic area do you most identify with:

Central America	1
Cuba	2
Dominican Republic	3
Mexico	4
Puerto Rico	5
South America	6
Other _____	7

7. Do you consider yourself to be one or more of the following:

Bisexual	1
Lesbian	2
Queer	3
Questioning	4
Straight	5
Transgender	6
Other: _____	7
DK/UNSURE	8
REFUSED	9

8. What is the highest level of school you have completed? (**CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER**)

No formal schooling	01
Junior High or less	02
Less than high school graduation	03
A GED (high school equivalency)	04
High school graduation	05
Trade or technical school	06
Some college	07
College undergraduate degree	08
College graduate degree	09
DK/UNSURE	77
REFUSED	88

9. When was the last time you were enrolled and attended any kind of school or training program?

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Within the past 30 days | 1 |
| 1 to 6 months ago | 2 |
| 7 to 12 months ago | 3 |
| 13 months to 2 years ago | 4 |
| 25 months to 5 years ago | 5 |
| Over 5 years ago | 6 |
| Never | 7 |

9a. What was the program: _____

10. In the last year, have you been interested in enrolling in a training program?

- | | |
|-----|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 0 |

11. What is your civil status? **READ LIST AND CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER**

- | | | |
|--|----|----|
| Single (never married) | 01 | |
| Married | 02 | |
| Common law/living as married with female | | 03 |
| Common law/living as married with male | 04 | |
| Living with female partner | 05 | |
| Living with male partner | 06 | |
| Domestic Partner | 07 | |
| With a sexual partner | | 08 |
| Separated | 09 | |
| Divorced | 10 | |
| Widowed | 11 | |
| Other (Specify _____) | 12 | |
| DK/UNSURE | 77 | |
| REFUSED | 88 | |

12. What is your partner's citizenship status? _____ (**USE ORANGE CARD**)

13. How long have you lived in Tucson? _____ (cumulative)
Years Months Days

14. What do you consider to be your hometown? _____, _____
Country City State

15. Which adults did you live with mostly until your 16th birthday?

Relationship to you

16. During the last year, how many people did you live with regularly? ___ ___

17. Of those ___ ___ (from 15 above), how many were U.S. citizens? ___ ___

18. Has your living situation changed in the past year? Yes 1 No 0

18a. If yes, how has it changed?

19. Do you have family/friends that you can rely on (talk to or visit when you need to); how do you communicate with them (e.g., phone, letter, messengers, email, text, etc); AND how often?

Relationship: _____
State: _____ City: _____
Method(s) of communication: _____
How often: _____

Relationship: _____
State: _____ City: _____
Method(s) of communication: _____
How often: _____

Relationship: _____
State: _____ City: _____
Method(s) of communication: _____
How often: _____

Relationship: _____
State: _____ City: _____
Method(s) of communication: _____
How often: _____

20. For family/friends living outside of the U.S., how have the face-to-face visits changed in the past year?

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY AND SUPPORT TO/FROM INDIVIDUALS

1. What is your occupation/training? _____
2. Have you worked in the past year?

Yes	1
No	0
3. What types of work did you do? _____
4. How has your ability to work changed in the past year?

5. In the last full month, what were your sources of income?
(READ LIST AND CIRCLE A RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM)
6. Do you send money to family members in another country?

Yes	1
No	0

If no, skip
to question 9.
 - 6a. Where do you send the money? _____
 - 6b. How much money do you send? _____
 - 6c. How often do you send money? _____
 - 6d. Who do you send the money to? _____
 - 6e. Who was the money to be used for? _____
 - 6f. What was the money to be used for? _____
9. Do you send items other than money to family members in another country?

Yes	1
No	0

If no, skip
to question 10.
 - 6a. Where do you send items? _____
 - 6b. What types of items do you send? _____
 - 6c. How often do you send items? _____
 - 6d. Who do you send the items to? _____
 - 6e. Who were the items to be used for? _____
11. Do you feel you have enough money to buy the things you need for your family?

12. How do you make it from one month to the next?

GLOBAL QUESTIONS

1. In the past year, immigration has been a topic of many discussions and actions.

1a. Have you participated in any? Yes 1 1b. How have your participated? _____

No 0

2. What are your thoughts regarding the immigration issues in Arizona?

Quality of Life:

This questionnaire asks about how you feel about your quality of life, health, or other areas of your life. Please answer all the questions. If you are unsure about which response to give to a question, please choose the one that appears most appropriate. This can often be your first response.

