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Abstract

Race and Making America in Brazil: How Brazilian Return Migrants Negotiate Race in the US and Brazil

by

Tiffany Denise Joseph

Co-Chairs: Alford A. Young Jr. and Sarah A. Burgard

This dissertation explores how US immigration influenced the racial conceptions of Brazilian returnees, individuals who immigrated to the US and subsequently returned to Brazil. Since Brazil was once regarded as a multi-racial utopia and represents a very distinct social environment when compared to the US, the dissertation objective was to learn how returnees adapted to the US racial system and if they “brought back” US racial ideals to Brazil upon returning. I conducted semi-structured retrospective interviews with 49 Brazilian returnees in Governador Valadares, Brazil, the country’s largest immigrant-sending city to the US to explore how these individuals perceived and navigated racial classification and relations in Brazil and the US before, during, and after the US migration. To more effectively isolate the influence of immigration for returnees, I also interviewed a comparison group of 24 non-migrants.
Findings suggest that returnees relied on a transnational racial optic to navigate the US racial system as immigrants and to readapt to the Brazilian racial system after returning to Brazil. I use the term “transnational racial optic” to demonstrate how migration transformed returnees’ observations, interpretations, and understandings of race in Brazil and the US. Returnees felt the US racial system was characterized by more rigid racial classification, overt forms of racism, and pervasive interracial social and residential segregation compared to Brazil. The US migration also influenced returnees’ perceptions of racial stratification in both societies, particularly with regard to the socio-economic positions and behaviors of US and Brazilian blacks.

After the US migration, most returnees were not conscious of how their racial classifications or perceptions changed, although the results indicate shifts in their racial and skin tone classifications over the course of the migration. Furthermore, returnees felt that they did not remit US racial ideals to Brazil after returning. While both returnees and non-migrants thought racism existed in Brazil, returnees, after having lived in the US, were more cognizant of the structural manifestations of racism than non-migrants. This suggests that returnees’ observations of race in the US influenced their perceptions of race in Brazil post-migration, which is indicative of the transnational racial optic.
Chapter 1
Introduction

I filled it out [Census form]. Yes, they asked [for my racial classification] and I put white because I wasn’t Hispanic or Latino. [The form] had Hispanic, white, black, there wasn’t an option for me specifically. Even though in Brazil, I considered myself white, there [in the US] for them [the Americans] I am not white because white there is blue eyes and blonde hair.

–Renata, white woman, 46 years, New York¹

Because when they [Americans] look at you, they know, they know that you’re not American. (quirks) I don’t know how they know, but...if you speak English [with a foreign-sounding accent] like in America, they know you are not American. I don’t know why.

-Amanda, white woman, 33 years, Massachusetts

Increasing immigration to the United States in the last fifty years has had a significant impact on the population’s racial and ethnic diversity. Although the US historically has been predominantly white and black, the 2000 US Census revealed a population that has become increasingly racially nonwhite since the majority of recent immigrants have come from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean.² While these immigrants bring with them hopes for a brighter future, they also come with conceptions of race from their countries of origin, which are not easily shed and may influence their perceptions of and incorporation into US society. In the US, race is a primary mode of social organization and the social construction of race has created widespread social

¹ Each quote includes the participant’s pseudonym, self-ascribed open-ended racial classification at the time of the interview, gender, age at the time of the interview, and their US state of residence while living in the US.
² In this dissertation, Latin America refers to all countries in South America and includes Spanish-speaking countries and territories in the Caribbean.
inequality between whites and people of color since the nation’s inception (Feagin 2000; Omi and Winant 1994). Feagin (2000) argues that the black-white racial binary is the foundation of US race relations and is the ruler by which other racial and immigrant groups are measured. Therefore, immigrants who come to the US enter a racially polarized social context.

The quotes at the beginning of this chapter provide recollections of how Brazilian return migrants, or Brazilians who immigrated to the US and subsequently returned to Brazil, negotiated race while living in the US as immigrants. The ideas captured in Renata and Amanda’s quotes suggest a reconfiguration in the US of self-ascribed racial classification that differed from their racial self-classifications in Brazil, as well as recognition of how ―Americans‖ identify foreign others.

While race is a strong structuring factor for US residents, race and racial classification in immigrants’ countries of origin may be very different from those in the US, which means immigrants must learn how to negotiate race in their new context. According to Landale and Oropesa (2002):

“Not only must migrants adapt to change in their status from majority group member to minority group member; they also face pressure to redefine themselves in terms of the black-white dichotomy that delineates race relations in the U.S.” (pg. 234).

Such a process of redefinition may be challenging for immigrants who never before have classified themselves using rigid racial terms, particularly for those who come from Latin America, which has a history of more socially-accepted racial mixing that has resulted in populations with a diverse range of physical racial markers, such as skin tone and hair texture (Landale and Oropesa 2002; Roth 2006; Duany 2002; Itzigsohn 3

3 I will also use the word “returnees” to refer to Brazilian return migrants throughout this study.
et. al 2005). Brazil, once considered a racial utopia compared to the US because of its perceived harmonic interracial relations, is such a country. Whereas one’s ancestry and physical features are generally the basis for classification into a single specific racial group in the US, such characteristics may signify different racial classifications in Brazil and other Latin American countries. Renata’s quote clearly demonstrates how her physical features are considered white in Brazil although she is considered nonwhite in the US. Thus, Renata and other Latin American immigrants come to the US with a different understanding of race and must adjust to existing racial classifications and race relations upon arrival. As Latinos are currently the largest ethno-racial minority in the US and do not easily fit into the historical black-white racial binary, it is important to explore how immigrants from Latin American countries, more specifically Brazil, adapt to race in the US.

Brazil is the Latin American country of interest in this study for three reasons. First, there have been various comparative studies of race in the United States and Brazil that have explored the unique racial characteristics of these countries (Degler 1986; Marx 1998; Telles 2004; Bailey 2009). Brazil and the US are two of the largest countries in the Americas and share a history of European colonization, Indigenous conquest, and African enslavement. Yet, the social construction of race has unfolded very differently in each context, motivating studies that explored how the racist US differed from Brazil’s multi-racial paradise. Second, as the largest slave-holding societies in the Americas, Brazil and the US have large African-descended populations. The majority of African slaves imported to the Americas were sent to Brazil. Even after the abolition of the Atlantic

\[4\] Chapter two includes a discussion of how the social construction of race developed in each country.
Slave Trade, African slaves were still illegally imported to Brazil, which was last country in the Americas to abolish slavery in 1888. Thus, Brazil’s African-descended population is significantly larger than its US counterpart (Telles 2004). In fact, it has been argued that Brazil has the world’s second largest-African descended population after Africa (Telles 2004; Martes 2007). Finally, this research is also motivated by the increase in Brazilian immigration to the US in the last thirty years. Brazil’s economic recession in the 1980s with its high unemployment and inflation rates encouraged significant emigration for employment purposes to the US, Canada, and Japan (Goza 1999; Margolis 1994; Takenaka 2000). Since that time, Brazilians have migrated to the US in large numbers, yet there had been very little research examining their experiences until the mid-1990s.

Given the plethora of comparative race research on Brazil and the US and the growth of Brazilian immigrant communities in the US, a study exploring how Brazilian immigrants come to understand race in the US is warranted. The primary goal of this dissertation is to comparatively explore the social constructions of race in Brazil and the US through the observations, perceptions, and experiences of individuals who have lived in each country for an extended period of time. While other comparative studies have relied on survey and historical data to understand how race and racism “work” on a macro-level in each society, I examine how individuals make sense of and negotiate race in both countries at the personal level. Because Brazilian immigrants are one of the most recent immigrant groups to the US and extensive return migration has been documented among this group, Brazilian return migrants are the ideal group for such a study. As individuals who were racially socialized in Brazil, they entered the US with a different
perception of race and encountered a racial system that relied on more rigidly defined racial categories and groups and appeared to be more overtly racist than Brazil.

Furthermore, upon leaving the US, Brazilian return migrants go home with a different mindset that has been shaped by their experiences abroad. Migration between both countries facilitates comparisons between migrants’ quality of life in Brazil and the US that make it difficult to readapt to life in post-migration Brazil (Margolis 2001). Margolis (2001) argues that “some returnees become people in-between [who] are not entirely satisfied with life in either country” (pg. 243). Thus, if their mindsets are “changed” by living in the US, it is possible that US migration also facilitates a change in these individuals’ racial conceptions in Brazil after the US migration. I define racial conceptions as a set of ideas that help individuals understand how social actors, in this study Brazilian returnees, negotiate race in a particular context. In this study, I operationalize these conceptions in three ways using data from respondents’ experiences of: (1) racial classification, (2) observations, perceptions, and experiences of racism or racial discrimination, and (3) an understanding of how race functions on a societal level. For example, Brazilian return migrants in this study negotiated racial conceptions in the US through: (1) their personal, professional, and miscellaneous interactions with other Brazilians, other immigrants, and native born US citizens, and (2) their “consumption” of US culture through television, music, and newspapers.

This dissertation examines how exposure to racial systems in the United States and Brazil influences the racial conceptions of Brazilian return migrants in three contexts: (1) in Brazil before the US migration; (2) in the US as immigrants; and (3) in Brazil after
the US migration. To comparatively explore race in the US and Brazil via Brazilian return migrants’ racial conceptions, I address two major questions in this study:

(1) How does immigration to the US change racial conceptions for Brazilian return migrants while they are living in the US and after returning to Brazil?

(2) Do return migrants “bring back” racial ideals from the US and if so, what impact does extensive US migration have on racial relations in returnees’ communities?

To address these research questions, I rely on data obtained from semi-structured interviews with 49 Brazilian return migrants and 24 non-migrants (Brazilians who never migrated) in Governador Valadares, Brazil, a city of 250,000 residents in the South Central state of Minas Gerais. Governador Valadares (GV) has historically been Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city to the US. Emigration to the US has so heavily influenced the local economy that the city has been famously nicknamed by Brazilians as “Governador Valadolares,” as in US dollars. About 15 percent of GV residents, also known as Valadarenses, are estimated to be living in the US and nearly 80 percent of Valadarenses have at least one relative residing in the US (CIAAT 2007; Margolis 1998). Additionally, return migration to GV after the US migration has been heavily documented (Marcus 2009; Assis and de Campos 2009; Martes 2008; Siqueira 2008; CIAAT 2007; Siqueira 2006). The prevalence of US migration has created a constant flow of people, money, and culture between GV and the US, so much so that GV and particular US cities with large numbers of migrants from GV are considered transnational social fields or:
“... set[s] of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices, and resources are unequally exchanged, organized, and transformed... [that] connect actors through direct and indirect relations across borders” (Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004, 1009).

Because the majority of migrants from GV intend to return to their native city after the US migration, they maintain social and economic ties while living in the US. Valadarenses generally immigrate to the US to work for two to five years to earn and save as much money as possible for the purpose of purchasing a home and car or starting a business upon returning from the US. This process has been referred to as “Fazer à América,” which translates in English to “making America” (Martes 2008; CIAAT 2007; Siqueira 2006). These migrants hope the US migration will facilitate upward social mobility and access to what they perceive to be a better or more “American” quality of life in GV after migration.

Governador Valadares was also an appropriate study site because most comparative race studies have focused on larger Brazilian cities such as Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, with less research conducted in smaller locales like GV. I lived in the city while conducting this research from October 2007 to October 2008, in the midst of the US presidential primaries that featured Barack Obama (the son of a Kenyan immigrant) as the first major black contender for the US presidency, an increase of deportations from the US back to Brazil, and the start of a major recession in the US (and therefore global) economy. This allowed me to gain a variety of perspectives from Valadarenses about the role of race, immigration, and the global economy in GV.

