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This proposal is accompanied by two documents: a bibliography and a list of founding members of the proposed section, that is, current ASA members who have committed to joining the section and to paying dues for the first two years. The proposal begins with the section’s purpose and organizational background, followed by an introductory overview of global and transnational sociology that facilitates discussion of the distinctive character of the section in relation to existing ASA sections. The next two segments of the proposal discuss the section’s activities, structure, governance, and bylaws. The final segment presents a review of the literature on selected key topics of global and transnational sociology.

Purpose of the Section
Despite the great number of scholars engaged in global and transnational research and the vast literatures on global and transnational topics, the American Sociological Association provides no intellectual home for these scholars. Global studies programs and majors proliferate in universities, centers for research on the European Union or transnational migration or human rights have become commonplace, journals dedicated to globalization or transnational civil society abound – but ASA members engaged in global or transnational research see no check-off box fitting their interests in the list of ASA sections. Yet global and transnational sociology are already prevalent in ASA annual meeting sessions and publications; the ASA has no institutionalized place for those who work in these areas.

The proposed section will fill this void. For global and transnational scholars and teachers, it will expand research networks, facilitate communication about publications and conferences, and provide a forum for intellectual exchange and debate. It will compile and disseminate course syllabi and other teaching materials, create a data bank of classroom exercises and assignments, and keep members informed about films and web sites of pedagogical value. It will give annual awards for outstanding research by established researchers and graduate students. Eventually, the section will sponsor or co-sponsor small conferences, organize research and teaching workshops, and facilitate research that will benefit established scholars and enhance graduate student training. The section will also give a boost to the globalization of the ASA itself, attracting many scholars from around the world who rarely participate in ASA activities.

Looking beyond sociology, global and transnational sociologists find themselves ever more engaged in networks of scholars from other disciplines who study similar topics and issues. The latter often lack institutionalized fora for their research in their respective professional associations, and we believe that an ASA-based focal point for contacts, resources, and professional participation would be highly attractive to them. Thus, the new section would enhance cross-disciplinary contacts and research, increase participation in ASA activities by scholars from other disciplines, and help bring different theoretical perspectives and substantive concerns under the sociological umbrella.

Apart from these organizational and practical concerns, we seek the formation of a Global and
Transnational Sociology section on substantive grounds: global and transnational processes are of enormous significance across a great many social arenas, and they have expanding and increasingly palpable consequences for people’s daily lives all around the world. The new section will be devoted to the study of processes that we think are crucial at this juncture in human history.

Organizational Background
The Organizing Committee for the proposed Global and Transnational Sociology section consists of the following scholars:

Julia Adams, Yale University
Peter Beyer, University of Ottawa
John Boli, Emory University (Chair)
Glenn Firebaugh, Pennsylvania State University
Sanjeev Khagram, University of Washington
Frank Lechner, Emory University
Peggy Levitt, Wellesley College
John Meyer, Stanford University
George Ritzer, University of Maryland
Roland Robertson, University of Aberdeen
Ino Rossi, St. Johns University
Jackie Smith, University of Notre Dame
George Thomas, Arizona State University

Early on, the Organizing Committee contacted Michael Murphy, the ASA’s Archivist and Director of the Governance, Sections, and Archives Department. He kindly supplied several previous section proposals that have been helpful in preparing the current proposal.

The Organizing Committee conducted an informal recruitment effort via email in the winter of 2007-08, working mainly through scholarly networks. The recruitment effort yielded about 250 “founding members” of the proposed section. Given the avid interest in the section shown by many ASA members, and the ease with which we were able to recruit this considerable number of founding members, we believe that the Global and Transnational Sociology section will enroll 500 to 600 members in its first two years. It could eventually grow to become one of the largest ASA sections.

The Organizing Committee held an initial meeting for the proposed section at the ASA annual meeting in Boston on August 3, 2008. About 60 people attended, filling the room to capacity. The meeting topics included structure and governance of the section, details regarding the by-laws that are being drafted, potential candidates for section offices and committees, and future activities and programs that the section should consider. Enthusiasm was high, discussion was rich, and additional founding members signed on, bringing the total to about 265. With further additions throughout the fall, the founding member count has passed 320. The Organizing Committee is in regular communication with the founding members through a listserv based at Emory University.
Global and Transnational Research: An Introductory Overview

Transnational sociology is the study of structures and processes that transcend the national level. The field includes studies of transnational organizations, such as the European Union, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), or Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie. It also comprehends research on transnational phenomena, such as regional migration patterns in North America, auto theft syndicates in northern and eastern Europe, the spread of managerial techniques among Asian manufacturers, and efforts to promote civil society in former Soviet republics. Global sociology is the subset of transnational sociology that considers structures and processes that are seen as, or claim to be, relevant to the entire world. It includes studies of global production systems and value chains, worldwide environmental problems and movements, the relationship between global and local cultures, world public opinion, global communications systems, globally oriented IGOs (e.g., the World Trade Organization and International Telecommunication Union) and NGOs (e.g., the International Accounting Standardization Board and World Vision), and so on.

