

UNCHARTED TERRAINS

The University of Arizona Press  
© 2013 The Arizona Board of Regents  
All rights reserved

www.uapress.arizona.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Uncharted terrains : new directions in border research methodology, ethics, and practice /  
edited by Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Colin M. Deeds, and Scott Whiteford.

pages cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8165-3055-7 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. United States—Emigration and immigration.
2. Emigration and immigration—  
Government policy—United States.
3. Border security—United States—Research.
4. United States—Boundaries—Mexico—Research.

JV6465 U43 2013

325.73—dc23

2013009922

This research was supported by the United States Department of Homeland Security through the National Center for Border Security and Immigration under grant number 2008-ST-061-B50002. However, any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of Homeland Security.



Manufactured in the United States of America on acid-free, archival-quality paper containing a minimum of 30% post-consumer waste and processed chlorine free.

18 17 16 15 14 13 6 5 4 3 2 1

*This book is dedicated to Raquel Rubio Goldsmith, whose lifelong struggle for social justice has been an inspiration to all who know her, and whose love of science and methodology provided us with the illuminating vision for this book.*

*The editors thank the following research assistants for their invaluable efforts in organizing the Border Research Ethics and Methodologies workshops, conference, and manuscript:  
Lisa Gardiner, Adrian Mendoza, and Azucena Sanchez.*



# Contents

Preface xi

Introduction 1

*Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Colin M. Deeds, and Scott Whiteford*

## Part I. The Big Picture

1. Vulnerable Immigrant "Subjects": Definitions, Disparate Power, Dilemmas, and Desired Benefits 25

*Jessie K. Finch and Celestino Fernández*

2. The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Border Research Collaboration 53

*Kathleen Staudt*

3. Dilemmas in Immigration Policy Research 69

*Judith Gans*

## Part II. The Border as an Unstable Place

4. On Shifting Ground: The Conundrums of Participant Observation and Multi-Actor Ethnography in Contemporary Border Research 83

*Rocío Magaña*

5. Methodological Challenges and Ethical Concerns of Researching Marginalized and Vulnerable Populations: Evidence from Firsthand Experiences of Working with Unauthorized Migrants 101

*Daniel E. Martínez, Jeremy Slack, and Prescott Vandervoet*

6. *Entre Los Mafosos y La Chota: Ethnography, Drug Trafficking, and Policing in the South Texas–Mexico Borderlands* 121  
*Santiago Ivan Guerra*

7. *Shaping Public Opinion on Migration in Mexico: The Challenges of Gathering and Proving Information for the National News Media* 140  
*Manuel Chavez, Scott Whiteford, and Silvia Nuñez Garcia*

### Part III: Fieldwork among Entrapped Communities

8. *Researching Women's Vulnerability and Agency with Regard to Sexually Transmitted Diseases during Migration through Altar, Sonora: Methodological and Ethical Reflections* 167  
*Katherine Careaga*

9. *Reflections on Methodological Challenges in a Study of Immigrant Women and Reproductive Health in the U.S.–Mexico Border Region* 184  
*Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Gloria Cita Valdez-Gardea, and Azucena Sánchez*

10. *Women, Migrants, Undocumented Business Owners: Methodological Strategies in Fieldwork with Vulnerable Populations* 206  
*Erika Cecilia Montoya Zavala*

11. *Research on Oppressed Communities* 222  
*Pat Rubio Goldsmith*

### Part IV: A Fence on Its Side Is a Bridge

12. *Methodological and Ethical Implications in the Design and Application of the Mexican Household Survey in Phoenix, Arizona (EHMPA 2007)* 233  
*Blas Valenzuela Camacho*

13. *Lessons for Border Research: The Border Contraceptive Access Study* 249  
*Jon Amastae, Michele Shedlin, Kari White, Kristine Hopkins, Daniel A. Grossman, and Joseph E. Potter*

14. *Social Research and Reflective Practice in Binational Contexts: Learning from Cross-Cultural Collaboration* 265  
*Jack Corbett and Elsa Cruz Martinez*

*Conclusion* 275  
*Scott Whiteford, Anna Ochoa O'Leary, and Colin M. Deeds*

*Code of Personal Ethics for Border Researchers* 283

*Editors* 285

*Contributors* 287

*Index* 293

# *Introduction*

Anna Ochoa O'Leary, Colin M. Deeds,  
and Scott Whiteford

## **Foundations**

With rapidly changing patterns of migration, violence, and boundary enforcement, border regions are quickly becoming transformed. In the process, a range of actors are also transformed, among them researchers who then contribute to the reformulation of ideas and practices. This dynamic process reveals new prospects, missed opportunities, and new methodological and ethical challenges. However, while the foregoing is true of most all research, some very unique concerns arise along tension-laden international borders and because of them, researchers find themselves increasingly navigating uncharted terrains: The chapters in this book offer a sampling of the issues contemplated by and experienced by scholars from different fields, who, in the course of designing and completing their projects, contribute to our understanding of the dynamics of research. It is a way of looking under the hood, so to speak, of knowledge production. Moreover, beyond the mechanics of research, many who work on transborder themes routinely navigate significant ethical considerations. Intricately woven into their efforts is the conspicuous relationship between the knowledge and understanding that research provides and the design of policies that impact communities and families. In the balance, we argue, are researchers' ethical responsibilities to funders and other stakeholders, the academic institutions under whose auspices they work, and affected populations. Also conspicuous is that in spite of the fact that publishing

is such an important part of the academic process, researchers are rarely encouraged or required to reflect critically on their methodologies and those processes by which often contradictory priorities and values are reconciled. Indeed, as Bilger and Van Liempt (2009a: 1–2) note, the relative lack of publications on the topic points to serious dilemmas associated with very personal methodological and ethical questions. Herein lies this volume's contribution. With both public and private universities becoming increasingly dependent on support from nonpublic funding sources, researchers' ethical responses to public concerns may be compromised (Carofalo and Geuras 2006). In fact, stakeholders may reflect competing priorities and interests that contradict each other, resulting in ethical dilemmas. For example, the Border Research Ethics and Methodology (BREM) workshops and conference—through which the papers for this volume were collected—were supported by a Center for Excellence Grant from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, a powerful governmental agency whose mission includes securing the nation's air, land, and sea borders and enforcing U.S. immigration laws. In this case, as investigators for the project, we had to consider how our research agendas might continue to attend to the concerns of the communities we worked with and the ways in which these did not quite align with funding objectives centered on achieving greater enforcement.