Because very little research has explored how exposure to two different racial systems (via international migration) may change how people think about race and
classify themselves and others in racial terms, this project will fill a significant gap in immigration and race literature in Brazil and the US. It also will contribute to researchers’ understanding of perceptions of racial (and/or skin tone) discrimination in Brazil and the US, racial classification, racial and ethnic identity formation, and how transnational migration influences racial conceptions for a growing, yet understudied immigrant group in the United States.

Additionally, the exploration of racial conceptions for this subset of individuals who are on the move between the US and Brazil also helps me develop a more nuanced argument about race as a social construction that varies from place to place. This is particularly true for the comparison of the US and Brazil, two countries with very distinct racial histories that are now experiencing shifts in racial discourses due to changing ethnic demographics (US) and the introduction of affirmative action policies (Brazil). The increase in rates of interracial marriage, introduction of an option to classify in more than one racial category on the US census, the dismantling of race-based affirmative action policies in the US and the recent election of Barack Obama as the first black (biracial) president of the United States have spurred debates about whether the US has now become a postracial society. Furthermore, the growth of the Latino population into the country’s largest ethno-racial minority and increased immigration from Latin America have had a significant impact on US demographics.

At the same time, to address racial inequality in Brazil, some universities and companies have begun to implement racial quotas to increase the representation of Afro-Brazilians in Brazil’s higher education system, which has been very controversial. Although nonwhites constitute nearly half of the Brazilian population, whites constitute
about 73 percent of university students (Telles 2004; Stubrin 2005; Bailey 2009). Due to the prevalence of racial mixing in Brazil and many white Brazilians’ acknowledgment of having black racial ancestry, the implementation of affirmative action has made it necessary to racially classify individuals (blacks) in a socially meaningful way to determine who can benefit from race-specific policies. This policy has facilitated discussions about an importation of US racial classification standards (Telles 2004; Araujo 2001; Fry and Maggie 2004; Maio and Santos 2005; Bailey 2009). Because both Brazil and the US are experiencing shifts in racial discourse as they relate to discussions of racial demographics, racial classification, and inequality, some researchers have argued that the US will undergo either a (1) “Latin-Americanization” of race in which existing racial boundaries will become more ambiguous or (2) shift from the traditional black-white racial binary to a black-nonblack binary in which existing racial boundaries will be realigned (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Skidmore 2003; Lee and Bean 2004; Yancey 2003). Other researchers suggest that the US and Brazilian racial classification systems are on “converging paths,” as each country’s racial dynamics seem to be resembling its counterpart (Daniel 2006; Bailey 2009):

It appears to be the case that racial dynamics in the United States and in Brazil are like two ships passing in the night, one showing signs of movement toward mixed-race framings and the other toward single-race identification (Bailey 2009, 8).

Thus, it is possible that just as Brazilians are moving back and forth across US and Brazilian borders, that racial ideals in each country are also being exchanged, which highlights the significance of this study in another way. If race in the US is becoming “Latin-Americanized,” it is important to understand how Latin Americans (in this study
Brazilians) conceive of race in their countries of origin and in the US if researchers are to understand how the social construction of race in the US may evolve in the future.

This study is also relevant because it explores how transnational migration influences how migrants negotiate race in receiving and sending societies. In recent years, many researchers have begun examining the effects of transnational migration on the socially symbolic practices of migrants as they relate to religion, culture, and gender relations, among other socially important domains (Levitt 2007; Levitt and Waters 2002; Pedraza 1991; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991). Such studies demonstrate that the transnational movement of bodies across geo-political boundaries also implies a movement of individuals’ internal social processes, which affects their perceptions and interpretations of the social worlds they encounter in their host societies. Furthermore, the majority of migration studies explore the impact and consequences of immigration on receiving societies. Yet, very little research examines how migration affects economic, social, and cultural processes in sending communities.

While previous migration studies in the immigrant-sending city of GV have documented the importance of social networks, the socio-economic impacts of migration in the city, and the US experiences of Brazilian immigrants, they have not explored the city’s racial demographics nor how race might influence the lives of Valadarenses when they go to or return from the US (CIAAT 2007; Levitt 2007; Siqueira 2009a; Soares 2002; Scudeler 2000; Goza 1999; Sales 1999a; Reis and Sales 1999). These studies also do not discuss how race relations in GV may have changed as a consequence of this circular migration. As the global economic trends that influence migration continue to change, it will be even more important to understand how migration affects the ways
individuals engage with the social world, particularly as it relates to racial, ethnic, national, and other relevant social identities in immigrant-sending and receiving societies (Massey and Sanchez 2007; Castells 1997; Glick Schiller, Basch, & Blanc-Szanton 1992).

The findings in the study are organized in the following chapters: to theoretically situate and frame the study results, Chapter two includes a review of the existing literature on the social constructions of race in Brazil and the US, the history of Brazilian immigration to the US, and transnationalism/ transnational migration studies. I also provide more detailed information about the historical and contemporary impacts of immigration on the city of GV. In Chapter two, I also introduce my theoretical framework of the “transnational racial optic” that will be used to situate my research findings. I define the transnational racial optic as a lens which Brazilian return migrants utilize to observe, interpret, and ascribe social meaning to race in the US while residing there, but also to readapt to race in Brazil after returning. My theoretical concept of the transnational racial optic demonstrates how encountering, incorporating aspects of, and/or resisting the US racial system during migration facilitates a change or shift in return migrants’ original pre-migration racial conceptions that influence how they understand race in Brazil post-migration.

In Chapter three, I thoroughly describe the methods used to conceptualize and conduct this research from entering the field to conducting interviews to doing data analysis. I also discuss some of the unique challenges I encountered conducting research on race in GV not only as a black American sociologist, but one who “looks Brazilian.” I
conclude the chapter by discussing my use of certain race-related terminology and contextualizing the findings in light of research limitations.

In Chapters four and five, I discuss how Brazilian return migrants in the study negotiated race while they were in the US as racialized immigrants. While Chapter four focuses on returnees’ personal experiences negotiating racial classification and experiences of racial and anti-immigrant discrimination, Chapter five explores their recollections regarding race in US society with regard to their perceptions of the positionality of US blacks vis-à-vis Brazilian blacks and extensive social and residential segregation in the US compared to Brazil. In presenting these findings, I show how the transnational racial optic allowed returnees to negotiate racial classification and relations in the US via the lens of the Brazilian racial system.

Whereas Chapters four and five explore returnees’ racial conceptions when they were in the US, Chapters six and seven focus on how Brazilian returnees negotiated racial and skin tone classifications and racial relations in Brazil, after having returned from the US. To more effectively contextualize these findings and elucidate comparisons, I incorporate data from the interviews I conducted with 24 non-migrants, each of whom was a close relative of one of the 24 return migrants. In Chapter six, I examine how returnees and non-migrants negotiated racial classification in Brazil as a social process by exploring how both groups “define” racial classification and what factors they use to racially classify themselves. I then investigate and compare returnees and non-migrants’ categorical racial classifications.

In Chapter seven, I explore returnees and non-migrants’ perceptions of racism in Brazilian society as it relates to the ideology of racial democracy and the social position
of Brazilian blacks. I also examine if and how returnees perceive that their racial conceptions have changed as an influence of the US migration. Finally, I conclude the chapter by discussing returnees and non-migrants’ thoughts about how extensive migration between the US and GV has affected racial relations in the city. I also discuss how the transnational racial optic seemed to be present in post-migration returnees’ racial conceptions with regard to the way they observed social inequality and racial relations in GV. Finally, the conclusion briefly reviews the findings from Chapters four through seven and discusses how they show or do not show evidence of the transnational racial optic. It also discusses the implications of this study for future research on race in Brazil, race in the US, and migration studies in the US and abroad.
Chapter 2
Background and Theoretical Framework

In order to establish the intellectual context and theoretical framework for this dissertation, this chapter reviews existing literature relevant to exploring the research questions with regard to: (1) the social construction of race in Brazil and the US; (2) racial socialization and identity formation; (3) the history of Brazilian immigration to the US; (4) racial conceptions among Brazilian immigrants in the US; and (5) transnationalism or theory regarding transnational migration studies.\(^5\)

Comparing the Social Construction of Race in the United States and Brazil

In recent years, there has been significant comparative research on racial classification and inequality in Brazil and the United States. Although both countries were the largest-slave holding societies in the Americas, the social construction of race has developed much differently in each society (Bailey 2009; Telles 2004; Bailey 2002; Marx 1998; Skidmore 1993).\(^6\) As the only country in the Americas to be colonized by the Portuguese, it has been argued that Brazil’s more “peaceful” transition to nationhood and

\(^{5}\) Due to scholarly criticism of the term transnationalism in migration studies, I use the term “transnational migration studies” to refer to migration studies that explore various facets of transnational migration.

\(^{6}\) In this dissertation, I refer to the social construction of race as the historical, cultural, and contextual process in which humans used phenotypical features (e.g. skin tone, hair texture, nose shape) to place individuals in racial groups and categories and ascribe differences to individuals on the basis of those racial groups. For more on the social construction of race, see Gossett (1967), Van den Berghe (1978), Omi and Winant (1994), Winant (2000), Bonilla-Silva (1997), Feagin (2000), McKee (1993).
to a slave-free society also played a role in the development of its cordial race relations, at least when compared to those of the US (Degler 1986; Marx 1998).\footnote{This is compared to the US where independence and civil wars were fought to achieve similar outcomes (Degler 1986; Skidmore 1993). The Portuguese royal family peacefully ceded nationhood to Brazil in 1822 and slavery was peacefully abolished in 1888. In the US, a violent independence war against Great Britain and a violent Civil War were fought to respectively gain independence and end slavery.}

While recent studies have shed more light on understanding differences in the racial systems in Brazil and the US, previous quantitative and comparative historical studies conducted in the 1950s through 1980s sought to explain the distinctive racial dynamics in each country (Degler 1986; Silva 1978; Hasenbalg 1979; Pierson 1967; Harris 1952; Fernandes 1965; Wagley 1952). Although these studies provided a more nuanced understanding of racial classification and inequality in Brazil, there have been debates among US and Brazilian scholars as to how racism has manifested itself in that country, particularly in light of the racial democracy ideology, which will be discussed in depth below.

The rule of hypo-descent, also known as the one-drop rule, has historically racially classified an individual with any black ancestry as black. This informal rule has been influential in shaping US race relations, created the black-white racial binary that became the basis for implementing racially discriminatory policies, and facilitated rigid racial classifications and the development of race-based identities among racial minorities (Feagin 2000; Davis 1991). In Brazil, the rule of hypo-descent did not influence race relations in the same way. Gilberto Freyre’s \textit{Masters and Slaves} (1933) introduced the racial democracy ideology, which encouraged Brazilians to embrace their African heritage and encouraged racial miscegenation or mixing between Brazilians of different
skin tones. Freyre’s conception of racial democracy also argued that since Brazilians were racially mixed, there could be no distinct racial groups and thus, no basis for racial discrimination in Brazilian society.