What makes global and transnational sociology distinctive is the basic conceptual shift involved. The systems, organizations, causal processes, and interconnections at issue are often described as “deterritorial” because they are defined not in terms of political or geographic boundaries but as transcendent forms of social “space” whose contours are largely disconnected from such boundaries. For global research, the entire world is the social space or conceptual framework. For example, a great many international NGOs define their arena of action as the entire world; Médecins Sans Frontières will go wherever a catastrophe occurs, the International Reading Association promotes literacy everywhere. Similarly, a commodity or value chain is global insofar as it may have links located in any particular place, since place as such is largely irrelevant in the construction of such chains. In human rights research, human rights doctrines and documents (such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) are deemed applicable everywhere in the world; global research on education studies the impact of worldwide models of schooling and curricula on national educational systems in all countries.

In counterpoint, much transnational sociology deals with phenomena of less than global scope but having the same deterritorial quality. The scope of concern is typically regional, and often the region at issue is geographical (and, hence, not entirely deterritorial) – the study of migration patterns in Latin America, African micro-lending organizations, Asian media industries, or the institutions of the European Union. But topics oriented to many other kinds of transnational regions (conceptualized as cultural, civilizational, ecological, and so on) are also common: scholarly networks in the francophone world, Islamic education, sports in the British Commonwealth, deforestation in tropical rainforest areas, and eradication efforts in the global malaria belt, to name but a few. These multiple levels of social organization are often studied jointly; for example, the burgeoning literature on sports considers the relationships among world-spanning associations (for everything from aikido to wrestling), their regional and national counterparts, and prominent individual teams or clubs.

Other forms of global and transnational social organization also fall within this research domain. Considerable attention is given, for example, to global cities that function as centers of global production, nodes in networks of professional organizations (business enterprises and associations), sources of global popular culture, and so on. International law is studied with...
respect to human rights, rules of war, interstate relations, and environmental regimes. World conferences, sponsored by organizations ranging from the UN to coalitions of INGOs to the World Social Forum, are frequent subjects. World heritage, the Internet and other telecommunications systems, accounting standardization, world religions and religious movements – the list expands day by day as the range of theoretical perspectives and issues grows and the community of scholars becomes ever more interconnected.

As these many examples indicate, global and transnational research transcends or goes beyond, in particular, the nation, the state, and national (or sub-national) levels of analysis. Not that nations, states, and sub-national units are unimportant or necessarily on the decline; rather, they are “relativized” (as Roland Robertson puts it) by being embedded in global and regional contexts, and the properties and transformations of the larger contexts affect them in numerous ways. In turn, these organizational and cultural canopies are themselves affected by the sub-units they encompass, and the interplay between canopies and sub-units is a crucial issue for many branches of global and transnational research. For global sociology, a construct often invoked in this regard is “glocalization,” also associated with Robertson, which refers to the ways in which the features and forces of larger contexts are adapted, modified, and reinterpreted in accordance with local structures and cultures. Interaction between the global and the local is seen as a two-way process involving complex causal structures, and many fine-grained analyses probe this complexity in considerable detail.

A sampling of key issues and controversies. Global and transnational sociology has generated a considerable number of central controversies, particularly with respect to globalization. Mauro Guillén usefully summarized several controversies in a 2001 article in Annual Review of Sociology. The first, whether globalization is “really happening,” is hardly controversial among most researchers, but the prior question on which it rests – “What is globalization?” – evokes almost as many answers as there are researchers. Early on, globalization was commonly seen as primarily or exclusively an economic phenomenon; when culture was considered, globalization was often equated with Westernization or Americanization. Such conceptions retain favor in some circles, but most researchers now recognize that globalization has numerous dimensions and each of these dimensions is increasingly multi-centric. Simple models of one-way influence from the West to the rest of the world have faded as more complex understandings of the tangle of influences among various globalizing centers, engines, and forces have emerged.