As in our case, the quest for methodological ethical clarity begins with how contemporary globalization has cast doubt on older approaches to scientific inquiry. These more conventional approaches often assume the enforceability of political boundaries; they often assume that processes taking place within national boundaries can be easily separated from those outside (Wimmer and Schiller 2003). Referred to as methodological nationalism, these scholarly conventions rely on the idea of the nation-state as a “container” of social phenomenon. This tendency has traditionally shaped social science thinking about governance and institutions (Wimmer and Schiller 2003: 579). Paralleling significant historical events (such as conquests or war), methodological nationalism has served to validate popular ideas about nationhood, national identity, and sovereignty. Up until World War II, social science research in the United States also reflected a nation-building paradigm premised on the idea that borders were fixed, and where movement across borders was an exception to the rule rather than the norm. The essays in this volume refute this notion in various ways.

Beginning with invigorated globalization in the 1980s, the older perspectives have been demonstratively negligent in addressing the history

and dynamics of how modern nations evolve out of their interconnectedness to other nations. Moreover, this framework for analysis has been further weakened by contemporary realities, by the incremental and sustained social, political, and economic exchange relationships that link local communities within the nation-state to those outside its boundaries (Levitt 1998). This dynamic has contributed to the reordering of ordinary lives and familial relations; in the process, those who are displaced become entangled and altered by the state (Greenhouse 2002). This dialectic explains the robust scholarly focus on the topics of migration, mobility, diasporas, transnational communities, and immigration as topics of scholarly inquiry. Ultimately, these foci belie the model of national boundedness, and researching them is a stark reminder that borders are fragile and that movement across them is a common if not inevitable force of history and human development. It follows then that border and immigration researchers contribute to the reformulation of theory, practice, and intellectual enterprise that might be perceived as not conforming to the nationalism paradigm. Moreover, by unsettling the conventional nationalism paradigm promoted by political and nationalistic discourse, these scholars increasingly direct the public's gaze toward the nation's extant diversity that has largely come about through cross-border movement (Wimmer and Schiller 2003). These are just a few ways that ethical and methodological considerations distinguish those whose research is carried out with feet planted on both sides of the border.

Another phenomenon—the militaristic approach to boundary enforcement (Dunn 1996)—has had an immense impact on the communities with whom these researchers are engaged. Policies related to boundary enforcement have historically emanated from the nation's interior (in Washington and not the border) and these have largely focused on regulating the movement of goods and people (Heyman, Morales, and Nuñez 2009). However, intertwined within these developing policies are residents of the border with long but varied connections to it and the region, resulting in variances in immigration status (O'Leary and Sánchez 2011). History notwithstanding, since the 1980s, the United States has initiated greater efforts to develop systems for control of migration from Mexico (Heyman and Ackleson 2009; Shirk 2003). Heyman and Ackleson (2009) point out that even before the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001, almost all of the resources targeted for border enforcement went toward increasing the number of U.S. Border Patrol agents and upgrading operational equipment in sectors along the U.S.–Mexico border. These measures, beginning with the Southwest Border Strategy in 1993, included the building of

walls between the two countries in urban areas. The system of border wall constructions became better known as *Operation Hold the Line* in El Paso, Texas (in 1993 and 1997), *Operation Gatekeeper* in San Diego, California (in 1994), *Operation Safeguard* in Nogales, Arizona (in 1995), and *Operation Rio Grande* in Brownsville, Texas (1996). It is also important to point out, as Heyman and Ackleson do, that the purpose of the enforcement efforts of the pre-9/11 period that realized massive concentrations of energy and material resources on the border was not to identify specific potential terrorist activity but rather to slow the movement of millions of unauthorized immigrants from Mexico.

At the same time, political discourse dehumanizing Mexican migrants has supported the state's gradual seizure of greater power to enforce boundaries. This discourse has been amplified by media reports depicting the U.S.-Mexico border region as lawless and unrestrained, and Mexican immigrants as criminals (Santa Ana 1999). Santa Ana (1999) has examined how print media texts helped frame the 1994 political debate and the campaign in California over an anti-immigrant referendum, Proposition 187. He makes clear the relationship between the less-than-human representations of immigrants and the support mustered for a policy measure aimed at restricting immigrants' access to social welfare programs (Inda 2006). This tendency to dehumanize and criminalize foreigners became especially contentious after the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center when a highly charged debate over national security and the nation's flawed immigration system heated political clamor to secure the nation's borders once and for all.

The ensuing outcome of this acrimony was the growing perception that immigrants were the natural enemies of the state (Wimmer and Schiller 2003). Consequently, in the post-9/11 environment, enforcement policy initiatives that had not received much traction gained political momentum and became viable (Heyman and Ackleson 2009). In this post-9/11 context, a host of legislative measures followed, such as the *Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001* (better known as the U.S. Patriot Act). These in turn subjected a larger number of populations to policing and gave new meaning to the word "vulnerable." Furthermore, even though these measures were created to apply specifically to noncitizens whose mere presence potentially represented a crime and an affront to the territorial boundedness of the state (Barsky 2009), with greater frequency their application also engulfed citizens, including the U.S.-born children of immigrants (O'Leary and Sanchez 2011). The legislative measures have

been countered by innovative ways of circumventing them in an endless cycle, aggravating existent social divisions based on ethnicity, race, and language (Romero 2008; Goldsmith, Romero, Goldsmith, Escobedo, and Khoury 2009). These developments complicated the research process in ways not imagined by university institutional review boards (IRB) for the protection of human subjects, the oversight mechanism that obligates researchers to observe established ethical standards for the conduct of human research. At the same time, in the wake of 9/11, research dollars have shifted away from economic security and quality of life issues toward military preparedness and defense (Garofalo and Geuras 2006). These changes have normalized armed responses as immigration enforcement tactics, in turn producing reformulations of migrant agency vis-à-vis state power. The new policies have created a troublesome tension between researcher compliance with the objectives dictated by the state, along with defense-related industry and technology, and the expectations and inherent values of the academy as a public institution that privileges the nurturance of democracy, global awareness, and moral agency (Garofalo and Geuras 2006). Accordingly, the U.S.-Mexico border engages many scholars who must navigate the new terrain wrought by displacement and turmoil, more than ever fraught with growing clandestine activity (Erfani 2009; Heyman 1999), violence (Slack and Whiteford 2011), and political wrangling. Perhaps Magaña (this volume), in alluding to this as a metaphoric "shifting ground," says it best:

As researchers try to comprehend border phenomena, the challenge at hand is to study the practices that give rise to the border as a social field—which may include border crossing and policing, migrant smuggling and rescue, injuring and healing, exposing and protecting—without exposing practitioners to undue risk and danger.