The ideology of racial democracy yielded more fluid racial classification for Brazilians who did not use race as a basis for legal discrimination after the abolition of slavery in 1888. Additionally, this racial classification system in Brazil acknowledged that while there were white and black Brazilians, there were also “browns” (known as pardos or morenos) who were considered to be an intermediate racial “group” situated between blacks and whites. Due to significant racial mixture in the population and the popularity of racial democracy ideology, “browns,” as an intermediate group, represented the ideal Brazilian phenotype. Degler (1986) argues that this racial classification system with an official “brown” category facilitated the “mulatto escape hatch” in which Brazilian browns were socioeconomically positioned between blacks and whites to ameliorate tense racial relations. Furthermore, Degler argues that the “mulatto escape hatch” is the primary difference between the US and Brazilian racial systems since the “one-drop rule” in the US ascribed black racial classification to all individuals with black ancestry and relegated them to lower and inferior social status in relation to US whites. Because Brazilian elites were staunch supporters of racial democracy ideology, it was
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8 Freyre published *Masters and Slaves* (*Casa Grande e Senzala*-Portuguese) and developed the racial democracy ideology after returning from the US where he studied under anthropologist Franz Boas at Columbia University in the 1920s. During that time, he also witnessed the legal discriminatory treatment of US blacks, which he noted did not exist in Brazil (Telles 2004).

9 I use “group” euphemistically here to refer to individuals who classify in these racial categories. However, I would like to emphasize that racial groups do not exist in Brazil as they do in the US. Bailey (2009) demonstrates that Brazilian racial categories generally refer to skin tone and are not indicative of a “group-based” identity.
quickly disseminated and gained broad support among the Brazilian masses (Skidmore 1993).

The positive emphasis on racial miscegenation in the racial democracy ideology came to be perceived as the solution to the racial unrest that had developed in other parts of the world, especially since racial democracy was conceptualized during the eugenics movements in the US and Western Europe which promoted white racial purity and superiority. Furthermore, due to the dissemination of white racial purity rhetoric by Hitler and the Nazi Party before and during World War II, the concept of racial democracy in Brazil caused that country to be regarded as a multi-racial paradise. Although racial democracy promoted a positive emphasis on racial miscegenation, the unstated goal of the ideology was to whiten the African “elements” of the population through racial mixing to create a Brazilian super “race” in which the African and Indigenous physical characteristics would be less visible (Dulitzky 2005; Skidmore 1993). Even in contemporary Brazilian society, Brazilians continue to more highly value lighter or whiter physical characteristics (e.g. skin tone, straight hair, light eyes) compared to darker or blacker ones (Bailey 2009; Telles 2004; Dulitzky 2005; Twine 1998).

Due to the ideology of racial democracy and having its image as a place where people of different colors peacefully co-existed, Brazil was considered a 20th century racial utopia when compared to the US, a country where overt, legally sanctioned racism had oppressed nonwhites for centuries. However, as various studies have increasingly documented extreme racial inequality in Brazil, the legitimacy of the racial democracy ideology has been challenged by academics and laypersons, particularly since researchers have assumed that embracing racial democracy facilitated a denial of racial

Furthermore, social class position, more so than race, has been considered an important factor in facilitating social inequality in Brazil although nonwhites in Brazil disproportionately have less favorable social outcomes than do lighter or whiter Brazilians (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009; Schwartzman 2007; Burgard 2002).

However, Bailey (2009) suggests that these challenges to racial democracy are possibly based on researchers’ misinterpretation of the ideology. Relying on survey data that explores racial attitudes among Brazilians, he argues that Brazilians acknowledge the existence of racism in Brazil and are aware that black Brazilians are the victims of such discrimination. Bailey suggests that Brazilians’ belief in racial democracy is not inconsistent with recognizing racism, but should be interpreted as a national ideal or goal for social inclusion to which Brazilian society strives. He compares it to the American creed based on principles such as democracy, freedom and justice or the Horatio Alger myth that anyone can accomplish the American Dream with hard work to which many Americans subscribe, in spite of persistent social inequality in US society. Sheriff (2001) who interprets racial democracy in a similar way argues that racial democracy:

> Summons the collectively-held notion of the moral force of a shared heritage, a common family, a unified nation. Racism is repugnant. It is immoral. It is, above all, un-Brazilian (pg.221 as cited in Bailey 2009, pg. 6)

Bailey and Sheriff’s interpretation of racial democracy in this sense may also correlate with Telles’ (2004) framework of horizontal and vertical relations for analyzing Brazilian race relations. Horizontal social relations refer to interpersonal relationships such as friendships, intermarriage, and residential proximity while vertical relations refer
to economic indicators such as income, education, and wealth. Telles finds that while Brazil has more cordial horizontal interracial relations, the country’s vertical relations are worse than in the US: “While Brazil’s fluid horizontal relations may be interpreted as signs of a less racist system, they also facilitate vertical racial domination” (232).

Therefore, in light of Bailey’s interpretation of racial democracy, it is possible for favorable racial horizontal relations to coexist with substantial vertical racial inequality in Brazil.

Because racial democracy ideology and racial mixing have received broad social acceptance in Brazil, racial classification and race-based group identities among Brazilians have been difficult for researchers to assess. Brazilians of all phenotypes acknowledge having African ancestry and almost half self-identify as racially mixed, not as solely white or black (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009). Furthermore, Telles (2004) posits that the Portuguese word for color, côr, is more commonly used to refer to race in Brazil and “is based on a combination of physical characteristics including skin tone, hair type, nose shape, and lip shape” (pg. 79). Because Brazilians generally associate race with actual skin tone, these skin tone classifications have not had social significance in facilitating group-based racial identities for Brazilians, who see themselves as Brazilians and not as part of a distinct racial group (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009; Piza and Rosemberg 1999; Silva 1996). According to Nogueira (1985):

The expressions “preto or negro group,” “white group” or “brown group” when used in relation to Brazil, connote primarily a sense of a grouping of individuals with this or that physical appearance rather than a sense of “social groups” (p.89 as cited in Bailey 2009, p. 60)
The absence of group-based racial identities among Brazilians is a significant contrast to racial identity development among Black, Native, Asian, and Latino Americans in the United States. Some researchers argue that the development of race-based identities in the US was a result of overt racial discrimination, which facilitated the social mobilization of racial minorities and yielded the Civil Rights Movement (Telles 2004; Marx 1998; Degler 1986). While the Civil Rights Movement was important for addressing racial inequality and solidifying racial and ethnic identities among minorities in the US, similar social movements in Brazil have not had the same impact. While there has been localized mobilization of black and Indigenous people in Brazil in recent years, the effects of such social movements have yet to culminate a national following that would result in more Brazilians asserting race-based identities instead of skin tone classifications (Bailey 2009; Telles 2004; Sansone 2003).

**Racial Socialization and Racial Identity Formation**

Brazilian return migrants I interviewed in this study were racially socialized in Brazil and also returned to that context after the US migration. For this reason, I briefly define racial socialization and review existing literature on racial socialization since it will contextualize and improve our understanding of the findings presented in the following chapters. While the majority of such research has been conducted in the US, socialization related to race and other social constructions occurs in all contexts irrespective of geopolitical borders, though there may be geographically and culturally specific differences in how socialization happens. Thornton et al. (1990) defines racial socialization as specific messages and practices that provide information regarding race
status as it relates to personal and group identity, intergroup and inter-individual relationships, and position in the social hierarchy. These messages can come from a variety of sources, including family members, instructors, or the media (Hughes et al. 2006; Anderson and Taylor 2005; Haney Lopez 1998; Twine 1997; Howarth 2002; Perry 2002; Abrams 2003; Phoenix and Brah 2004; Stevenson 1995). Therefore, racial socialization is an important social contextual factor that affects racial identity.

While socialization can occur throughout a person’s lifetime, adolescence is considered a pivotal time during which individuals discover, interpret, and decipher social meaning about who they are in the social world (Erikson 1959; Marcia 1966; Meeus 1996; Schlegel 1998). However, the primary and secondary socialization that occurs during adolescence can have a profound impact on racial identity development later in life, especially for racial/ethnic minorities in the US (Jenkins 1994; Quintana 1994, 2007; Helms 1995; Pahl and Way 2006; Whitesell et al. 2006). Factors such as US region of residence, immigration status, language, and the social construction of race in country of origin, all influence the social contexts in which immigrants in the US derive social meaning about race and racial identity.

Nonwhite immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean who vary in skin tone, hair texture, and other US racial markers are immediately racialized in US terms regardless of their ethnic backgrounds. Such racialization may constrain and influence not only the identity choices of these immigrants, but also affect how they understand race in the US. Because Brazilian immigrants are generally racialized as nonwhite in the US, this may affect how they racially classify themselves and others while living in the
US. Furthermore, living in the US may facilitate a re-socialization of race that influences migrants’ racial conceptions in their country of origin if and when they return.

**The Brazilian Immigrant Experience in the US**

The United States has experienced a significant amount of immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean and many studies have documented the immigration and assimilation experiences of ethnic groups such as Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Mexicans, Cubans, and West Indians. However, considerably less is known about Brazilian immigrants, whom Margolis (1994) once referred to as an “invisible minority” (Waters 1999; Falconi and Mazzotti 2007; Duany 2002). However, this has begun to change as their numbers have increased and their presence has become more visible in US society. In the last 15 years, various researchers have examined the situation of Brazilian immigrants in the US (Margolis 1994, 1998; Sales 1999a; Siqueira 2006; Jouet-Pastré and Braga 2008; Goza 1999; Soares 2002; Marrow 2003; Scudeler 2000; Martes 2000; Reis and Sales 1999; Martes and Fleischer 2003). Margolis’ (1994, 1998) ethnographic explorations of Brazilian immigrants in New York are now considered foundational studies that began to shed light on why and how Brazilians immigrated to the US.

Although Brazilians have been coming to the US (in smaller numbers compared to other immigrant groups) since the 1960s, their numbers increased significantly during Brazil’s economic crisis in the 1980s and continued to grow into the 21st century. In fact, for most of its history, Brazil had been an immigrant-receiving society, particularly in the early and mid 1900s (Skidmore 1993; Sales 1999a). However, the economic recession of
the 1980s facilitated Brazil’s transition from being an immigrant-receiving to an emigrant-sending country (Sales 1999a). Studies on Brazil-US migration cite the process beginning in Governador Valadares (GV), a small city in South Central Brazil, where US mining executives arrived with their families in the 1940s (Levitt 2007; Goza 1999; Sales 1999a; Margolis 1998, 1994; Sales 2003; Jouet-Pastre and Braga 2008; Martes 2000). When the industry declined in the 1960s, these executives returned to the US. Yet, one American family remained in GV, established an English School, and was responsible for starting a cultural exchange program that brought middle and upper class Valadarenses to the US in the 1960s (Siqueira et. al 2010). This initial group of immigrants established the social networks that would be influential in the Brazilian migration stream from GV, especially with the onset of Brazil’s economic crisis in the 1980s which facilitated immigration to the US, Japan, and Canada (Takenaka 2000; Goza 1999; Sales 1999a; Margolis 1994).

Since the 1980s, there has been circular migration between GV and US cities such as Boston (Framingham) and New York because it is not uncommon for immigrants to return to GV and subsequently migrate again to the US (Margolis 1994, 1998; Martes 2000; Siqueira 2006). Extensive emigration from GV to the US has resulted in the city’s dependence on the stability of the US dollar to sustain its economy, with economic remittances estimated at $2.4 billion in 2004, and the city has also been referred to as the “Town that Uncle Sam Built” (CIAAT 2007; Siqueira 2006; Levitt and de la Dehesa 2003; Brooke 1990). Additionally, a culture of migration exists in the city, which means most Valadarenses expect to migrate to the US at some point during their lives (Siqueira 2006). Many Valadarenses describe the possibility of temporarily living in the US as a
“sonho” or dream (Siqueira 2006). Although GV remains Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city to the US, Brazilians from other locales such as Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo among many others have immigrated to the US in recent years (Marcus 2009; Siqueira and Jansen 2008; Martes 2000; Assis 1999; Margolis 1998).