The related issue of whether a global culture is emerging has been a tougher nut to crack; the concept of a global or world culture is rejected out of hand in some quarters while its proponents cast the concept in highly varied molds. In that light, the field could hardly be expected to reach agreement as to how global culture originates, what it contains, or how it differs from “Western” culture or “modernity (another of Guillén’s issues). Discussions of these issues are often metatheoretical or epistemological in character and may not be resolvable. On the other hand, many researchers, particularly those adopting a world-polity perspective (below), have produced revealing empirical studies based on the assumption that global culture is operative. They make inferences about its constitutive elements and test hypotheses about how particular elements of world culture affect the identity, structure, and behavior of states, organizations, and locales embedded in world culture and transnational systems and structures.
Other controversies, far from resolved but in principle resolvable, hinge on growing bodies of empirical work. One is the question of whether, how, and to what extent globalization produces convergence, that is, homogenization or isomorphism among states, transnational corporations, national societies or cultures, and so on. A second is whether, how, and to what extent globalization undermines the authority of nation-states. The prevailing views early on were rather clear with respect to both of these issues: globalization was a homogenizing steamroller flattening all cultural differences around the world, and it rendered nation-states increasingly incapable, overwhelmed, and irrelevant due to the border-erasing character of capitalist neoliberalism, global communications and transportation systems, air and water pollution, infectious diseases, and so on. As global and transnational sociology developed, it became clear that over-simplification was again prevalent. Transnational processes are not simply homogenizing; they also reinforce the validity, importance, and symbolic value of national, ethnic, and other differences, thereby strengthening heterogeneity or distinctiveness. Inexpensive movement of goods and people makes cities increasingly diverse, mixing groups and cultures in often bewildering ways. As Ulf Hannerz and Jan Nederveen Pieterse argue, cultures are increasingly creolized or hybridized, and the trajectories of national or local cultural development are shaped by many forces. Globalization and transnationalization are thus both homogenizing in some respects and diversifying in others, and the task many researchers set themselves is sorting out these varied effects across different social sectors.

**Distinctive Character of the Section and Relations with Existing Sections**

The Global and Transnational Sociology section appears to overlap with a number of existing ASA sections, such as Comparative and Historical Sociology; International Migration; Labor and Labor Movements; Peace, War, and Social Conflict; and Political Economy of the World-System (PEWS). Each of these sections includes research adopting a global or transnational perspective; indeed, some of the topics we explore in the research review below relate directly to one or another of these sections (e.g., migration to International Migration, labor to the Labor and Labor movements section). However, the global/transnational component of these sections (apart from PEWs, which we discuss separately below) is only a small, and often rather neglected, dimension of these sections’ concerns. In the sociology of labor, for example, most research studies nations, above all the USA, or sub-national units – national labor policies, particular national industries, strikes in one or a few countries, and so on. In the sociology of migration, and of war and peace, a logic of international relations – relations between or among nation-states – occupies most of the research arena. Such internationally oriented research perspectives tend to interpret the global or transnational dimension, when they heed it at all, as interaction processes involving mutual influences among nations and states. Globalization is limited to such phenomena as flows of international capital or military weaponry, while transnational regional analysis reduces to such phenomena as efforts by major powers to exert influence over IGOs or the transferability of educational credentials across Latin American countries.

Comparative and historical sociology occupies something of a middle ground in this respect. Traditionally it has been dominated by an epistemology that favors nations and states as units of analysis, with researchers treating each unit as a more or less autonomous entity driven largely by internal domestic forces (though subject to the influence of other units). More recently, however, the field has broadened its approach, recognizing that nations and states are substantially and often dramatically conditioned by specifiable transnational – often global – processes. In turn,
nation-state action and ideology condition the larger processes to which they are exposed. Thus, global and transnational sociology also includes methodologically comparative research that addresses both the causes and consequences of such global/transnational phenomena as wars, regionalism, social movements, aspects of economic globalization, and so on.

While researchers using global and transnational sociological perspectives have carved out a niche in several of these existing sections, they often feel rather isolated, lacking the critical mass necessary to constitute a vibrant community of scholars. They tend to feel stronger intellectual connections with global/transnational scholars in other research arenas than with other members of existing sections who work solely within a national or international context. Many of them have signed on as founding members of the proposed section because they see it as the intellectual home they have been unable to find in the current lineup of ASA sections.

The proposed section’s relationship with PEWS is of particular importance. During the initial recruitment effort that sought to assess whether interest in a Global and Transnational Sociology section was great enough to warrant the organizing effort, a number of PEWS members expressed the concern that PEWS might suffer significant membership loss to the proposed section. In response, the Organizing Committee chair contacted the current PEWS chair, Prof. Shelley Feldman, to explain the distinctive character of the proposed section and its deliberately catholic approach regarding theoretical perspectives, research areas, and the like. An amicable relationship was established and a tentative agreement emerged to engage in joint activities with PEWS, such as hosting joint receptions and co-sponsoring mini-conferences. One specific activity under consideration is a mini-conference to be held after the ASA meetings in 2009 in San Francisco. It is also worth noting that a good many PEWS members have signed on as founding members of the proposed section and attended the organizing meeting in Boston, including numerous current and former PEWS section officers. We therefore see the proposed section and PEWS as essentially complementary and expect to see a cooperative relationship between the two sections emerge.

Activities of the Section

At the Boston organizing meeting, and via the proposed section’s listserv, we identified a sizable number of activities to be undertaken by the section. Many of them can be found among the activities of any number of current ASA sections; some are original or rather rare.