For research projects in which the primary mode of data gathering involves personal interaction with the subjects within social fields that are in disarray—such as those produced by displacement, clandestine and illicit activity, and turmoil—specific ethical dilemmas warrant special methodological attention (Greenhouse 2002). The chapters in this volume demonstrate how researchers are often preoccupied by their responsibilities toward participants who are in the midst of turbulent, transnational displacement (Hannerz 1998; Wimmer and Schiller 2003). While codes of professional conduct provide researchers with a template of appropriate action, once out in the field, operating precepts are frequently tested, and

often invite renegotiation (Manderson and Wilson 1998: 215). For this reason it is incumbent upon researchers to be aware of ethical principles and assure that these are honored.

In the pages that follow, we highlight the ways in which research might be subjected to a wide range of border-related contingencies. Relatively few works provide discussions about the difficulty of experiences, and how these impact results, inherent biases, and ethical and methodological issues of researchers' positioning (Bilger and Van Liempt 2009a: 2). To address this gap, two workshops and a conference on Border Research Ethics and Methods (BREM), organized in 2009 and 2010, brought together researchers whose primary focus was the border and immigration. They were asked to use a case study approach to analyze their particular experiences and in so doing highlight important ethical and methodological moments, negotiations, and lessons learned. From these two workshops, a broader call for conference papers on the topic, the BREM conference, was developed. After the BREM conference in April 2010, conference and workshop participants were asked to submit their papers to be considered for publication. Of those that were submitted, the editors accepted a selection of papers that provided intimate reflections on issues posed by the choice of methods or on the ethical dilemmas contemplated during the course of their research. While some of the illustrations overlap, researchers weigh in on different factors in varied ways. They all offer fragments of larger success stories and point to the broader implications of the intellectual exercise for the modern research process and for the gathering of policy-relevant data about how transnational activity and state power increasingly collide (Greenhouse, Mertz, and Warren 2002). In the sections that follow, we draw attention to some of the central methodological issues and ethical themes found in the book, before highlighting the individual contributions to timely and ongoing discussions.

## The Methodological Issues and Ethical Themes

### Research Methods

With increased interest in border enforcement policies and violence, researchers are contributing to a rich body of empirical evidence that captures social realities of the border and immigration. However, positioning themselves to depict emerging conditions is a complex undertaking. This book presents a sampling of different methodological approaches from

various fields. Anthropological methods and techniques are represented, as are case study, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches. The chapters illustrate the challenges of collecting and extrapolating data. It is important to point out that useful methodological trends include multidisciplinary research not just within the social sciences but also linking to law, public health, and other fields. Interdisciplinary approaches have a rich tradition in border research, especially in the arena of environmental research (López Hoffman, McGovern, Varady, and Friessa 2009).

The chapters in this book offer crucial insights into how the aforementioned political and policy developments have affected local communities, and thus the researchers' engagement with them (Heyman, Morales, and Nuñez 2009). In contexts where research participants are displaced persons and in particular those labeled as "illegal" or "undocumented," appropriate methodologies consider the buildup of enforcement that makes data gathering increasingly sensitive. Following Heyman (in press), the essays in this book help make a case for the argument that research and its methodological considerations are not distant intellectual exercises but rather a part of an ongoing stream of reflexive, moral thinking in which researchers with extensive social science expertise engage with local, underserved communities and local problems.

Conventionally, a project might be conceived by delimiting a social field, or population. However, where populations are in transit and therefore no longer defined by their social boundaries, this approach poses a dilemma (O'Leary 2008). For researchers doing quantitative research, it also raises issues of sampling. Those engaged in qualitative research face another problem: how to gain the trust of potential research participants where the time to develop relationships is limited. In addition, the same rapidly emerging policy changes that have contributed to a research participant's vulnerable status can further complicate research once it has begun. For one example, in her contribution to this volume, Erika Montoya reflects on the methods employed for obtaining information about undocumented Mexican women who owned or worked in hair styling businesses in a metropolitan area of Arizona just at the time when greater scrutiny over the employment of undocumented immigrants began. She shows how combinations of both qualitative and quantitative methods allowed researchers to adjust to the greater anxiety generated by the enforcement climate in the state. In this case researchers were forced to broaden the population frame that was the focus of the study to include all female stylists who were willing to participate. This slight change from the original research design resulted from trends toward harsher measures aimed



at detecting undocumented or unlicensed employees. The book contains other examples in the chapters by Goldsmith, Corbett and Cruz Martínez, and O'Leary and colleagues that describe how researchers must be increasingly sensitive to emerging punitive social and political climates. Such conditions may add to respondents' reluctance to divulge information that might reveal the identity of someone who resides and works in the United States without official authorization.

How fear influences research has been little studied. In an early article, Cornelius (1982) addressed some of the methodological compromises involved in designing projects for populations that may be fearful of reporting self-incriminating information regarding immigration status. This conundrum is no less true today (see Corbett and Cruz Martínez, this volume) where vulnerable populations may require "more stringent proof of good faith" that researchers will maintain high standards to minimize the possible adverse impact of their studies on the respondents (Manderson and Wilson 1998: 215).

In terms of both theory and practice, contributors to this volume reflect responsibilities and commitments to contending cross-sectors of society. In addition to the conventional list of stakeholders (business, government, and civic groups with constituencies that are likely to be impacted by policies), a growing number of projects include immigrant-serving organizations that advocate for powerless and marginalized (and therefore undeserved) communities (Heyman, Morales, and Nuñez 2009; see also the Goldsmith and Staudt chapters in this volume). For academics, the implications of collaborating with stakeholders are complex, as the chapter by Goldsmith demonstrates. They must weigh the possible consequences of sharing information across competing sectors against the opportunities for civic engagement that might enhance the ability of decision makers to resolve rival solutions (Heyman, Morales, and Nuñez 2009). Similarly, many contributors to this book reflect the difficulties of taking a social justice stance in their research while also perceiving their findings to be necessary for formulating policy.