Please keep in mind your standards, hopes, pleasures, and concerns. FOR THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS, we ask that you think about your life *in the PAST YEAR*. QUESTIONS 3 TO 26 REFER TO THE PAST 30 DAYS.

Please read each question, assess your feelings, and circle the number on the scale that gives the best answer for you for each question. Note each of the different scales for questions one and two.

1. How would you rate the quality of your life?	Very Poor 1	Poor 2	Neither poor Nor good 3	Good 4	Very Good 5
2. How satisfied are you with your health?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
The following questions ask about how much you have experienced certain things in the last 30 DAYS.					
3. How much do you enjoy life?	Not at all 1	A little 2	A moderate amount 3	Very much 4	An extreme amount 5
4. To what extent do you feel your life to be meaningful?	Not at all 1	A little 2	A moderate amount 3	Very much 4	An extreme amount 5
5. How safe do you feel in your daily life?	Not at all 1	Slightly 2	A moderate amount 3	Very much 4	Extremely 5
6. How healthy is your physical environment?	Not at all 1	Slightly 2	A moderate amount 3	Very much 4	Extremely 5
The following questions ask about how completely you experience or were able to do certain things in the last 30 days.					
7. Do you have enough energy for everyday life?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
8. Are you able to accept your bodily appearance?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
9. Have you enough money to meet your needs?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
10. How available to you is the information that you need in your day-to-day life?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
11. To what extent do you have the opportunity for leisure activities?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
12. How well are you able to get around?	Not at all 1	A little 2	Moderately 3	Mostly 4	Completely 5
The following questions ask you to say how good or satisfied you have felt about various aspects of your life over the PAST 30 DAYS. USE WHITE CARD					
13. How satisfied are you with your sleep?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5

14. How satisfied are you with your ability to perform your daily living activities?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
15. How satisfied are you with your capacity for work?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
16. How satisfied are you with your abilities?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
17. How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
18. How satisfied are you with the support you get from your friends?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
19. How satisfied are you with the conditions of your living place?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
20. How satisfied are you with your access to health services?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
21. How satisfied are you with your mode of transportation?	Very dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
The last question refers to how often you have felt or experienced certain things in the last 30 DAYS.					
22. How often do you have negative feelings, such as blue mood, despair, anxiety, depression?	Never 1	Seldom 2	Quite often 3	Very often 4	Always 5

Thank you for your time. Is there anything you would like to comment on about the interview?

End Time: ___ ___ : ___ ___ (military time 24 hour clock)

Work Cited

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands, la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Douglass, M. (2009). Globalizing Householding: Toward A Multicultural Age In East Asia. *Global Movements in the Asia Pacific*, 37-67.
- Ehrenreich, B., & Hochschild, A. R. (2003). *Global Woman: Nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hellman, J. A., & Tiano, S. (1996). Patriarchy on the Line: Labor, Gender and Ideology in the Mexican Maquila Industry. *Contemporary Sociology*, 25(2), 146-220
- Hing, B. O. (2010). *Ethical borders: NAFTA, globalization, and Mexican migration*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kofman, E. (2012). Rethinking Care Through Social Reproduction: Articulating Circuits of Migration. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(1), 142-162.
- Landau, S. (2005). Globalization, Maquilas, NAFTA, and the State: Mexican labor and 'The New World Order'. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 21(3-4), 357-368.
- Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, 14(3), 49-64.
- Manning, R., & Butera, A. (2000). Global restructuring and U.S.-Mexican economic integration: Rhetoric and reality of Mexican immigration five years after NAFTA. *American Studies*, 183-209.
- Peterson, V. S. (2014). Family Matters: How Queering the Intimate Queers the International. *International Studies Review*, 16(4), 604-608.
- Peterson, V. S. (2010). Global Householding amidst Global Crises. *Politics & Gender*, 6(02), 271-281.
- Rouse, R. (1991). Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1(1), 8-23.
- Peterson, V. S. and Runyan, A. S. (2010). *Global gender issues in the new millennium*. 3rd edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Schmidt, R. H., & Gruben, W. C. (1992). *Ejido reform and the NAFTA*. San Francisco, CA: Research Dept., Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
- U. N. (2013, March). International Migration Report. Retrieved January 23, 2016, from <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/theme/international-migration/>
- Zavella, P. (2011). *I'm Neither Here nor There: Mexicans' quotidian struggles with migration and poverty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