Brazilian immigrants come to the US primarily seeking better economic opportunities as do many other immigrant groups, yet various studies have documented extensive return migration to Brazil which ranges from 30 to 50 percent particularly in GV (Marcus 2009; Assis and De Campos 2009; Martes 2008; Siqueira 2008; CIAAT 2007; Siqueira 2006). As mentioned in Chapter one, the majority of migrants from GV intend to return since their goal is to “Fazer à América,” or “making America,” in Brazil after the US migration by improving their socioeconomic situation (Martes 2008; CIAAT 2007; Siqueira 2009a). Therefore, Brazilians view immigration as a means of social mobility since wages in Brazil, even for the well-educated, are very low. However, one factor that many of these immigrants, especially those with high educations and middle-class origins, must deal with upon migration is experiencing a downgrade in social status (Margolis 1994; Martes 2000; Sales 1999a; Fleischer 2002).

An additional concern for Brazilians (and other immigrants) at the current time is growing anti-immigrant sentiment and tightening immigration enforcement in the US and the onset of the US economic recession in 2008, which have prompted the return of many Brazilians as their jobs in the informal job sector, as housecleaners, cab drivers, dishwashers and construction workers, disappeared (Siqueira 2009b; Assis and De
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10 The 2010 Brazilian minimum wage is $267 per month (Nicolaci da Costa, Reuters 2009). This rate has risen since I first arrived in the field in October 2007.
An increase in return migration (due to deportations and voluntary returns) and the remittance of fewer US dollars to GV within the last few years have had a significant economic impact on the city (Siqueira 2009b). It has also become more difficult for Brazilians, especially those from GV, to obtain US tourist visas since they are perceived as potential undocumented immigrants by US immigration officials.

Additionally, conversations with Valadarenses during my most recent trip in June 2009 revealed that the high number of returnees is especially problematic since there are not sufficient jobs and resources in the city to accommodate these individuals. Furthermore, Siqueira (2009b) examines the economic consequences of the US recession on GV through the experiences of recent returnees who left the US after losing their homes due to subprime lending practices and jobs in the informal job sector. Siqueira refers to these recent returnees as “fugitives” of the US economic crisis who had no other choice but to return to GV.

The 2000 US Census estimated that 247,020 foreign-born Brazilians are living in the US, mostly in Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut (Martes 2008; Siqueira and Jansen 2008). However, due to their predominantly undocumented status and difficulty with US racial categories, researchers argue that the Brazilian immigrant population is severely undercounted (Margolis 1994, 1998; Jouet-Pastre and Braga 2008; Siqueira and
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11 Although Brazil has not been as severely affected by the US economic recession as other countries, GV’s ties to the US through immigration has had a negative impact on the city’s economy (Siqueira 2009b; Padgett and Downey 2009; Economist 2009). GV’s local economy is dependent upon US dollars remitted by immigrants in the US, which means GV’s economy prospers when the US economy is doing well, even if the Brazilian national economy is weaker. Conversely, when the US economy experiences a downturn, as in the current recession, the GV economy also suffers due to receiving fewer economic remittances.
Jansen 2008; Siqueira and Lourenço 2006). With regard to other social demographic characteristics, historically, Brazilian immigrants have mostly been better-educated than the general Brazilian population, range from working to middle class, and have been predominantly male (Sales 1999a; Goza 1999; Margolis 1998, 1994). They have tended to be less than forty years old and are lighter in skin tone than most Brazilians, with most self-classifying as white (Sales 1999a; Goza 1999; Margolis 1998, 1994). However, Jouet-Pastre and Braga (2008) and Souza (2004) argue that these trends may change as female, poorer (and probably darker-skinned) and less-educated Brazilians migrate to the US.

**US Racial Conceptions among Brazilian Immigrants**

Despite the recent emergence of research on Brazilian immigrants and comparative studies of race in Brazil and the US, few studies have examined how Brazilians negotiate race in the US, a country with rigid racial categories, strictly defined racial groups, and a history of social exclusion and discrimination against nonwhites. Rivera-Salgado (2003) argues that immigrants’ reconfigurations of race in the US must be connected with immigrants’ racial and ethnic experiences in their countries of origin. Studies of various immigrant groups of Latin American origin, such as Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and Dominicans, document the renegotiation of racial and ethnic identities upon entering and spending prolonged time in the United States (Roth 2006; Itzigsohn et al. 2005; Landale and Oropesa 2002; Duany 2002; Bonilla, et al. 1998). Because
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12 Just to contextualize the significance of this undercount, the Brazilian foreign office estimated that 230,000 Brazilians were living in the USA in 1990, of that number, 150,000 were estimated to be in the Boston area alone (Margolis 1998).
Brazilians were racially socialized in Brazil, they come to the United States with a more flexible understanding of race compared to that held by US citizens. Therefore, Brazilians like other Latin American immigrants, face special challenges and may undergo a re-socialization of race in order to negotiate the US racial system. This is particularly true for Brazilians who cannot phenotypically pass for white (McDonnell and Lourenço 2009; Zubaran 2008; Martes 2007; Marrow 2003; Margolis 1994).

While Margolis’ (1994) pioneer study explored the experiences of a group of Brazilian immigrants in New York, there was not an in-depth exploration of how these immigrants developed an understanding of race in the US, particularly as compared to the Brazilian racial system. Margolis noted that race might affect potential Brazilian immigrants’ chances of acquiring tourist visas to the US in the early 1990s, suggesting that visa applicants with a “boa aparência” or good appearance, generally those with lighter or whiter phenotypes, were more likely to be granted visas than their darker counterparts. Although Margolis’ sample primarily consisted of Brazilians who self-classified as white, and the respondents did not discuss race in their interviews, she found that Brazilians in 1990s New York had to contend with negotiating the Latino/Hispanic categories and had internalized negative ideas about US “Hispanics,” whom participants thought were inferior to Brazilians.

More recent and subsequent studies on Brazilian immigrants in the US have also noted Brazilians’ resistance to the “Hispanic” marker. Brazilians as Portuguese speakers are not Hispanic –they are not Spanish speakers- because Brazil was a Portuguese colony (Margolis 1994; Fleischer 2002; Marrow 2003; Marcus 2003; Martes 2007; Jouet-Pastre and Braga 2008; Zubaran 2008; McDonnell and Lourenço 2008). These studies also
reveal that Brazilians’ resistance to the Hispanic category stems from negative stereotypes regarding the different physical appearance, lower socioeconomic status, work ethic, perceived laziness, and marginalized lifestyle of “Hispanics” in the US.

Furthermore, language and cultural differences between Brazil and the Spanish-colonized countries of Latin America have yielded an ideology of Brazilian exceptionalism, in which some Brazilians attempt to distinguish Brazil as a country and themselves as Brazilians from Spanish-Latin America (Margolis 1994, 2007). As Brazil has grown in global prominence due to its size and export of culture (e.g. soccer, samba, Carnival) and is expected to be a major economic competitor of the US within the next decade, this may continue to heighten a notion of superiority among Brazilians as they compare themselves to other Latin Americans in the US and Latin America. Margolis (2007) also suggests that Brazilians also bring such attitudes, in terms of feeling superior to other groups, from Brazil “where feelings of cultural pride, of the uniqueness of the Brazilian “race” (raça) are pronounced” (pg. 218). However, despite resistance to the Hispanic and Latino labels and perceived differences between themselves and Hispanics, Brazilians, as Latin American immigrants, recognize that Americans externally ascribe the Hispanic category to them (Margolis 1994; Marcus 2003; Marrow 2003; Martes 2007; McDonnell and Lourenço 2009).

Therefore, immigrating to the US results in a reconfiguration of various identities, especially those based on nationality and race, for Brazilian immigrants. Margolis (2007) argues that Brazilians really only understand the essence of being Brazilian once they leave Brazil and that their identity abroad is shaped by a certain perspective:
“[a] ‘we're not like them’ perspective that refers both to social class and to ethnicity, that is, "the others" can be other Brazilians who are purportedly of a lower social station and less educated than the signifiers, or more commonly, it can be other immigrant groups, most often Hispanics” (pg. 215).

According to Margolis, this “othering” is an attempt to obscure commonalities among Brazilian and other Latin American immigrants (e.g. immigration status, education level, and job status) and recreate the “sharp social [class] distinctions of Brazilian society” (pg. 215). Furthermore, these social distancing attempts symbolize an internalization of American ethnic stereotypes and hierarchies as a way to “give themselves a leg up on the ethnic ladder” in a society that is highly stratified by race and ethnicity (pg. 217).

Marcus (2003), Martes (2007), and McDonnell and Lourenço (2009) also find that the conflation of the ethnic (but highly racialized) terms Hispanic and Latino in the US plays a role in shaping Brazilian immigrants’ ethnic identity options.13 The term Hispanic was “devised by the US state as a deliberate strategy of erasure with regard to the more particular histories of Chicanos and Puerto Ricans” in the US (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003, 4). Therefore, the term was used to suppress ethnic differences between Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans and thereby prevent political mobilization among these different “Hispanic” nationalities. However, as more Latin American immigrants arrived to the US after 1964, all Spanish-speaking immigrants were classified as Hispanic, homogenizing the diversity of national, social, linguistic, and racial experiences of at least 25 million people (Oboler 1995). However, in more recent years, “Latino” has been the preferred category since it is more similar to the term

---

13 The Latino label also includes Portuguese-speaking Brazilians who are also Latin American. Although “Latino” is a term denoting an ethnic category, many researchers and laypersons treat the term as though it refers to an actual racial group. Therefore, the term is highly racialized in US society.
“Latinoamericano,” which is more commonly used in Latin America (De Genova and Ramos-Zayas 2003). Nonetheless, Marrow’s (2003) study finds that Brazilian immigrants resist US racial categories and do not identify with the pan-ethnic “Latino” label.

In Martes’ (2007) examination using survey data of how Brazilian immigrants in Boston make sense of and use the terms Latino and Hispanic, she finds that when asked to categorize themselves, Brazilian immigrants generally affirm nationality as their primary social identity, reject the Hispanic label and embrace Latino (as related to Brazilian culture). She also finds that these individuals racially identify themselves as white even though they are regarded by others as black or nonwhite. Like Marrow (2003), Martes (2007) also discovers that by the second generation of residence in the US, Brazilians adopt the use of US racial categories for self-identification and argues that this indicates a type of cultural assimilation.

McDonnell and Lourenço (2009) also explore how thirty Brazilian immigrant women in Massachusetts developed an understanding of how they are racialized by others in the US and how they renegotiated their racial and ethnic classifications in the US: “our work shows that many women are much more aware that they have been racialized than they are aware of their racial identity” (pg. 242). The authors also argue that three aspects of Brazilian society make it difficult for Brazilians to negotiate race in the US: (1) emphasis on class over race, (2) Brazilians’ rejection of the existence of racism in Brazil in the presence of racial democracy, and (3) that racial classification/identity is more nuanced and fluid in Brazil. With regard to racial democracy ideology, McDonnell and Lourenço suggest that it is portable and can be
carried with Brazilians abroad and influence their perceptions of race in their host societies:

The portability of the racial democracy discourse is a powerful force in our respondents’ response to racialization. The discourse is not discarded at nation-state boundaries and, in fact, may be renewed with vigour as a laudatory aspect of being Brazilian and exacerbated by processes of globalization (pg. 244).