A. Promote scholarship and scholarly community in relevant research areas
   - Publish an electronic section newsletter, eventually on a quarterly basis
   - Operate an engaging listserv for dissemination of information and scholarly debate
   - Compile a comprehensive, searchable bibliography
   - At some future point, launch a journal

B. Enhance teaching and curricula
   - Promote global and transnational perspectives in all types of sociology courses, particularly for undergraduates
     - Compile a syllabi set
     - Compile a set of classroom exercises and assignments
     - Compile a detailed data base of information about films and video for classroom use
C. Engage and support graduate students and graduate student training
   • Create a Student Outreach Coordinator position to recruit student members and develop
     activities of special interest to students
   • Promote student mentoring (e.g., hold a mentoring lunch during the ASA annual meeting)
   • Sponsor workshops and short courses on global and transnational topics

D. Collaborate with other ASA sections (Law, Labor and Labor Movements, Social Movements,
   PEWS, etc.)
   • Co-sponsor mini-conferences and similar events
   • Co-sponsor sessions at ASA annual meetings, particularly with sections in which global and
     transnational perspectives are rarely adopted in research

E. Cooperate with other scholarly associations and organizations
   • International Sociological Association (encourage membership, co-sponsor activities)
   • Global Studies Association, which is willing to host sessions organized by the proposed
     section at its annual conference
   • International Studies Association, particularly its International Political Sociology section
     and a new section on global research that is in formation
   • Sociologists Without Borders (collaborate on the event it sponsors each year with local
     activists during the ASA annual meeting)

F. Establish annual research awards: best faculty (or equivalent) article and book, best graduate
   student publication, best article or book by non-US scholar

G. Promote global engagement in the section
   • Sponsor annual meeting sessions and panels that emphasize perspectives and issues from
     outside the USA
   • Offer an annual award or two for work by non-US scholars
   • Develop a fund to bring non-US students and scholars from less developed countries to
     annual meeting sessions and panels
   • Obtain external funding to conduct workshops for graduate students (similar to those
     sponsored by the International Sociological Association, with UNESCO funding)
   • Conduct some section activities at meetings and conferences abroad
   • Lobby the ASA to change its membership rules to facilitate participation by scholars from
     abroad (e.g., section affiliate status not requiring ASA membership)

Structure and Bylaws of the Section
The initial organizing meeting also addressed a variety of matters related to section governance.
These points will guide preparation of the draft by-laws, which is the next task of the Organizing
Committee.

Following the standard section model, governance will be led by a Council and a section Chair.
The Council will have six to eight members, perhaps with one seat reserved for graduate students.
Council members will serve staggered three-year terms, while the Chair position will involve a
three-year cycle (Chair-Elect, Chair, Past Chair) to ensure continuity in the leadership. Each
Council member will chair or be an active member of at least one section committee.
Besides the Chair, we envision the following officers or positions for the section: Secretary/Treasurer, Newsletter Editor, Webmaster(s), Archivist (for course syllabi, assignments, and the bibliography), Outreach Coordinator (handling relationships with other organizations and the public realm), and Student Outreach Coordinator (reserved for a graduate student). The Council, Chair positions, and Secretary/Treasurer would be elective offices; also for the sake of continuity, the Secretary/Treasurer and Newsletter Editor would serve three-year terms.

We anticipate that the section will create this initial set of committees:
- Membership, to handle recruitment, membership records, and listservs
- Program and Activities, chaired by the section Chair
- Publications, chaired by the newsletter editor and initially focusing only on the newsletter
- Nominations, whose members should include several Council members
- Student Outreach Committee, comprised of graduate students and chaired by the Student Outreach Coordinator
- Web Work, chaired by the webmaster or co-webmasters
- Awards: with several different annual awards to be developed, including best book, best article, and best student publication, we anticipate creating separate committees (or sub-committees) for each award. One or more awards for non-US scholars may be offered.

Finally, we have canvassed the founding members informally to identify individuals interested in serving as Council members or section officers in the proposed section. Many founding members are ready to stand for election or be considered for non-elective offices, so we expect to be able to hold elections and get the section underway quickly once it is formally established.

Research Review: Topics in Global and Transnational Scholarship
Because of the wide range of topics that fall within the rubric of global and transnational sociology, we have not attempted to give a complete survey of relevant research. Rather, we present concise paragraphs, many of them drafted by founding members, that cover numerous disparate research areas. Not all of these topics are among the most important or central foci of global and transnational sociology; our intention here is only to give a sense of the range of concerns that researchers address. We begin with general theoretical perspectives that cover the broadest research domains. The specific topics that follow are presented in alphabetical order.

General theories. Several general theories have attained considerable prominence in the past two decades or so. They are typically global in scope but are often applied to transnational issues of regional or sub-regional scope as well. Some of these theories are primarily economic or politico-economic in emphasis, focused especially on global capitalism. For example, William Robinson emphasizes the emergence of a transnational state overseeing transnational production controlled by transnational capitalists, while Leslie Sklair’s global system theory focuses on the composition and behavior of what he calls the transnational capitalist class, which includes technocrats and politicians along with global capitalists. Other politico-economic approaches of prominence have been offered by Philip McMichael, who is especially concerned with global inequalities; Jan Nederveen Pieterse, who studies the global interplay between "empire" and "emancipation;" Antonio Hardt and Michael Negri, who espay a new kind of “empire” of global capitalism that is beyond the control even of major capitalist groups; and Manuel Castells, whose network society approach shines a spotlight on information technology, systematic knowledge, and market and
organizational networks that structure the world economy and symbolic communications industries.