Research and its dissemination thus serve as mechanisms that operate under the assumption that an informed public will ultimately press for problem-solving policies, and by doing so, advance democracy (Hayes 2009). Indeed, researchers consistently respond to important and controversial topics like Arizona law SB1070, which supports local law enforcement officials' efforts to enforce immigration law and codifies racial profiling (Chin, Byrne, and Miller 2012). Simultaneously, heightened anti-immigrant discourse and current profiling practices pose new

methodological challenges for researchers driven by ethical imperatives to uncover facts that threaten social harmony and peaceful coexistence. Predictively, as greater concentrations of economic and commercial wealth continue their upward spiral (Reich 2010), those outside the political system will be even less taken into account. This prospect calls out to researchers who, as committed intellectuals with a concentration of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1998), are well positioned to analyze social phenomena, including the impact of discursive attacks (O'Leary and Romero 2011), and offer alternative explanatory narratives and solutions (Heyman, Morales, and Nuñez 2009).

### *Ethical Themes*

Our review of the BREM conference papers revealed a rich body of work that can be used to illustrate and discuss some of the ethical considerations that buoy border research practices. According to Andre and Velasquez (1987), ethical behavior operates at two levels. At the most fundamental level, it revolves around a reasonable expectation of what constitutes right and wrong, which, in turn, prescribes what humans ought to do. At this level, the idea of what rights people have help determine what is just and virtuous. Beyond this are standards of ethical behavior established collectively and, in some way, codified by a group. For example, the American Anthropological Association has a code of ethics that is routinely revised by members of the organization. At this group level, BREM workshop participants engaged cooperatively to develop a personal code of ethical conduct for border research, a working document that we include at the end of the volume. Our discussion of general ethical issues thus includes examples of research that necessarily consider dealing with intersecting clandestine activities such as human smuggling, smuggling contraband across borders, or entering the United States as "illegal" or "undocumented" immigrants.<sup>1</sup> According to Bilger and Van Liempt (2009a: 11), ethical standards in social science research are based on three principles: respect for human dignity, justice, and beneficence. These concepts are commonly found in the guidelines provided by U.S. research institutions through their review boards or committees that oversee research design and researcher conduct. In this regard, the papers in this collection reflect these ethical concerns and, in addition, capture the context where potent immigration enforcement programs are premised on the supremacy of national sovereignty and a discredited subject—a process that increasingly relies on promoting differences and distrust of people based on immigration status,

gender, ethnicity, and race. With each intersecting division, insecurity and vulnerability grow, leaving researchers increasingly contending with confidentiality issues and a heightened awareness of how, by obtaining sensitive information, they automatically become “bearers of secrets” (Bilger and Van Liempt 2009a). Several authors raise the importance of protecting the hard-earned trust given to them by the researched, who may be understandably suspicious and fearful of those asking questions. These examples help generate questions and discussions about choices researchers need to consider in weighing the potential benefits of research against actions that may harm.

An ethical commitment to social justice and human rights runs throughout the book, reflecting rights-based or justice-based approaches to research practice (Velásquez et al. 1996). According to Velásquez and colleagues (1996), a rights-based approach to research resides in the acknowledgment of the fundamental human right to be free from injury by the research or its products. The justice-based approach rests on questions about the fairness of an action and whether the impact of the research is disparately distributed. In much the same way, border scholars grapple with harmful conditions and suffering that are already unequally distributed along the social divisions present in society. Discriminatory and unequal social structures, known as “structural violence” (Galtung 1969), have been blamed for the hardships that drive migration (Farmer 2003), and ultimately explicate how the poor are disproportionately subjected to violence at the hands of bandits (O’Leary 2009a), their often unscrupulous guides (O’Leary 2009b), and narco violence (Slack and Whitford 2012) as they make their way to the United States in search of not only economic improvement, but also survival. Not surprisingly, such ethical concerns for the systematic abuse, extortion, privation, and death that hundreds of migrants face each year have been raised by many scholars researching borderland phenomena (Cornelius 2001; Goldsmith et al. 2006; Eschbach et al. 1999; O’Leary 2008; Hinkes 2008).

Many of the contributors to this volume demonstrate the ethical obligation to share information with community members with whom they have worked in their research. They argue for a common good approach to ethics. Velásquez and colleagues (1996) write that this approach to ethics assumes that society is comprised of individuals linked inextricably by what is good for the whole community. The common good approach thus encourages researchers and communities outside the academy to recognize and further those goals they have in common. Accordingly, some of the chapters illustrate a range of ethical preoccupations about collaborative

activity between researchers, community groups, and border crossers. We invite readers to examine all of the chapters with an eye to the variety of ethical issues addressed by the contributors, including sociocultural variations in the principles that guide them through the research process (Corbett and Cruz Martínez, this volume; Whiteford and Trotter 2008: 9).

### Organization of the Volume

The book is organized into four parts: part 1, “The Big Picture”; part 2, “The Border as an Unstable Place”; part 3, “Fieldwork among Entrapped Communities”; and part 4, “A Fence on Its Side Is a Bridge.” The chapters in part 1 introduce some of the broader questions and issues posed by research in the border region. For example, immigrant vulnerability is a recurrent theme found in many of these chapters. So it follows that in “Vulnerable Immigrant Subjects: Definitions, Disparate Power, Dilemmas, and Desired Benefits,” Finch and Fernández expand on the discussion of the power dynamics that contribute to vulnerability as “any person or group who can be easily taken advantage of due to the disparate power relations present in the context of the specific research project.” The authors raise concerns about how researchers can appropriately document the many ways in which populations are made vulnerable as well as how research might ultimately benefit subject communities. Another recurrent theme is the importance of collaborative relationships. Whether it is with community immigrant rights organizations or other academic institutions, researchers consistently seek out and cultivate these vital relationships. For example, in “The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Border Research Collaboration,” Staudt examines the creation of research opportunities shaped by cross-border community organizations and other collaborative activities and explores what good collaboration is. As Staudt notes, “good collaboration” is difficult to measure and, perhaps because of this, is under evaluated. Institutions offer no clear way for measuring the input of time and energy when community participation is a central feature of the research process. A series of vignettes, “the good, the bad, and the ugly,” registers both benefits and challenges of community collaboration (e.g., navigating bureaucracies, differing regulatory procedures, and expectations), providing us with illustrations drawn from invaluable experience. Here, the ethical and methodological concerns center on operational transparency, and are exalted as key for building trust and for finding common ground shared by binational partners.