McDonnell and Lourenço also find that their participants used a comparative framework to negotiate their racial classification in the US, that is, they constantly compared aspects of race in the US with these aspects’ counterparts in Brazil. The findings from each of these studies suggest that living in the US facilitates a re-socialization of race for Brazilian immigrants, especially as they negotiate their nationalized identities in relation to the Latino/Hispanic ethno-racial categories.

**Transnational Migration Studies: A Theoretical Framework**

As migration from developing to developed nations has increased in recent decades, more attention has turned to exploring how these migrants experience life in their host societies. Among US immigration scholars, this focus has examined how contemporary migrants differ from previous migration waves to the US, yielding numerous studies and significant theorizing regarding the assimilation of these individuals into US society. Since foundational studies on immigrant assimilation by Park (1950) and Gordon (1964), more contemporary scholars have expanded the traditional assimilation model arguing that immigrants will eventually culturally and socioeconomically resemble native-born Americans although race and ethnicity can also play a role in this process (Alba and Nee 2003; Jacoby 2004; Kivisto 2001). Proponents
of segmented assimilation theory posit that immigrants can take multiple routes to assimilation: they can experience incorporation and social mobility similar to that of white Americans or experience downward social mobility, coming to resemble black Americans (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Portes and Zhou 1993).

The theory of transnationalism was developed to account for a rapidly globalizing and internationally connected world in which individuals, goods, and money were on the move and/or being exchanged across geo-political borders. When originally theorized by Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton (1992), transnationalism was defined as:

“the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement,” and referred to individuals who belong to and participate in social fields in both locales as transmigrants (pg. 1).

Glick et. al (1992) also contended that transnationalism was a new theory which accounted for the ways that contemporary migrants maintained social, cultural, economic, political, and familial ties to their home and host societies. However, scholars have debated the meaning and conceptualization of the term transnationalism, many arguing that the term is ambiguously defined and that it is not a new concept (Foner 1997; Mahler 1998; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). Additional critiques to this broadly defined concept were that it: (1) seemed incompatible with assimilation theory; (2) did not account for generational differences in transnational ties; (3) did not clearly define what constituted transnational processes or involvement; (4) did not completely account for the role of human mobility in facilitating transnational contact; and (5) prematurely dismissed the importance of national borders (Lucassen 2006; Mahler 1998; Portes et. al 1999; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Waldinger 2006).
In response to such critiques, subsequent studies developed more specific terms such as transnational social fields, translocalism, and trans-state activity to further delineate transnational processes (Mahler 1998; Barkan 2006; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). More recent research makes use of the terms “transnational migration” or “transnational migration studies” instead of the term “transnationalism” to describe, analyze, and interpret ideals, processes, and activities that are considered transnational or unbounded by traditional nation-state boundaries (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Khagram and Levitt 2008). Subsequent studies demonstrated how first and second generation immigrants maintained transnational ties, separately explored transnational economic, social, political, and religious connections in home and host countries, and argued that transnationalism acknowledges the multiple links between citizens and nation-states (Mahler 1998; Pedraza 2006; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). Furthermore, while these studies did acknowledge that transnationalism was not a new concept, they suggested that the nature of such ties are different for contemporary migrants compared to previous immigrants due to increased technology, an interdependent international economy, and the potential for dual nationality status (Foner 1997; Pedraza 2006; Levitt and Jaworsky 2007). The ability to communicate via email and telephone and travel to one’s country of origin is much easier and inexpensive for contemporary immigrants. Likewise, globalized financial markets and remittances allow international financial transactions to occur almost instantaneously. Immigrant remittances to home countries have a significant impact on those economies, which have encouraged emigrant-sending governments to garner support from absent citizens.
Among Brazilian returnees in this study, I found that the ability to remain in constant contact (via telephone, internet, visits) with family and friends in Brazil and live in mostly Brazilian communities in the US allowed them to remain connected symbolically and literally to Brazil. Such connections and having a strong desire to return to Brazil increased the likelihood that Brazilian immigrants would constantly have to negotiate their perceptions and experiences of life in the US as an extension of their lives in Brazil. Transnational social networks were essential to the migration process and this was reflected among the nearly 85 percent of Brazilian returnees who migrated to US states where there were large Brazilian communities.¹⁴ Within such Brazilian enclaves, participants relied on assistance from other Brazilians to find housing and jobs and also remained connected to Brazil by worshipping at Brazilian churches, living in Brazilian neighborhoods, and shopping at Brazilian stores. For this reason, there was little need to learn English or not speak Portuguese, which was also reflected in the language proficiency of participants: 62 percent reported that they spoke little or no English.¹⁵ Therefore, even though Brazilian returnees were physically living in the US, for the most part, they had very little informal social interaction with non-Brazilians, demonstrating a significant transnational connection to Brazil.¹⁶

In terms of transnational communication, nearly all return migrants in this study reported speaking with family members or friends in GV at least once every week via

¹⁴ These states were Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Florida and coincide with those from other studies on Brazilian immigrants (Goza 1999; Siqueira and Jansen 2008; Martes 2008; Margolis 1998).
¹⁵ This number is based on self-report. This was a categorical variable in which I asked each return migrant: “Do you speak English?” There were four responses: (1) very good, (2) good; (3) a little bit; (4) none.
¹⁶ Returnees reported having primarily workplace-based relationships with Americans and other (usually Hispanic) immigrants.
phone or internet (e.g. Skype, Windows Messenger) while in the US. The interview data indicated that during these conversations, all participants spoke about their experiences in the US, of how much they missed home, and what was happening with family members and friends in Governador Valadares. The twelve return migrants who obtained green cards or US citizenship also sustained transnational ties by visiting Brazil periodically while residing in the US as immigrants. As a result, returnees’ social relationships and interactions spanned three different groups in transnational spaces while living in the US: (1) with Brazilians in GV, (2) with Brazilians in the US, and (3) with Americans and others in the US. Their interactions among these three groups may have had some impact on their lived experiences as racialized immigrants in the US, influencing how they negotiated race in the US and demonstrating the additional importance of transnational ties.

Another way returnees maintained transnational links related to the project of return migration was through sending remittances back to GV. Money sent from the US drives the local economy in GV, as it is used to support family members, construct homes, start businesses, and facilitate post-migration financial security and social mobility. Other studies examining the relationship between remittances and return migration indicate that sending remittances demonstrates a homebound orientation and increases the likelihood of returning home (Kaufmann 2008; Lucas 2005; Rapoport and Docquier 2005). All of these factors represent the traditional ways in which transnational migrants remain connected to their home country during the immigration process.

While the returnees in this study share some characteristics of transnational migrants in studies by Levitt (2007, 2001), Glick Schiller (1999), and others, two factors
differentiate the majority of Brazilian returnees from other transnational migrants in prior studies: (1) their undocumented status made it difficult for them to be transnational citizens who actively participated in civic practices in the US, and (2) their return to Brazil signifies a different transnational process. Studies of other transnational migrants suggest that ties are maintained via remittances, communication and (when possible) short visits to the home country rather than a complete return.

Recent studies on transnational migration suggest that migrant flows between countries can change migrants’ perspectives of interpersonal relations and social constructions, such as religion, politics, culture, and gender dynamics, in the sending and receiving societies (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Levitt 2007; Levitt and Waters 2002; DeBiaggi 2002; Fox 2005; Pedraza 2006; McCann 2004; Levitt 2001; Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002). Such studies demonstrate that the transnational movement of bodies across geo-political boundaries also implies a movement of individuals’ internal social processes, which affect their perceptions and interpretations of the social worlds they encounter in their host societies. Thus, it is possible that transnational migration may influence migrants’ and non-migrants’ racial conceptions and race relations in their countries of origin.

**Transnational Migration Studies as a way to Examine Brazilian Return Migrants’ Racial Conceptions?**

Studies exploring the transnational implications of various social processes have increased, as have those examining how migration influences how Latin American immigrants think about race in the US. A study by Itzigsohn et al. (2005) explores how
immigrant incorporation affects Dominican immigrants’ racial self-identification and finds that the more Dominicans are probed about race using US racial categories, the more likely they are to identify in US racial terms, since their identification options are more limited when compared with Dominican society. In Duany’s (2002) study of Puerto Ricans on the island and in the US, he finds that distinct and competing racial classification systems and ideologies have a profound impact on how Puerto Ricans racially self-classify in both contexts. While the majority self-classifies as white on the island, Puerto Ricans in the mainland US self-classify as somewhere in between the black and white categories.

While Itzigsohn et. al (2005) and Duany (2002) separately explore racial conceptions among Dominicans and Puerto Ricans in the US, Roth’s (2006) study comparatively examines the transmission of US racial ideals to Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic via Puerto Rican and Dominican migrants in the US. To more accurately assess this “transnational” exchange of racial ideals, she also includes a sample of Puerto Rican and Dominican non-migrants in each locale. Roth argues that migrants and non-migrants use different racial schema to discuss race or color in the three contexts: US, Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico. Roth identifies four racial schema among the four samples: (1) a continuum racial schema in which race operates on a fluid continuum of categories between black and white; (2) a US racial schema in which race operates on the black versus white binary; (3) a Hispanicized US racial schema in which race operates as black, white, and Hispanic/Latino; and (4) a nationality schema in which one’s nationality is his/her race. Roth finds that while Dominican and Puerto Rican
migrants in the US use the US racial and Hispanicized US racial schema, Dominican and Puerto Rican non-migrants adopt the continuum and nationality schema to discuss race.

Furthermore, despite not living in the US, Roth finds that both Dominican and Puerto Rican non-migrants differentially adopt the term Latino as a pan-ethnic label to identify with Latinos in the US and that three factors influence this identification. First, the extent of transnational contact with migrants in the US and whether that contact is first-hand versus secondary or indirect affects identification as Latino. Second, the support that such identities receive from local institutions and cultural discourses (e.g. local Census, exposure to “Latino” media) can also affect this process. Finally, when the migration stream occurred and the ease of migrating to the US is important, especially since Puerto Ricans have been able to migrate more easily to the US than Dominicans due to their status as US citizens.

While Roth (2006), Duany (2002), and Itzigsohn (2005) focus on how migration and transnational ties may influence Dominican and Puerto Rican migrants’ racial classifications in the US, McDonnell and Lourenço (2008) explore this process among a small sample of Brazilian immigrant women in the US. The authors argue that these women negotiate their US racial classifications with class-based notions of Brazil’s racial democracy, which McDonnell and Lourenço (2009) argue is portable for Brazilian immigrants. Due to current technologies that allow constant communication with family and friends in Brazil and some of the women’s abilities to travel between both countries, McDonnell and Lourenço argue that their transnational ties to Brazil allowed them to retain aspects of their Brazilian racial classifications while resisting US-based categories:
“Connections to home were realized through the self-defined changes women experienced in their journeys to the United States...Brazilian women's lives are often racialized, imposing on some a double burden of being neither here nor there and not belonging anywhere and the reality of being seen as inferior” (pg. 169).

Therefore, the women’s classification choices indicated their recognition of differences in the social meaning attached to racial categories in the US and Brazil: while some of the women self-classified as white in Brazil, they realized they were not white in the US. These women were likely to identify as “other” rather than use US-based or externally imposed classifications (from Americans or others) such as Latina, Latin American, and Hispanic.

Margolis (2007) also posits that the transnational character of Brazilian immigrants’ lives stems from their perceptions of themselves as temporary sojourners who do not plan to establish permanent lives in the US, but who intend to return to Brazil. Though they may physically live in the US, their level of social, civic, and political engagement in the host society is limited due to their homebound orientation. Margolis suggests that this lack of engagement may also influence whether or not Brazilian immigrants adopt US norms of ethno-racial classification:

“While they live in the host society transnational migrants may be classified according to local ethnic rubrics, but their sense of self remains rooted in their own nation and even in a particular locale within it. These fluctuating identities are both self-imposed and decreed by the host society” (pg. 222).