Other general theories are more cultural or organizational in character. Roland Robertson was a key early user of the term “globalization” in his work on the reconceptualization of the world as a single society and frame of reference for states, individuals, and groups embedded in a world-cultural framework. Cultural theories expand on this idea by analyzing, among other things, aspects of global consciousness or awareness, global ideologies (polacco-economic, religious, scientific, and so on), and alternative world views competing for global attention and adherence (for example, “anti-globalization” movements confronting capitalist neoliberalism). George Ritzer expands his McDonaldization thesis to argue that globalization impoverishes and reduces culture and experience to standardized forms of “nothingness.” World-polity theory, developed by John Meyer and colleagues, draws attention to the impact of global cultural models on the identity, structuration, policies, and behavior of states, organizations, and individuals. Jan Aart Scholte combines cultural and political approaches in work spanning many different global sectors, while John Tomlinson’s analysis gives particular attention to cultural imperialism issues. Much work from a cultural perspective operates mainly at the conceptual level, though the world-polity approach has produced numerous long-term, comprehensive empirical studies of various aspects of global development.

Key works: Albrow (1996); Beck (1998, 2007); Castells (1996-7); Hardt and Negri (2001); Harvey (2006, 2007); Lash and Urry (1994); Lash and Lury (2007); McMichael (2004); Meyer, Boli, Thomas, and Ramirez (1997); Nederveen Pieterse (2004); Petras and Veltmeyer (2001); Ritzer (2004); Robertson (1992); Robertson and White (2003); Robinson (2004); Scholte (2000); Sklair (2001); Thomas, Meyer, Ramirez, and Boli (1987); Tomlinson (1999, 2002); Urry (2002).

Children. Much work on children in global perspective stresses their vulnerabilities. Commonly studied issues include child poverty, child soldiers, trafficking and prostitution of children, child labor exploitation and slavery, orphans, and street children. Scholars study both the global processes, networks, and organizations that contribute to these problems and efforts by IGOs (e.g., UNICEF, ILO, World Food Programme) and global NGOs (e.g., Save the Children, Children International, Plan) to alleviate them. Additional topics, often examined cross-culturally, include child consumption, surveillance, resilience, migration, and media use. Many different aspects of global development are considered for their effects on children: political, economic, health, educational, technological, media, religious, cultural, and familial structures operating in and across societies. At the institutional level, scholars study the emergence and spread of childhood as a distinct, valued, and vulnerable stage of life, giving particular heed to how childhood is institutionalized in national institutions and global discourse. Many different approaches to the transnational study of children have emerged: demographic, developmental, interpretive, social movement, and so on. The adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 has stimulated scholarly interest in children and prompted greater effort to understanding children’s own perspectives about their situations. Key works: Boli-Bennett and Meyer (1978), Childhood: A Journal of Global Child Research (1993- ), Katz (2004), O’Connell Davidson (2005), Panter-Brick (2002), Prout (2005), Qvortrup (2005), Shanahan (2007), Spence Boocock and Scott (2005), Stearns (2006).
**Economic globalization.** A profusion of research seeks to explain why so many countries around the world, particularly since the 1980s, have made policy changes aimed at deepening international economic integration – an important aspect of globalization. Before the 1980s, many states, in a variety of ways, routinely sought to restrain or limit their openness. Researchers link the opening up of national economies to many factors such as pressures from international financial institutions, new cross-border flows of economic expertise, increased mobilization by business, cross-border policy diffusion, changes in international finance, and changes in domestic political institutions. At the same time, scholars study the effects of openness on economic growth, social welfare programs, environmental degradation, and so on, often with a critical eye to the impact of structural adjustment programs accompanying IMF or World Bank loans and support. Related lines of research study the development, operations, and governance of global commodity or value chains and their impact on local and national economies, including working conditions, pay, unionization, and the like. Key works: Babb (2001); Chorev (2007); Cohen (2008); Dezalay and Garth (2002); Esping-Anderson (1990); Fourcade-Gourinchas and Babb (2002); Gereffi, Humphrey, and Sturgeon (2005); Gereffi and Korzeniewicz (1994); Hicks and Kenworthy (2003); Kenworthy (1995); Knorr Cetina and Preda (2004); Lake (2006); McMichael (2005); Robinson (2004); Schrank (2004, 2007); Simmons, Dobbin, and Garrett (2008); Sklair (2002).