Many of the contributors reflected on the research process, one of the most salient of the BREM conference themes. In this regard, Gans's chapter critically discusses how research issues are framed, alerting us to the importance of safeguarding the integrity of the research process from agendas that are politically motivated. Her sensitivity to this issue is sure to resonate with borderland researchers who work in an environment where heated immigration policy debates are constant. For this reason, she argues, researchers should routinely reflect critically on how framing might problematize both reported facts and policy issues. She begins her essay with important questions, encouraging researchers to resist buckling to political pressures and ideologies in the interest of introducing moral and ethical concerns into the political debate.

Part 2, "The Border as an Unstable Place," highlights the issues arising from research in environments that are fragmented and unstable. In such environments, there is a dire lack of "effective mediating institutions or established routines . . . even within state agencies" (Greenhouse 2002: 2). The improvised nature of such places exposes tensions in the social fabric, as well as the systemic gaps in legitimized mechanisms for maintaining order and authority, for example when legal protection is systematically denied to those populations confronting conditions of extreme physical and psychological duress. Magaña's experience zooms in on such an environment where research can often be disrupted. In her chapter, "On Shifting Ground: The Commundums of Participant Observation and Multi-Actor Ethnography in Contemporary Border Research," she reflects on her ethnographic research to raise ethical concerns about having uneven access to legal protection and issues of representational fairness. While there are international agreements to protect political refugees, economic migrants are routinely neglected.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the terms under which researchers and research participants—as both citizen and subjects—engage on the ground with each other and in the public sphere are changing. Magaña's ethnography emerges as a methodology of exploration and interpretation of this litigious and socially unstable zone of social and state interaction where migrants are simultaneously entangled and abandoned.

Knowing beforehand about the conditions that await migrants is something researchers Martínez, Slack, and Vandervoet wrestled with. In their chapter, "Methodological Challenges and Ethical Concerns of Research Marginalized and Vulnerable Populations: Evidence from Fishhand Experiences of Working with Unauthorized Migrants," they describe in detail the mixed-methods research that reveals how migrants may struggle for days out in the desert, often falling ill from exhaustion, injury, or

dehydration. Psychological duress produced by unspeakable assaults to their dignity adds to migrants' pain. However, the compounding effect of multiple border-crossing attempts is skillfully captured by careful research design and planning that is attentive to both the rigors of science and humanitarianism. Preoccupations stem from the heightened awareness of migrant vulnerability, and concern for researcher safety in multiple data gathering sites that are witnessing an escalation of violence as drug cartels become enmeshed with human smuggling.

Issues of researcher safety raised by Martínez and colleagues summon greater appreciation of the final chapter in this section by Guerra, "Entre Los Mafiosos y La Chota: Ethnography, Drug Trafficking, and Policing in the South Texas–Mexico Borderlands." Challenging enough under most circumstances, research in the thick of rising narco violence in the South Texas–Mexico borderlands is infinitely more complicated. In this chapter Guerra also raises the enduring insider/outsider dilemma of conducting ethnographic research on drug trafficking. Key to this research are conventional anthropological techniques that have traditionally included strategies for building rapport with informants. These have been a keystone of most ethnographic fieldwork. However, the issue arising from borderland instability is filtered through the perspective of a "native anthropologist." Conventional anthropological approaches have long reflected preference for research that immerses the researcher amid the unfamiliar, and questions the effectiveness of insiders in conducting research. According to this critique, in being too intimately connected (by sharing the same ethnic origin and language) to the subject culture and community, insider anthropologists may risk taking for granted the significance of many social and cultural processes. Others contend that research by insiders predisposes them to emotional involvement, resulting in biased results (Bitlger and Van Liempt 2009b). In reflecting on this issue while completing fieldwork in his community, Guerra also recognizes some of the unique advantages that this type of research may provide: access to a large pool of research informants, established rapport and entrée into the community, an ability to speak to informants about taboo subjects, and the ability to quickly identify important informants who can help the researcher make the most of his or her time in the field. In a community where queries about illicit activities might be unwelcomed and might endanger social scientists, other unique advantages include the knowledge of whom and what to ask. In Guerra's analysis, the advantages are somewhat offset by a series of ethical dilemmas, posed simultaneously and in the course of maneuvering through the different roles in the community (as kin, friend,

and neighbor), while remaining true to his role as a scientist and observer, in a part of the world already under high surveillance.

What we know of the border is also largely infused by media reports, and in this regard, journalists very often provide the first reports and images that shape our perceptions of the border, and often at great risk. In the chapter by Chavez, Whiteford, and Niñez Garcia, the authors focus on the development of journalistic practices of the Mexican news media, enriched at times by academic insight and practices. In fact, the authors credit the long-standing moral imperative of migration research scholars on the Mexican side of the border with stimulating journalistic interest on the topic. This has contributed to a diversity of views and migrant stories and voices that ultimately inform the public, thus helping shape public opinion. This scholar-journalist fusion has offered important counter-narratives of the border as monolithically perilous and chaotic; but while the authors argue that it is incumbent on journalists to offer balanced and a bilateral approach to border reporting, “resisting the temptations of sensationalism” is unfortunately easily undermined by a chronic neglect of the state peripheries by the distant centers of power.

The chapters in part 3, “Field Work among Entrapped Communities,” are grouped to illustrate the methodological and ethical dimensions of working in and among populations that defy, albeit covertly, politico-legal attempts to control their movement. Núñez and Heyman (2007) refer to this process by which populations are immobilized by government forces as “entrapment,” and such conditions have significant methodological and ethical implications for those who research these quasi-hidden populations. Conceptually, although immigrant populations suffer great “inequality of movement” (Núñez and Heyman 2007: 354) with increased policing, they also exhibit a great deal of agency and resourcefulness to circumvent movement controls. In this regard, this volume contains an excellent example by Careaga, whose reflexive ethnography is implicitly ethical (Greenhouse 2002), as she considers her responsibilities as a researcher during her fieldwork in a remote migrant staging outpost, where migrants await the arrangements made by smugglers to take them into the United States. Her research aligns well with Hamner’s (1998) suggestion for conceptualizing transnational research in which, in many cases, the social field is delimited—albeit temporarily—by impeded mobility (see also O’Leary 2008; 2009). It is in this interstitial space, carved out by precariousness and the unknown, that Careaga demonstrates how iterative observations function as a methodological tool for working in isolation through difficult ethical issues and help her deal with these issues as they arise.