Although the aforementioned studies have incorporated the transnational framework into the negotiation of racial and ethnic classifications, the primary locale of interest for migrants in each study is in the US. Levitt and Jaworsky (2007) and Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) argue that transnational studies must move beyond focusing on the host society and that more multi-sited research should be conducted in immigrant
sending and receiving communities. While Roth’s (2006) inclusion of Puerto Rican and Dominican non-migrants makes an important step in that direction, the comparison groups are Puerto Rican and Dominican migrants in the US. Within broader immigration literature and newer transnational studies, the frame of reference has historically been the US and how immigration is socially, economically, and politically influencing the US.

Limited studies on return migration among other ethnic groups such as West Indians and Asian Pacific Islanders also suggest that these individuals are at times frustrated by the social, economic, and political situations in their home societies (when compared to the host society) and experience a sense of “in-betweeness” or an identification with two worlds- that of the host and home society (Conway and Potter 2006; Plaza and Henry 2006; Phillips and Potter 2005; Iredale, et. al 2003; Potter et. al 2005). However, additional research is warranted to explore the social, economic, and political processes in other sending communities, particularly those with large numbers of immigrants in the US. Levitt and Jaworsky (2007) and Foner (1997) suggest that examining return migration may be another way to measure the strength of transnational ties and how social remittances, like economic remittances, may affect the quality of life in sending communities. Margolis (2007) and Foner (1997) indicate that immigrants who go to the US with the desire to return home may have more of a reason (than immigrants who plan to reside permanently in the US) to remain connected to the home society and “truly have their feet in two societies” (Foner 1997, pg. 358).

Therefore, in light of existing studies on race among Latin American immigrants in the US, increasing and more nuanced studies on transnational migration, and limited research exploring the impact of migration in sending communities, my research attempts
to fill some of these gaps. By examining how living in the US influences racial conceptions for Brazilian return migrants in Governador Valadares, this study contributes to the literature on race among Brazilian immigrants, an understudied Latin American immigrant group, and broadens the scope of transnational migration studies via its setting in GV, Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city to the US. Just as other transnational studies have demonstrated that immigrants send economic, cultural, and social remittances (e.g. religious practices, gender relations) to their countries of origin, I aim to explore if Brazilian returnees also send what I refer to as “racial remittances” to Brazil and if these racial remittances influence the racial conceptions of non-migrants as well as racial relations between returnees and non-migrants in GV. I define racial remittances as racial conceptions associated with the US racial system that Brazilian returnees may adopt such as self-classifying in US racial categories, developing group-based racial identities, and participating in socially segregating behaviors (e.g. living in ethnic communities, primarily socializing with co-ethnics).17

The Transnational Racial Optic

In this exploration of racial conceptions among Brazilian return migrants, I argue that returnees in this study used a “transnational racial optic” to negotiate race while living in the US and after returning to GV. While Levitt and Jaworsky (2007) make use of the term “transnational optic” to describe how “economic, political, social, cultural, and religious life are transformed when they are enacted transnationally” (pg. 130), in

---

17 These racial remittances could also flow from Brazil to the US, but I focus on remittances sent from the US to Brazil via return migrants.
this dissertation, I conceptualize the term “transnational racial optic” to demonstrate how the process of migration transforms how individuals observe, interpret, and ascribe social meaning to race in the host society, but also in their country of origin after returning from the US. I also argue that the negotiation of race in different countries (in this study Brazil and the US) using the transnational racial optic does not have to be directly connected to transnational activities as originally defined in the literature on transnational migration studies. Levitt and Khagram (2007) also argue that earlier transnational migration studies emphasized that transnational ties had to consist of transnational involvement in social, religious, or political organizations in the host society that were aligned to or within the home society.

However, Levitt and Khagram (2007) also suggest that it is not always easy or preferable to define an individual or group’s level of transnational involvement based on such activity, especially since transnational activity may be limited due to undocumented immigration status that prohibits “back and forth” movement and fewer transnational organizations among some immigrant groups. Instead, they suggest that the transnational approach should “interrogate the territorial breadth and scope of any social phenomena without prior assumptions” about cross-border activities (pg. 9). In Mitchell’s (2003) comparative study of transnational activity among Brazilian, Mexican, Dominican, Haitian, Salvadoran, and Guatemalan immigrants in the US, he argues that Brazilians, as the newest immigrant group, are in the most precarious position for establishing transnational ties based on social networks and organizations that link the US and Brazil. However, he also suggests that Brazilians are moving towards participating in traditional transnational activities as their transnational links will probably improve within the next
decade. McDonnell and Lourenço (2008) also suggest that “back and forth” transnational movement is not required for migrants, especially those with undocumented status who cannot easily cross borders, to maintain transnational ties:

“In addition to the actual physical movement across borders, sometimes at great peril, ‘back and forth’ may also be construed by the women considering their identity as a place on the continuum of identity positioning. Yet even women who do not go back and forth or have children often still realize a transnational status, as they stay in regular contact with other family members, send money to relatives, are connected to Brazilian politics and culture and have general life experiences to which Brazil, rather than the United States, is the point of reference” (pg. 157, 160).

Therefore, in my use of the “transnational racial optic,” I attempt to show that internal social psychological processes related to racial socialization and identity formation may be considered transnational in the sense that Brazilian return migrants use a racial framework associated with their country of origin - where they were racially socialized- to develop an understanding of race in the US. The transnational racial optic provides a way to demonstrate how encountering, incorporating aspects of, and/or resisting the US racial system, one that is uniquely different from that of Brazil during migration, facilitates a change or shift in migrants’ original pre-migration racial conceptions that influence how they understand race in Brazil after returning.

Margolis (2001) demonstrates the difficulty Brazilian return migrants have in readapting to the social and cultural life of Brazil after the US migration as a consequence of having lived in the US, a country returnees perceive to be more organized and less corrupt than Brazil. In her exploration of the economic successes and failures of Brazilian return migrants in Governador Valadares, Siqueira (2009a, 2007, 2006) argues that returnees generally experience two trajectories, one being a successful return defined by opening a sustainable business with money earned in the US and the other being a
“sonho frustrado” or frustrated dream defined by having unsuccessful investment ventures. While many migrants from GV go to the US in hopes of making the American dream a reality in Brazil after migration, many return frustrated and disillusioned due to their inability to find employment (with comparable US wages), translate their hard earned dollars into sustainable or financially prosperous projects in GV, and cope with living in a city that is drastically different from the US:

“For this group [return migrants], the return was more difficult than the decision to emigrate. When they emigrated [to the US], they were full of hope and when they returned [to GV] they were overwhelmed by the strangeness of their places of origin and the people in their social universe. This occurs because during their time away, they realize that their social relationships and the space where they lived [have changed] and they [return migrants] no longer recognize them [social relations and space]” (Siqueira 2007, lines 28-31, translated from Portuguese).

In this study, I explore if the transnational racial optic develops among return migrants while they were living in the US in response to exposure to the US racial system and after they return to Brazil when readapting to the racial system there. I also examine if such exposure to the US racial system facilitates a social psychological shift in their post-migration racial conceptions. How does classifying as Latino/Hispanic in the US influence post-migration racial classifications for a returnee who self-classified as white before immigrating? Do more overt experiences of racism and anti-immigrant discrimination in the US change how return migrants perceive covert expressions of racial discrimination in Brazil? Do these returnees ascribe US racial categories to other Brazilians upon returning? Therefore, I aim to show that the “transnational racial optic” is a lens by which Brazilian returnees developed an understanding of race in the US by relying on a Brazilian framework and that influenced their perceptions of race in Brazil after the US migration.
The “transnational racial optic” can consist of comparisons in various aspects of the racial frameworks in each context with regard to racial classification, racism, and understanding the social meaning ascribed to skin color and race in each place. Therefore, US migration may have influenced Brazilian return migrants’ ability to make sense of the US and Brazilian racial systems by connecting the two. While spending time in the US elicits various racial, social, and cultural comparisons to Brazilian society, returning to Brazil elicits similar comparisons between both countries after the US migration. Return migrants’ responses to various questions about their lives as immigrants and racialized and nationalized others in the US, and as return migrants in Brazil post-migration, signaled that they do indeed observe and process their social worlds with a transnational racial optic, which helps them negotiate race and other aspects of their lives during and after migration. Thus, migration facilitates a dialectic or a simultaneous sense of “here and there” in the race-related thought processes of returnees in this sample, which is consistent with other transnational migration studies in which contemporary immigrants experience a dialectic regarding what happens in their host and home countries (McDonnell and Lourenço 2008; Levitt 2007; Levitt and Waters 2002; Foner 1997). Brazilian immigrants, who are accustomed to viewing race relations in Brazilian society from a more amiable lens, negotiate race in the US by constantly making comparisons to what they remember about Brazilian race relations. This transnational dialectic between race in the US and Brazil may create internal conflict for Brazilian immigrants as they attempt to make sense of race in the US during and in Brazil after the US migration. I argue that this dialectic is the transnational racial optic, in which returnees’ racial conceptions are not bound to only the US or Brazil, but rather is
associated with the social construction of race in both countries. The findings presented in the subsequent chapters will show how Brazilian return migrants used a transnational racial optic to navigate race in the US and Brazil.
Chapter 3
Methodology

To address the research questions for this study, I conducted international fieldwork in Governador Valadares, Brazil (or GV) from October 2007 to October 2008. However, my preparation for carrying out this fieldwork began in 2005, as I started learning Brazilian Portuguese, traveling to Brazil and GV, and reading as much literature as possible to gain a better understanding of the social construction of race in Brazil. To design and conduct a multi-lingual and international project of this scope, I felt it was essential to become immersed in the fieldsite so that I could learn more about GV, its history, culture, and people. Through my involvement in local cultural, social, and civic activities (e.g. church services, community projects), I was able to have informal conversations and establish relationships with Valadarenses. These conversations helped me determine which questions were culturally appropriate and linguistically accurate for inclusion in formal interviews. This chapter discusses the methods I used for recruiting participants, designing interview protocols, and analyzing data. It also addresses some of the challenges I encountered while conducting this research as a black American sociologist who “looked Brazilian.”

I conclude this chapter by introducing and defining race-related terms that will be used throughout the dissertation, especially since racial terminology used in the US and the English language and may differ from similar terms used in Brazil and the Portuguese
language. Given that this study explores the social construction of race in Brazil and the US through the perceptions of Brazilian return migrants, it is important to be very clear about my use of these terms.

Data Collection

Research Setting

Because I wanted to comparatively explore the social construction of race in Brazil and the US through the perceptions of Brazilian return migrants and the influence of US migration on Brazilians’ racial conceptions, Governador Valadares, as Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city to the US, was the appropriate place to conduct this study. In GV, it is considered a rite of passage for residents of GV, also known as Valadarenses, to immigrate to the US or some other country during their lives.\(^\text{18}\) While the US was the predominant destination in the 1980s, Valadarenses began immigrating to Portugal, Spain, and Italy in the 2000s in increasing numbers due to experiencing more difficulty in obtaining US visas, the higher currency value of the Euro compared to the U.S. dollar, and fewer linguistic differences between Brazilian Portuguese and European languages (Siqueira 2007). However, despite these recent changes, a significant number of Valadarenses continue to try to immigrate to the US.