**Environment.** Global and transnational sociology of the environment seeks to analyze the social forces shaping the transnational flows of ideas, people, resources, and institutions and their environmental consequences. It also studies the emergence and institutionalization of globalized conceptions of the environment and regional, national, and local responses to these conceptions. This body of scholarship has emerged in dialogue with a rich literature on global environmental politics in international relations (see, for example, the journal *Global Environmental Politics* and the MIT Press series on Global Environmental Accords). Substantively, research focuses on the rise of international organizations dedicated to environmental concerns, the effects of such organizations on states and corporations, drivers of global environmental degradation, practices and patterns of power and inequality in global environmental governance, and the cross-border motivation and mobilization of environmental concern. Theoretically, this body of scholarship is very diverse. Perspectives brought to bear on the transnational sociology of the environment include institutional perspectives that emphasize the structures and mechanisms of social order, Foucauldian discourse and power/knowledge frameworks, world systems perspectives, and social movement frameworks. Key works: Beck (1998); Bunker (1988); Buttel and Taylor (1992); Dietz, Fitzgerald, and Schwom (2005); Evans (2002); Goldman (2005); Haas, Keohane and Levy (1993); Jasano (2001); Keck and Sikkink (1998); Kloppeburg (1988); Meyer, Frank, Hironaka, Schofer, and Tuma (1997); Mol (2003); Redclift and Benton (1994); Roberts and Grimes (2002); Roberts and Parks (2007); Rootes (1999); York, Rosa, and Dietz (2003).

**Fair trade.** The fair trade movement deals with small producers of food and beverage commodities that are generally exported from the global South to the global North. Coffee dominates, but Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International’s independent certification arm (FLO-CERT GmbH) also accredits producer groups for tea, fruits, grains, spices, flowers, honey, and wine. Fair trade is part of the larger global "ethical consumption" movement that harnesses purchasing power to promote social and environmental sustainability. Fair trade systems resemble other global trade governance regimes in that they are market-based and work within existing
country- and commodity-specific export arrangements. They differ in that they stress social justice and sustainability. Fair trade encourages social responsibility in free-market capitalism by promoting a living wage, access to credit, and environmentally sound farming practices in the South while convincing buyers in the North to include these considerations in their purchasing decisions. Key works: Curran, Linton, Cooke, and Schrank (2008); Jaffee (2007); Jaffee, Kloppenberg, and Monroy (2004); Linton, Liou, and Shaw (2004); Levi and Linton (2003); and Raynolds, Murray, and Wilkinson (2007).

Gender and sexuality. Studies in this area of research focus on evidently transnational processes or examine the transnational nature of seemingly local or national processes and forces that shape the social organization of gender and sexuality. Examples of the first type include gender and sexuality in transnational empires in historical and contemporary periods, transnational movements promoting the rights and empowerment of women and gays/lesbians, and the transnational circulation of images and ideas that support or contest gender and sexuality relations in a given social context. Examples of the second type include studies of nationalism, economic and political development, and the production and consumption of popular culture that shape or are informed by the social relations of gender and sexuality. In addition to these two groups, studies of gender and sexuality in non-Western societies that may not be consciously transnational are significant to transnational sociology in terms of their contribution to the global production of knowledge in the discipline. Such studies enable American sociology to pay attention to "other" societies as sources of theoretical knowledge rather than merely case studies for Western-generated social theories. Key works: DasGupta (2006); Frank and McEneaney (1999); Frank, Hardinge, and Wosick-Correa (forthcoming); Hasso (2005); Kempadoo and Doeza (1998); Moon (2005); Naples and Desai (2002); Enloe (2000); Parrenas (2000).

Glocalization and hybridization. “Glocalization” was first used by Japanese economists to describe the business practices of expansive Japanese firms in the 1980s. Roland Robertson brought the term into sociology as a way of talking about the interplay between the universalizing and particularizing tendencies of world culture, stressing a two-way process: the local adaptation of global universals, which leads to unique constellations of cultural elements in any given locale, and the universalization of particular (local) cultural elements and practices in simplified, “transportable” forms that can be digested elsewhere. Adaptation and reinterpretation of transnational forms leads to complex cultural mixes, a process referred to in different research traditions as creolization or hybridization. Early discussions of glocalization in sociology tended to be broad and discursive, while anthropological work was more often based in ethnographic research; ethnographic sociological work is now also common. Increasingly, the global-local link is at the forefront of the analysis across many issue areas — democratization, sports, female genital cutting, sustainable development, environmental protection, city and community life, women’s rights and empowerment, the Internet, and much more. Key works: Cvetkovich and Kellner (1997), Donnelly (1996), Eade (1997), Friedman (1990, 1995), Hannerz (1987, 1990, 1992), Nederveen Pieterse (1995, 2008), Robertson (1994, 1995), Ritzer (2003).