Recorded as field notes, this fieldwork technique proves to be critical for the analysis and interaction with populations made acutely vulnerable by their impending undercover journey through the Sonoran desert, toward an existence of living in the shadows of the United States.

Picking up from this important staging place and time, the chapter by O’Leary, Valdez-Gardea, and Sanchez addresses several related methodological and ethical issues that emerged from the research conducted in a binational research project in Altar, Sonora (where Careaga’s research also took place), and Tucson, Arizona. The goals of the research included the documentation and analysis of the reproductive health-care strategies of those they term “im/migrant” women and their access to reproductive health care services in these two sites. In Tucson, Arizona, with the state’s growing antagonism towards immigrants, entrapment is a quotidian struggle. The methodological problem that arises is that of recruiting participants for the study amid the fear that increased policing invokes. As researchers grow increasingly sensitive to these fears, they consider their impact on the resultant sample, and resultant answers to questions that respondents provide. Interestingly, this conundrum resonates with the dilemmas faced by Montoya Zavala and described in her chapter, “Women, Migrants, Undocumented Business Owners: Methodological Strategies in Fieldwork with Vulnerable Populations.” This chapter, like the one by O’Leary and colleagues, describes contending with respondents’ apprehension and reluctance to divulge information that may place them at risk of punitive policy measures. The researchers in these two cases were influenced by the political sensitivity and the precarious lives of their respondents (Manderson and Wilson 1998). The resultant data must thus be analyzed within the overarching conditions of entrapment. In the same vein, the chapter by Goldsmith summarizes survey research and data analysis in two studies of the conditions faced by unauthorized migrants from Mexico who reside in the United States. To be sure, asking respondents within two “entrapped” communities about information that could be incriminating raised issues of confidentiality. Added to this were concerns raised by the immigrant advocacy organization that requested the research in the first study about protecting the rights of the community it served. As a result, great care was taken to design a survey instrument that did not contain any data that could be traced to individuals, and this included formulating questions that could not be used in combination with others to identify individuals. In the second study, the examination of secondhand data, disconnected from information that could be linked to individuals, provided a unique opportunity to answer questions about

injustice that had not been asked very often by those using quantitative methods about the relationship between racial profiling and legal status. Consequently, the study succeeded in revealing the perspectives of the oppressed silenced by policing, and enabled researchers to engage in a process of envisioning a better future.

Part 4 takes as a point of departure the central object that has preoccupied BREM participants, both materially and symbolically. Indeed, the border wall separating the United States from its neighbor Mexico has served as a flash point for activists, border residents, officials, entrepreneurs, and the media. It is on the border wall separating Nogales, Arizona, from Nogales, Sonora, that someone—perhaps inspired by other graffiti—lent his or her perspective on the matter by writing, “A fence on its side is a bridge.” These words reflect more than an opinion. They appeal to the imagination, an alternative logic, and a way of envisioning a solution through metaphor. These words also capture an idea that threads the chapters together in this final section of the book, which centers on triumph over barriers posed by international borders, boundary enforcement, and nationalism, to strengthen connections between researchers, communities, and stakeholders from both sides.

Valenzuela Camacho, from the Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa (UAS), discusses his research in “Methodological and Ethical Implications in the Design and Application of the Mexican Household Survey in Phoenix, Arizona (EHMPA 2007).” In this study, the author describes research conducted in Arizona, and the difficult task of locating and surveying a specific immigrant population, *sindioesnes* living in Phoenix, many of whom are undocumented. Working from basic statistical sources (U.S. Census records), he has been aided by organizations such as the Latino Health Council and the National Alliance for Hispanic Health, along with the Mexican Consulate in Phoenix and a small army of UAS students. The team has built on research by other UAS researchers who have over the years, created inroads and bridges (to continue with the metaphor), to enjoin compatriots living abroad. These students from the Department of International Studies and Public Policy received training and were provided with a uniform specially designed to make their identity, their origin, and their institution clear to potential respondents. Thus, elements of coethnicity and familiarity with a well-known Mexican institution of higher learning alleviated concerns of distrust amid anti-immigrant hostilities in Arizona, resulting in a very low rate of refusals during the survey research.

A mirror example comes from “Lessons for Border Research: The Border Contraceptive Access Study” by Amastae and colleagues from the University of Texas—El Paso, who point out the limitations of using community health workers (*promotores*) for their research. In this regard, they have a slightly different perspective on the use of coethnicity for enhancing research goals, and the reader can compare this chapter with the discussion of insider/outsider dilemmas addressed in the chapter by Guerra in part 2 of the book. Having supervised community health workers in a multyear and binational research study, Amastae and colleagues caution that there are both advantages and disadvantages to incorporating community health workers who are “insiders” to gather data from subjects within their own community. Whereas the very characteristics that enable their success in the field (such as having personal acquaintances, a common language, and knowledge of community dynamics and interaction style) are desirable and valuable (see also the chapter by O’Leary, Valdez-Gardea, and Sanchez), other less advantageous factors may impact outcomes. This cross-border research, designed to explore the use of contraceptives across the U.S.–Mexico border, also revealed a mismatch between community health workers and academically trained researchers responsible for the management of a research study. It is largely accepted that better data are acquired through reciprocal relationships. The authors call for greater discussion of how personal and even emotional involvement as an “insider” might pave the path toward greater in-depth knowledge.

Following the overarching “researcher as bridge” theme of this section, a perceptive case study of the challenges of binational scholarly collaboration is offered by the coauthored chapter by Corbett (Portland State University) and Cruz Martínez (Centro Médico Nacional de Occidente). Aptly titled “Social Research and Reflective Practice in Binational Contexts: Learning from Cross-Cultural Collaboration,” this chapter looks at two cases of binational research team efforts. As this chapter illustrates, successful binational collaboration depends on understanding and overcoming institutional cultural differences forged by bureaucracies and educational systems. The authors examine one case on the Mexican side of the border and one on the U.S. side. Both cases illustrate how institutions of higher education structure both opportunities and frustrating obstacles for collaboration. Among one of the important lessons from this chapter is that as researchers, we often need to be creative, and be the bridge that connects Mexican institutions and researchers with the “near sacred” protocols necessitated by institutional review boards in the United States.