Sample Demographics and Recruitment

Because the research questions that guided this research could not be examined or addressed using existing survey data from Brazil or the US, I conducted semi-structured

\(^{18}\) Please see Chapters one and two for more information on GV.
in-depth interviews with return migrants in GV.\textsuperscript{19} In order to more effectively explore the influence of US migration on returnees’ racial conceptions, I included a comparison group of Valadarenses who never migrated from GV (non-migrants), but who had similar socio-demographic characteristics as the migrant interviewees (e.g. age, education). To increase the demographic similarities between the return migrant and non-migrant samples, I used a family match strategy by interviewing a return migrant and a non-migrant family member - generally a sibling or cousin. Thus, I conducted semi-structured interviews in Brazilian Portuguese with a total sample of 73 Valadarenses, 49 of whom were return migrants and 24 of whom were non-migrants. I had 24 matched return migrant to non-migrant pairs for the purposes of comparative analyses.

When I designed the project, my initial goal was to interview 50 return migrants and 50 non-migrants. Although I conducted 55 total interviews with return migrants, I was unable to use the data from six interviews since these individuals were not “fully” returned migrants. Instead, these individuals were vacationing and temporarily visiting family members in GV and still resided in the US, which was revealed over the course of conducting those interviews. Additionally, while I successfully interviewed 49 fully returned migrants, 25 of these returnees did not have a non-migrant relative I could interview for the following reasons: (1) I was unable to schedule an interview after three scheduling attempts; (2) a potential interviewee declined to participate; or (3) no potential

\textsuperscript{19}Brazil and US censuses and household surveys do not contain immigration-related variables such as: (1) motivation for immigrating; (2) place of destination in host society; and (3) length of stay in host society. There is also only one question on racial classification, which does not account for how immigration might influence racial classification self-reports throughout the migration process.
interviewees lived in GV. Respondents’ demographic information - as reported when I interviewed them can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographics of Return and Non-Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Return Migrants</th>
<th>Non-Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: Women (%)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Average (yrs)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Range (yrs)</td>
<td>20-57</td>
<td>19-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Income: Mean ($USD)</td>
<td>1507 (std. 1891)</td>
<td>1461 (std. 2222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Income: Median ($USD)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Current Job Types (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales/Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Teacher, etc.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Unemployed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Monthly Income Reported, std = Standard Deviation

Table 1 suggests few major differences in age or monthly income between returnees and non-migrants. However, while a higher percentage of non-migrants completed post-secondary education (42 versus 30 percent), more returnees have graduate or professional degrees (8 percent versus none). Returnees appeared to be slightly less likely than non-migrants to work in sales or business-related industries (41 percent versus 54 percent). However, a slightly higher percentage of returnees reported being unemployed at the time that I interviewed them. Despite the small differences shown in table 1, both samples are pretty similar due to the small size of the return migrant and non-migrant samples. Because this dissertation explores perceptions of race

---

20 Following procedures outlined in my institutional review board application, I discontinued contacting potential participants after three attempts to schedule interviews.

21 The income amounts reported were converted from Brazilian reais.
among both return migrants and non-migrants, I present and discuss in detail the data regarding racial demographics of both groups in subsequent chapters.

Among returnees, I sought to interview Valadarenses between ages 25 and 50, who returned from the US after 1990. Since many immigrants left GV in the mid 1980s and stayed in the US for an average of five years, my target group reflected the individuals who were most likely to have immigrated to the US and subsequently returned to Brazil. My goal was to also interview a phenotypically diverse group of return migrants with a range of skin tones and hair textures to account for the different racial perceptions and experiences they might have had in the US and Brazil on the basis of their physical appearances. The majority of return migrants I interviewed fit the profile previously mentioned. Returnees’ US immigration-related demographics are presented in Table 2. 22

Table 2: Immigration Demographics for Return Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Length of Stay</td>
<td>7.7 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest Year of Migration</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Year of Return</td>
<td>early 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Location for Majority</td>
<td>East Coast: MA, CT, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Types in US</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babysitters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who spoke no/little English</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Reasons for Migrating</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended to return to GV before migrating</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained tourist visa before migration</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained Green Card or US citizenship</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrated One Time</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 The US states most highly represented among returnees were MA, CT, NY, NJ, and FL. These states were also the first states of residence where migrants lived. Some moved to different locations while in the US. Most returnees migrated for the first time in the 1980s or 1990s.
Among returnees I interviewed, the majority immigrated to Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey to work or be reunited with family members in the US. Before leaving GV, eighty percent intended to return. However, very few of them had any English proficiency. Furthermore while the majority did obtain tourist visas before emigrating, only 25 percent obtained Green Cards or US citizenship, which suggests the majority of returnees became undocumented by overstaying their tourist visas.

I also asked non-migrants immigration-related questions to learn what role US migration had played in their lives as residents of GV and relatives of individuals who immigrated to the US. Fully 88 percent (21/24) of non-migrants reported that they had never attempted to immigrate to the United States, and 93 percent did not intend to immigrate to the US in the future. While they were by sampling design a close relative of a return migrant, 88 percent of non-migrants (21/24) reported having family members currently in the US when I interviewed them, further demonstrating the prevalence of GV-US migration and its influence on many residents. Among those non-migrants with relatives currently in the US, the average number of relatives still living in the US was almost three. Generally these family members were other siblings, cousins, parents, or children.

To recruit the sample, I relied on snowball sampling and personal contacts. Because nearly everyone in the city had some migratory ties to the US and social networks are relevant for the migration process, snowball sampling was very effective for this project. At the end of each interview, I asked participants (both return migrant and non-migrant) if they knew other return migrants that might be interested in participating. I also asked each return migrant if he or she had a non-migrant sibling or cousin I could
also interview. Furthermore, the longer I stayed in GV and Valadarenses learned more about why I was there, my project drew local media interest, which resulted in local television and newspaper interviews. Through this publicity, I was able to recruit additional participants.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Due to the scope of this study and the language and cultural issues involved in developing the Portuguese interview protocols for the project, I decided to conduct five pre-test interviews (three with return migrants and two with non-migrants) while doing preliminary fieldwork in GV in the summer of 2008. These pre-test interviews revealed inaccurately translated words and phrases that respondents misunderstood and were very helpful for developing a more polished protocol. Subsequently, Brazilian researchers in the US and GV reviewed my revised protocol before I began formally interviewing participants in December 2008 to check for translation issues and to ensure that racial terminology in the protocol would be understood by Brazilian respondents. The incorporation of their feedback resulted in the final Portuguese version of the return migrant and non-migrant protocol used for this project.

Although I was primarily interested in racial conceptions among both samples, interview questions also delved into a number of topics related to the impact of US migration on GV, which can be seen in Table 3.
In interviews with return migrants and non-migrants, I measured racial classification in four ways: (1) self-ascribed categorical; (2) self-ascribed open-ended with no prompts; (3) perceived categorical external classification by others, and (4) how I as the interviewer racially classified respondents. These multiple measures of racial classification allowed me to assess consistency between participants’ official (e.g. Census) and informal/popular racial categories in Brazil and the US. Such measures also provided a way to measure agreement between how Brazilians’ racially classify themselves and how others externally classify them in both countries. Various studies exploring racial classification in Brazil document the lower level of consistency in respondents’ racial classifications (compared to those of US citizens), particularly when they are: (1) given specific categories in which to classify; (2) allowed to write in their

---

23 Perceived categorical external classification refers to how participants felt other people racially classified them. “Other people” referred to Americans while returnees lived in the US and to Brazilians in interviews sections on Brazil before and after migration. For return migrants, this measure was assessed using Brazilian Census categories pre and post- migration, but using US Census-derived categories while they lived in the US. See Chapters 3, 5, and 6 for the specific racial categories.
own response; (3) asked to self-classify; and (4) have the interviewer classify respondents (Bailey 2009; Bailey and Telles 2006; Telles and Lim 1998; Silva 1996; Hasenbalg and Silva 1991). It has also become more common for Brazilian survey researchers to use the racial classification measures I used for ascertaining the nuances of racial classification specific to the Brazilian context.

To assess return migrants’ categorical racial classifications in Brazil and the US, I used racial categories derived from the 2000 Brazilian and US Censuses. To assess non-migrants’ categorical racial classification, I used categories derived from the 2000 Brazilian Census. Given the everyday use of informal racial categories in Brazil as documented in previously cited studies, my use of Census-derived categories was important for exploring how Valadarenses’ informal racial classifications align with those of officially state-defined categories. Such categories can:

…establish and institutionalize categories that may become templates for social differentiation, thus structuring race relations and shaping popular understandings of race (Telles 2004, pg. 81).

Because race has generally been indicative of skin tone with less emphasis on ancestry in Brazil, I included a measure to assess self-ascribed skin tone classifications for all participants using a scale from 1 (light) to 10 (dark) to see how participants’ skin tone and racial classifications aligned with each other. Finally, at the end of each interview, to assess consistency between participants’ self-reported and the interviewer’s external classification of each participant, I chose to classify all interviewees using Brazilian Census categories according to how I thought they were racially perceived in Brazil. Brazilian Census categories allowed me to use a “Brazilian” lens and minimize the influence of my American norms for racial classification when classifying
participants. After noting the participant’s racial classification, I also recorded an interviewer-reported measure of the participant’s skin tone so I could examine consistency between self-ascribed and external skin tone classifications given the aforementioned lower level of consistency between these self and external classifications in Brazil.

Finally, the interview protocol for both groups consisted of qualitative open-ended and corresponding closed-ended questions which asked the same thing in different ways to ascertain how respondents would answer similar questions that were posed using different wording. Integrating qualitative and quantitative questions in the protocol was effective for recognizing patterns of evidence, counterevidence, and consistency not only with one participant’s responses, but also among the collective sample. While the qualitative questions were more subtle and allowed for more flexible responses, the quantitative questions were more direct. An example of a direct closed-ended question for both samples was: “Do you think race and skin color are the same?” I then asked participants for a qualitative explanation of their yes or no response.

I also asked participants for factors they considered when racially classifying themselves, one of which was skin tone, in order to learn what characteristics Valadarenses use since existing literature suggests that non-physical factors related to socioeconomic status can influence such classifications, such as education and attire (Telles 2004; Schwartzman 2007). By examining participants’ cumulative responses to a series of related questions, I could assess consistency between qualitative and quantitative responses and how conscious participants were of their racial conceptions. I found that combining qualitative and quantitative questions in my protocol allowed me to more
effectively explore the nuanced ways that participants observed, negotiated, and interpreted race in Brazilian and/or US society. Using strictly qualitative or quantitative measures would not have yielded the same wealth of data.

While there was some overlap in the topics covered in both returnee and non-migrant interviews, the questions for return migrants were more detailed to tap into recollections of their experiences negotiating race in multiple contexts: (1) in Brazil before immigrating; (2) in the US as immigrants; (3) in Brazil immediately after returning; and (4) in Brazil at the time I conducted the interview.24 Since I wanted to explore returnees’ racial conceptions before, during, and after migration and this data could not be gathered longitudinally and prospectively as these moments occurred, interviews with returnees were divided into five sections which allowed me to gain a retrospective account of each returnee’s perceptions of race over the course of the migration. While the first section was devoted to collecting immigration-related data from participants to jog their memories about their US migration, the remaining four sections focused specifically on returnees’ recollections of race in each of the aforementioned contexts. Interviews with returnees ranged from thirty to ninety minutes, as some returnees were more talkative than others.