Human rights. Long dominated by legal scholars, the study of human rights doctrine and struggles over human rights has become a major social science concern in the last two decades. Characterized by global and regional transnational perspectives in addition to conventional international approaches, this interdisciplinary field involves scholars from sociology,
anthropology, political science, and history, as well as legal studies. Research covers such topics as the constitution of human rights norms, the relationship between states and international and regional human rights systems, the discourses and strategies of transnational human rights advocacy networks and movements, the social and political conditions for the implementation of international human rights norms, and so on. Given the global, transnational, regional, and local relations of power behind the constitution and implementation of human rights norms, the field gives considerable attention to social inequalities and power relationships across nations, classes, genders, “races,” ethnicities, age groups, and other axes of social differentiation. In addition, a growing set of scholars seeks to document and explain the historical emergence, diffusion, and institutionalization of human rights as a distinct world-cultural sector. Key works: An-Na’im (2002); Brysk (2002); Çali and Meckeld-García (2006); de la Peña (2005); Elliott (2007, 2008); Forsythe and McMahon (2004); Fredman (2001); Goodale and Merry (2007); Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui (2005); Hochstetler, Clark, and Friedman (2000); Lyons and Mayall (2003); Keck and Sikkink (1998); Khagram, Riker, and Sikkink (2002); Koh (1997); Madsen (2004, 2007); Mamdani (2000); Mchome (2002); Monshipouri, Englehart, and Philip (2003); Mullanly (2006); Risse (2000); Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink (1999); Santos (2008); Santos (2007); Saugestad (2004); Sieder (2002); Tsutsui and Wotipka (2004).

Labor. While global or transnational labor unions are rare, a number of unions and several INGO confederations of labor have a long history of engagement in global governance, particularly in connection with the expansive work of the International Labor Organization. Recent decades have seen renewed efforts by labor organizations to transnationalize to increase their bargaining power with global corporations. Regional transnational efforts are particularly important in the European Union and NAFTA area. Increasing trans-border interaction among labor movements has been accompanied by expanding comparative labor research, including studies of the "labor imperialism" of the AFL-CIO in subverting developed countries' labor movements and their allies. The concept of "social movement unionism"—originally arising out of studies of labor movements in Brazil, the Philippines, South Africa and South Korea—has been generalized to include labor movements in highly developed places, including North America. Labor INGOs and unions have been in the forefront of several other global social movements, regarding child labor, working conditions and pay, fair trade, and the like. Key works: Armbruster-Sandoval (2005); Battista (2002); Bolsman (2007); Brooks (2005); Brecher, Costello, and Smith (2000); Cantor and Schor (1987); Collins (2003); Fletcher (2003); Herod (2001); Kamel and Hoffman (2002); Moody (1997); Munck (2004); Panitch and Leys (2000); Scipes (1992, 1996, 2005); Seidman (1994); Shailor (1998); Silver (2001; 2003); Sims (1992); Stevis and Boswell (2008); Ward (1990); Waterman (1999, 2001); Wood, Meiksins, and Yates (1998).

Migration. A transnational lens on migration counteracts the field's traditional emphasis on assimilation by seeking to understand how incorporation and enduring homeland connections mutually affect one another. The one-sided concern for how newcomers become American, French, or Brazilian has yielded to a broader approach that studies how migrants simultaneously become incorporated into the countries that they move to and remain involved in their homelands, “straddling the borders” rather than being irrevocably bound by them. Migration therefore involves, for example, the construction of transnational identities that cannot simply be reduced to dual national identities and the operation of transnational networks as conduits for flows of migrants, money, religious impulses, and so on, in both directions. This viewpoint informs new
kinds of policy discussions that see immigrant poverty and sending-country (under-) development as two sides of the same coin. The vantage point of immigrants’ countries of origin has begun to come to the fore; scholars examine how labor-sending states shape migrants' global trajectories and how they too contend with reconfigurations of nationalism and citizenship. Countries of emigration are increasingly invested in both facilitating out-migration and encouraging their (former) citizens' sustained linkages with the "homeland." On a related theme, scholars in the sociology of religion, recognizing religious life as transnationally constituted, recast Christianity in relation to the ways in which Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, as articulated in the West, inform homeland religious experiences and identities. Key works: Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton Blanc (1994); Bauböck (2003); Faist (2000); Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller (2003); Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004); Morawska (2007); Portes (2003); Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004).

**Methodological cosmopolitanism.** Methodological cosmopolitanism criticizes the methodological nationalism that has long dominated the social sciences because of the latter’s severe conceptual limitations in explaining the multi-dimensional changes associated with globalization. Associated primarily with Ulrich Beck and flourishing above all in the UK, methodological cosmopolitanism focuses on the preconditions and resistances to the emergence of new socio-cultural entities transcending the “national” as the main cultural principle of societal and political action, a process designated as cosmopolitanization. This concept highlights interactive processes between the global and the local that may result in the denationalization of state practices; research from this perspective seeks to show how cosmopolitan principles are translated into actual dispositions and become institutionally embedded. The goal is to free concepts related to “modern society” of the limitations of a national ontology – the axiomatic assumption of the nation-state as the unit of analysis – by re-examining, reconceptualizing, and empirically establishing the transformed concepts within the alternative epistemological horizon of a cosmopolitan social science. Critics of methodological cosmopolitanism take it to task for going too far in its insistence on the decline of the national unit and for its polemics directed against such non-cosmopolitan but remarkably vigorous phenomena as multiculturalism and polyethnicity, arguing instead that only methodological glocalism can adequately deal with the complex relationships between the global and the national. Key works: Beck (2001); Beck and Sznaider (2006); Delanty (2006); Levy and Sznaider (2005); Vertovec and Cohen (2003); Woodward, Skrbis, and Bean (2008); for critiques, see Holton (2005, 2007).