## Final Considerations

As Garofalo and Geuras (2006) argue, the fundamental task of institutions of higher learning is to create and sustain coherence between the academy and society. However, as this book resoundingly demonstrates, more than coherence, conviction is needed to address the ethical and methodological issues that should define the relationship between scholarship and the pressing issues of today. The rich variety of approaches to methodological and ethical issues discussed by contributors to this book underscores the evolving development of scholarship addressing the movement of people and ideas across borders and the policies that enhance or impede them. In the border region, for many researchers engagement with the world around them has increasingly led to the investigation of policies and perspectives that impact the achievement of greater social justice for populations progressively more discredited due to migration and legal status. This volume offers a snapshot of that educational and intellectual process that engages the challenges and difficulties scholars have experienced in implementing their research.

As the BREM project progressed and the collection of papers developed, the advantage of binational spaces for research became ever clearer. However, one of the limitations of achieving a truly binational collaboration and audience comes from the need to have both Spanish and English versions of published texts. The cost of translation to produce a publication in both English and Spanish is certainly a challenge in a time of budget constraints. In spite of this, we agree that whenever possible, every effort should be made to support the elusive goal of binational publishing. Many scholars from the border region as well as those who research border issues are bilingual and increasingly publish in both languages. The Mexican SNI (Sistema Nacional de Investigación) has moved to give incentives to Mexican scholars who publish internationally. In addition, institutions that engage in border research, especially the Colegio de la Frontera Norte (COLEF) and the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), including its Centro de Investigación de América del Norte (CISAN), publish in both English and Spanish. The Colegio de Sonora (COLSON) has also fostered cross-border scholarship through publications in Spanish and English. In many ways, Mexican social scientists have been more proactive than their U.S. counterparts in promoting publication in both languages. Comparative and cross-border collaborative research also proves challenging. A final recurring theme among the

papers relates to issues of binational collaboration that the authors tease out. They agreed on the many factors that offer opportunities and that facilitate cross-border collaboration based on shared interests. However, they point to a longer list of factors that hinder it. We are encouraged that several chapters in this volume are the products of research between researchers from institutions on both the United States and Mexican sides of the border. We look forward to a new era of international collaborative research that transcends barriers, while maintaining sensitivity and respect for the many regional variations, cultures, and topographies that we know as the U.S.–Mexico border.

## Notes

1. Although both of these terms are imprecise and their meanings are varied, there are real and symbolic consequences for those who are labeled as such. For most living in the United States, it means that they entered the country without inspection (at a place other than a port of entry) and are thus present in the country without authorization. Others may have entered legally but subsequently overstayed the term limit of their visas. Either way, as unlawful residents they are not entitled to employment or public benefits and increasingly are the focus of law enforcement scrutiny. For an in-depth discussion of the various terms used historically, see Plascencia (2009).
2. For example, international agreements that provide for the safe and orderly repatriation of Mexican nationals, signed in 1997 and 2009 by U.S. Border Patrol officials and officials from the Mexican State of Sonora, “*Procedimientos para la Repatriación Segura y Ordenada de Nacionales Mexicanos*,” are routinely ignored (O’Leary and Sanchez 2011). In addition, the results of a survey undertaken by a community-based organization of more than 13,000 Mexican nationals who had been held in short-term Border Patrol custody (No More Deaths, 2011), documents the overwhelmingly systematic abuse of power by U.S. authorities.

## References

- Andre, Claire, and Manuel Velasquez. 1987. What Is Ethics? *Issues in Ethics* 1, <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/ie/v1n1/whatis.html>.
- Basky, Robert F. 2009. Methodological Issues for the Study of Migrant Incarceration in an Era of Discretion in Law in the Southwestern USA. In I. Van Liempt and V. Bilger, eds. *The Ethics of Migration Research Methodology: Dealing with Vulnerable Immigrants*. Pp. 25–48. Brighton, England: Sussex Academic Press.
- Bilger, Veronica, and Ilse Van Liempt. 2009a. Introduction: Methodological and Ethical Concerns in Research with Vulnerable Migrants. In I. Van Liempt and V. Bilger, eds. *The Ethics of Migration Research Methodology: Dealing with Vulnerable Immigrants*. Pp. 1–24. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.