**Networks and network analysis.** Social network theory and methods are ideally suited to the study of global and transnational processes in which the relations between actors are of central importance. David Snyder and Edward Kick pioneered the application of networks analysis to global processes by providing empirical support for the core-periphery thesis of world-systems and dependencia theorists through an examination of trade between nations. David Smith and Douglas White later reconfirmed these findings, adding a valuable dynamic component to the analysis of global economic relations. Network analysis has also been used to chart relative rates of globalization and regionalization in world trade, and analysts have extended the research to linkages among global cities. The structure of other types of global networks (for example, telecommunications networks, the Internet, and air travel) have also been mapped. David Knoke and Jason Beckfield in particular have examined international political relations from a network perspective. Other researchers have turned from the analysis of existing structures to investigation of the processes involved in building up these structures. Michael Sacks, Marc
Ventresca, and Brian Uzzi found that structural autonomy plays an important if transitory role in determining a nation’s trade status; network contagion spreads similar policy approaches between nations; and structural position affects firms’ rates of international expansion. Additionally, economist James Rauch has made several important contributions to our knowledge of the effect of social networks on international trade. Key works: Alderson and Beckfield (2004); Barnett (2001); Beckfield (2008); Beckfield and Alderson (2006); Dorogovtsev and Mendes (2003); Grofman and Landa (1983); Guimerà, Mossa, Turtschi, and Amaral (2005); Kim and Shin (2002); Knoke (1990); Koka, Prescott, and Madhavan (1999); Martin, Swaminathan, and Mitchell (1998); Rauch (2001, 2007); Rauch and Cassella (2001); Sacks, Ventresca, and Uzzi (2001); Shin and Timberlake (2000); Smith and Timberlake (1995); Smith and White (1992); Snyder and Kick (1979).

Organizations. Global and transnational sociology’s study of organizations considers institutions, structures, and forms of organizations that have a global character or that have developed as elements of or in response to transnationalization. These organizations are normally trans-territorial (deterritorialized), for example, international NGOs, transnational social movement organizations, diaspora networks, and transnational corporations. Studies of global and international organizations typically focus on the most prominent bodies: IGOs like the UN, IMF, World Bank, and WTO; INGOs like Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Third World Network, and World Vision; mammoth corporations like Shell, WalMart, and Freeport-McMoRan. Studies of less well known IGOs and INGOs organizations are increasingly common, however. Key questions addressed include the impact of transnational organizations on state identity, interests, behavior, and sovereignty; the operations and governance of the global economy; and processes of constructing world culture via transnational – especially, global – organizations. Analysts of transnational organizations also contribute to discussions of global civil society, transnational activism, migration, and the meaning of community and identity. How local organizations are influenced by globalization, and how local organizations (can) have global impact, are also sites of inquiry into issues such as development, security, terrorism, and industrialization. Methodologies range from ethnographic fieldwork to comparisons of national survey data. Key works: Abrash (2001); Babb (2007); Barkin (2006); Barnett and Finnemore (2004); Boli and Thomas (1999); Brunn (2006); Charnovitz (1997); Diehl (2005); Florini (2000); Fox and Brown (1998); Harvey (2006); Karliner (1997); Korten (1995); Nadelmann (1990); Peet (2003); Salamon, Sokolowski, and Associates (2004); Smith and Wiest (2005); Transnational Corporations (journal); Wilkinson (2006).
Notes

1. John Boli took primary responsibility for drafting this proposal, greatly aided by the contributions on specific topics of numerous founding members: Maria Schmeeckle, children; Malcolm Fairbrother, economic globalization; Simone Pulver, environment; April Linton, fair trade; Seungsook Moon, gender and sexuality; Cecilia Santos, human rights; Kim Scipes, labor; Peggy Levitt and Robyn Rodriguez, migration; Jackie Smith, social movements; Daniel Levy, methodological cosmopolitanism; Emily Erikson, networks and network analysis; Heather Hurwitz, organizations. The comments and suggestions of Julia Adams, Malcolm Fairbrother, Glenn Firebaugh, John Meyer, George Ritzer, Roland Robertson, Ino Rossi, and George Thomas were invaluable in revising the proposal.
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2. In the proliferating literatures of transnational and global sociology, these terms are interpreted, not surprisingly, in a great many ways. We do not think it essential for the purpose of forming a new section to review or contrast the many different meanings associated with the terms, nor do we think it useful to attempt to formulate definitions that would surely be inadequate and controversial.

3. One major perspective, world-systems theory, provides the foundation for the Political Economy of the World-System section and will therefore be left aside.