- . 2009b. Methodological and Ethical Dilemmas in Research among Smuggled Migrants. In I. Van Liempt and V. Bilger, eds. *The Ethics of Migration Research Methodology: Dealing with Vulnerable Immigrants*. Pp. 118–140. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. The “Globalization” Myth and the Welfare State. In *Acts of Resistance: Against the Tyranny of the Market*. New York: The New Press.
- Chin, Gabriel J., Carissa Byrne, Hessick, and Mark L. Miller. 2012. Arizona Senate Bill 1070: Politics through Immigration Law. In O. Santa Ana and C. González de Bustamante, eds. *Arizona Firestorm: Global Immigration Realities, National Media & Provincial Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cornelius, Wayne A. 1982. Interviewing Undocumented Immigrants: Methodological Reflections Based on Fieldwork in Mexico and the U.S. *International Migration Review* 16(2): 378–411.
- . 2001. Death at the Border: Efficacy and Unintended Consequences of U.S. Immigration Control Policy. *Population and Development Review* 27(4): 661–685.
- Dunn, Timothy J. 1996. *The Militarization of the U.S.–Mexico Border, 1978–1992: Low-Intensity Conflict Doctrine Comes Home*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Efami, Julie A. Murphy. 2009. Crime and Violence in the Arizona-Sonora Borderlands. In K. Staudt, T. Payan, and Z. A. Kruszewski, eds. *Violence, Security, and Human Rights at the Border*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Eschbach, Karl, Jacqueline Hagen, Nestor Rodríguez, Rubén Hernández-León, and Stanley Bailey. 1999. Death at the Border. *International Migration Review* 33(2): 430–454.
- Farmer, Paul. 2003. *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research* 6(3): 167–191.
- Garofalo, Charles, and Dean Geuras. 2006. *Common Ground, Common Future: Moral Agency in Public Administration, Professions, and Citizenship*. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis.
- Goldsmith, Pat, Mary Romero, Raquel Rubio Goldsmith, Miguel Escobedo, and Laura Khoury. 2009. Ethno-Racial Profiling and State Violence in a Southwest Barrio. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 34(1): 93–124.
- Goldsmith, Raquel Rubio, Melissa M. McCormick, Daniel Martínez, and Inez Magdalena Duarte. 2006. A Humanitarian Crisis at the Border: New Estimates of Deaths among Unauthorized Immigrants. In *Immigration Policy Center*. Washington, D.C.: Immigration Policy Center.
- Greenhouse, Carol J. 2002. Introduction: Altered States, Altered Lives. In Carol J. Greenhouse, Elizabeth Mertz, and Kay B. Warren, eds. *Ethnography in Unstable Places*. Pp. 1–36. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Greenhouse, Carol J., Elizabeth Mertz, and Kay B. Warren, eds. 2002. *Ethnography in Unstable Places*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1998. Transnational Research. In H. R. Bernard, ed. *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. London: Sage.
- Hayes, Wayne. 2009. The Public Policy Cycle Web Site Vol. 2012, ©Wayne Hayes, Ph.D.,™ ProfWork. <http://profwork.org/pp/study/define.html>, accessed August 9, 2012.
- Heyman, Josiah McC. 1999. United States Surveillance over Mexican Lives at the Border: Snapshots of an Emerging Regime. *Human Organization* 58(4): 430–442.
- . N.d. “Political-Ethical Dilemmas Participant Observed.” In Carl Maida and Sam Beck, eds. *Public Anthropology in a Borderless World*. Berghahn Press, forthcoming.
- Heyman, Josiah McC., Maria Cristina Morales, and Guillermina Gina Nuñez. 2009. Engaging with the Immigrant Human Rights Movement in a Besieged Border Region: What Do Applied Social Scientists Bring to the Policy Process? *NAPA Bulletin* 31: 13–29.
- Heyman, Josiah McC., and Jason Ackleson. 2009. United States Border Security after September 11. In John Winterdyck and Kelly Sundberg, eds. *Border Security in the Al-Qaeda Era*. Pp. 37–74. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Hinkes, Madeline J. 2008. Migrant Deaths along the California–Mexico Border: An Anthropological Perspective. *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 53(1): 16–20.
- Levitt, Peggy. 1998. Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-level Forms of Cultural Diffusion. *International Migration Review* 32(4): 926–948.
- Manderson, Lenore, and Ruth P. Wilson. 1998. Negotiating with Communities: The Politics and Ethics of Research. *Human Organization* 57(2): 215–216.
- Markova, Eugenia. 2009. The “Insider” Position: Ethical Dilemmas and Methodological Concerns in Researching Undocumented Migrants with the Same Ethnic Background. In I. Van Liempt and V. Bilger, eds. *The Ethics of Migration Research Methodology: Dealing with Vulnerable Immigrants*. Pp. 141–154. Brighton: Sussex.
- Núñez, Guillermina Gina, and Josiah McC. Heyman. 2007. “Entrapment Processes and Immigrant Communities in a Time of Heightened Border Vigilance.” *Human Organization* 66(4): 354–365.
- López-Hoffman, Emily D. McGovern, Robert G. Varady, and Karl W. Fliessa. 2009. *Conservation of Shared Environments: Learning from the United States and Mexico: the Edge, Environmental Science, Law and Policy*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- O’Leary, Anna Ochoa. 2008. Close Encounters of the Deadly Kind: Gender, Migration, and Border (In)Security. *Migration Letters* 15(2): 111–122.
- . 2009a. The ABCs of Unauthorized Border Crossing Costs: Assembling, Bailleurs, and Coyotes. *Migration Letters* 6(1): 27–36.
- . 2009b. In the Footsteps of Spirits: Migrant Women’s Testimonios in a Time of Heightened Border Enforcement. In K. Staudt, T. Payan, and Z. A. Kruszewski, eds. *Violence, Security, and Human Rights at the Border*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- O’Leary, Anna Ochoa, and Azucena Sánchez. 2011. Anti-immigrant Arizona: Ripple Effects and Mixed Immigration Status Households under Policies of Attrition Considered. *Journal of Borderland Studies* 26(1): 115–133.
- O’Leary, Anna Ochoa, and Andrea J. Romero. 2011. Chicano/a Students Respond to Arizona’s Anti-Ethnic Studies Bill, SB 1108: Civic Engagement, Ethnic Identity, and Well-being. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 36(1): 9–36.
- Plascencia, Luis. 2009. The “Undocumented” Mexican Migrant Question: Re-examining the Framing of Law and Illegalization in the United States. *Urban Anthropology* 38(2–4): 378–344.

- Reich, Robert B. 2010. *Aftershock: The Next Economy and America's Future*. New York: Vintage.
- Romero, Mary. 2008. The Inclusion of Citizenship Status in Intersectionality: What Immigration Raids Tells Us about Mixed-Status Families, the State, and Assimilation. *International Journal of the Family* 34(2): 131–152.
- Santa Ana, Otto. 1999. "Like an Animal I Was Treated": Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in U.S. Public Discourse. *Discourse & Society* 10(2): 191–224.
- Shirk, David A. 2003. Law Enforcement and Security Challenges in the U.S.-Mexican Border Region. *Journal of Borderland Studies* 18(2): 1–24.
- Slack, Jeremy, and Scott Whiteford. 2011. Violence on the Arizona-Sonora Border. *Human Organization* 70(1): 11–21.
- . 2012. Caught in the Middle: Undocumented Migrant Experiences with Narco Coyotaje, Backpacks and Bandits. In Tony Payan, ed. *The Many Labyrinths of Illegal Drug Policy*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Velasquez, Manuel, Claire Andre, Thomas Shanks, and Michael J. Meyer. 1996. Thinking Ethically: A Framework for Moral Decision Making. *Issues in Ethics* 1. <http://www.seu.edu/ethics/publications/files/7n1/thinking.html>.
- Whiteford, Linda, and Robert Trotter II. 2008. *Ethics for Anthropological Research and Practice*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2003. Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37(3): 576–610.

---

## The Big Picture

---

### PART ONE