Thus, while this was not a longitudinal study, I will subsequently refer to each aforementioned context as a “time period” or “stage” that is related to returnees’ retrospective accounts regarding their perceptions of race throughout the GV-US-GV

24 I modeled many of my closed-ended race measures using the race module from the 2002 Belo Horizonte Area Study (BHAS). The author of the race module, Dr. Solange Simões, gave me permission to use those measures in my protocol. The BHAS is part of an international survey project modeled after the Detroit Area Study that was conducted in Belo Horizonte, a large metropolitan area in Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte is the state capital of Minas Gerais and is 210 miles from Governador Valadares.
It is thus important to keep in mind that these data were collected retrospectively—that is, after returnees migrated to the US and returned to Brazil. For some participants, a number of years had passed since they returned from the US and their probable inability to fully remember every aspect of the migration experience is a limitation of the study. The data presented are recollections of what returnees may have remembered or experienced many years ago, but most social scientific studies gather data after social events have occurred, and it is understood that participants’ memories of events may degrade as time passes from the occurrence of the particular event in question (Bernard et al. 1984; Wolcott 1994; Trivellato 1999; Wellman 2007). Therefore, the credibility of participants’ responses may be questioned. In this study, I attempted to account for that by asking participants similar questions in different ways, especially relating to their racial and skin tone classifications at each stage of the migration. Including questions in this manner provided the ability to assess consistency and adds more credibility to the study. In analyzing, interpreting, and reporting the results, I tried to be as attentive as possible to concerns about retrospective reporting.

I was very interested in learning if non-migrants felt that returnees come back changed by their experiences in the US and in understanding more about how US migration influences social relations between returnees and non-migrants. Because non-migrants were left behind in GV to deal with the more direct consequences of US migration while return migrants were away, these non-migrants might be more capable of detecting changes and the social, cultural, and economic effects of US migration on

---

25 Please see the structure of the English interview protocols in the appendix.
GV. I also asked non-migrants about their frequency of contact with return migrant relatives during the US migration and if returnees had discussed any perceptions of race or experiences of racism or discrimination in the US with non-migrants. Such questions allowed me to explore how socially connected to GV and Brazilian society return migrants remained while living in the US. These questions also helped me determine how ideals about various aspects of US life may have been transmitted through migrants’ transnational contact or communication with non-migrants in GV. Since there were far fewer questions in the non-migrant interview protocol, the duration of those interviews ranged from twenty to forty minutes.

**Data Analysis**

*Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis*

Each interview was audio-recorded to ensure the authenticity of the participants’ words. During and after each interview, I wrote extensive field notes recording the interviewee’s body language, voice fluctuations, and other physical gestures that demonstrated their emotional responses to questions. Although I am highly proficient in Brazilian Portuguese, I am not a native speaker. Therefore, I hired three Valadarenses to transcribe the audio-recorded interviews to ensure the accuracy of each participants’ words. After all of the interviews were transcribed, I reviewed each transcript and listened to the corresponding audio-recorded interview to check for accuracy and

---

26 Some of the non-migrants were caretakers of the children left behind by return migrant parents. Non-migrants noted the following as major issues raised by US migration: (1) psychological and behavioral problems of “left-behind” children; (2) stress and social conflict in returnees’ readaptation to life in GV; and (3) more expensive real estate due to a rise in property value.

27 Two transcribers were college students, the third was an administrative assistant at the local university.
consistency between the recorded and transcribed versions. During that process, I took additional notes regarding themes that emerged from the data with regard to my research questions. Where necessary, I made corrections in each transcript and imported them into NVivo qualitative software for data analysis. Responses to closed-ended (survey) questions in the interviews were entered in SPSS software for descriptive analysis.

I relied on an inductive or grounded theory approach to derive the findings presented in subsequent chapters, which means that I did not have any hypotheses or preconceived notions about what results would emerge from the data before conducting fieldwork (Glaser and Strauss 1967). However before beginning extensive qualitative data analysis, I reviewed all of my fieldnotes and made notes regarding all topics related to race and immigration in the US, Brazil, and GV that began to emerge. This list of very broad themes was used to generate the coding schema that I used to do open and focused coding of the interview transcripts. The coding process consisted of closely reading each interview transcript and placing all words, phrases, and sentences under the specific thematic code that matched or was related to that particular part of the interview (Emerson et al. 1995). Whenever certain words, phrases, or sentences did not align with a pre-existing thematic code, I created a new thematic code for those words, phrases, or sentences. Therefore, as I did extensive qualitative data analysis, my list of coding schema grew to reflect the various perceptions found in the interview data.

Because the primary objective of the project was to explore pre and post-migration racial conceptions among returnees, I conducted analyses to coincide with my research questions. Where necessary, I made corrections in each transcript and imported them into NVivo qualitative software for data analysis. Responses to closed-ended (survey) questions in the interviews were entered in SPSS software for descriptive analysis.

I relied on an inductive or grounded theory approach to derive the findings presented in subsequent chapters, which means that I did not have any hypotheses or preconceived notions about what results would emerge from the data before conducting fieldwork (Glaser and Strauss 1967). However before beginning extensive qualitative data analysis, I reviewed all of my fieldnotes and made notes regarding all topics related to race and immigration in the US, Brazil, and GV that began to emerge. This list of very broad themes was used to generate the coding schema that I used to do open and focused coding of the interview transcripts. The coding process consisted of closely reading each interview transcript and placing all words, phrases, and sentences under the specific thematic code that matched or was related to that particular part of the interview (Emerson et al. 1995). Whenever certain words, phrases, or sentences did not align with a pre-existing thematic code, I created a new thematic code for those words, phrases, or sentences. Therefore, as I did extensive qualitative data analysis, my list of coding schema grew to reflect the various perceptions found in the interview data.

Because the primary objective of the project was to explore pre and post-migration racial conceptions among returnees, I conducted analyses to coincide with my research questions. Where necessary, I made corrections in each transcript and imported them into NVivo qualitative software for data analysis. Responses to closed-ended (survey) questions in the interviews were entered in SPSS software for descriptive analysis.

I relied on an inductive or grounded theory approach to derive the findings presented in subsequent chapters, which means that I did not have any hypotheses or preconceived notions about what results would emerge from the data before conducting fieldwork (Glaser and Strauss 1967). However before beginning extensive qualitative data analysis, I reviewed all of my fieldnotes and made notes regarding all topics related to race and immigration in the US, Brazil, and GV that began to emerge. This list of very broad themes was used to generate the coding schema that I used to do open and focused coding of the interview transcripts. The coding process consisted of closely reading each interview transcript and placing all words, phrases, and sentences under the specific thematic code that matched or was related to that particular part of the interview (Emerson et al. 1995). Whenever certain words, phrases, or sentences did not align with a pre-existing thematic code, I created a new thematic code for those words, phrases, or sentences. Therefore, as I did extensive qualitative data analysis, my list of coding schema grew to reflect the various perceptions found in the interview data.

Because the primary objective of the project was to explore pre and post-migration racial conceptions among returnees, I conducted analyses to coincide with my research questions. Where necessary, I made corrections in each transcript and imported them into NVivo qualitative software for data analysis. Responses to closed-ended (survey) questions in the interviews were entered in SPSS software for descriptive analysis.

---

28 I did not translate the interviews for data analysis to ensure authenticity and to minimize any social meaning from participants’ words being lost through total translation of interviews.

29 See appendix for a list of these coding schemes.
research questions. For example, to focus on pre-migration versus US racial conceptions in Chapters four and five, I did more in-depth analyses to focus particularly on coding schema that referred specifically to return migrants’ conceptions of race in the US compared to pre-migration conceptions in Brazil. For each of those coding schema, I read all of the interview excerpts that I had coded as indicative of returnees’ US and pre-migration conceptions to develop a broader idea of how returnees interpreted race in those two contexts. At times, the broader ideas that emerged from these analyses resulted in the formulation of “sub-codes” that I used to further explore how movement between GV and the US influenced returnees’ racial conceptions. This was an exhaustive process that continued until no more coding could be done and the coding schema could no longer be deconstructed into smaller sub-codes. Furthermore, I continued to write fieldnotes during this process to help me more effectively understand and interpret how returnees negotiated race in both places. This was particularly helpful for identifying whether particular themes were noted among only a few participants or among a larger portion of the sample. I used this analytical approach in each empirical chapter to allow for comparisons between the different stages of the migration process for returnees. A similar exhaustive process was also used to analyze the non-migrant data.

Based on the qualitative findings that did emerge, I incorporated corresponding quantitative data to underscore the qualitative findings. For instance, to learn more about returnees’ perceptions of the Latino/Hispanic ethnic categories in the US, I included qualitative questions and analyzed returnees’ responses to questions that delved into whether or not returnees agreed with this terminology. My in-depth analysis of the coding schema related to questions about the Latino/Hispanic categories revealed that returnees
did not like either ethno-racial category and preferred to self-identify as Brazilian. However, because I also asked participants for their categorical racial classifications while living in the US, I was also able to see what percentage of returnees self-classified as Latino/Hispanic and how that compared with their qualitative perceptions of those categories.

In instances where I present quantitative data in this dissertation, I ran descriptive analyses such as cross-tabulations and frequency tables to provide a comparative overview of the returnee and non-migrant sample demographics and how participants responded to closed-ended questions in the interviews. Some data manipulation had to be done to convert Brazilian reais to US dollars for the purpose of reporting participants’ income and to translate Brazilian educational categories into categories that could be understood by an American audience. Furthermore, when running crosstabs between returnees’ categorical racial classifications in Brazil and the US (using the respective countries’ Census categories), I had to be especially careful in aligning racial categories to make sure they were consistent with how both Brazilian and US Census categories are understood and interpreted in each context. Whenever results are presented in the following chapters to indicate that such data manipulation occurred, I have included explanatory footnotes. Since snowball sampling was the recruitment strategy for this sample, the non-random sample collected for this research hindered my ability to run traditional statistical tests or assess statistical significance of differences across groups for the descriptive findings presented. However, my main goals were to qualitatively explore participants’ racial conceptions in the US and/or Brazil while the descriptive quantitative data was used to provide secondary support of the qualitative findings.
Interviewer Effects

As a researcher, I had to acknowledge that my social identities as a black American female sociology doctoral student would have some impact on this project, especially since social class and education level can facilitate social whitening for nonwhites in Brazil (Telles 2004; Schwartzman 2007).30 For this reason, I tried to be very reflexive about my social identities while conducting this research and used various strategies during the data collection and analysis processes to account for how my social positionalities might influence the research. Because of my privileged social identities conducting research in GV, I was consciously aware of my privilege and concerned about how it would influence my entrée into the field and affect my ability to recruit and interview participants.

However, despite differences in nationality, race, social class, and education level, there was one important attribute I shared with participants: being a temporary migrant in another country. This created a shared experience between myself and return migrants, as we had both lived for an extended time in the US and Brazil, which endeared Valadarenses to me and helped with recruitment. Although I came to GV to conduct research under much different circumstances than many of the returnees who migrated to the US, Valadarenses were highly impressed that a US researcher would learn Portuguese and come live in their city for a year to learn more about the impact of US migration.

30 Although I recognize and am politically aware that Brazilians and anyone in the Americas are also “American”, I use “American” throughout this section as an adjective to describe my positionality as a US resident citizen for simplicity purposes. Furthermore, in the research site, participants referred to me as an “American” even when I tried to self-identify as “Estado-unidense”, the Portuguese word that refers specifically to people from the US. Social whitening in Brazil (and arguably other Latin American countries) can occur when phenotypically nonwhite individuals can access the social privileges and benefits of being racially white by virtue of having and disclosing factors associated with high socioeconomic status such wealth, education, and in my case US citizenship (Telles 2004; Schwartzman 2007).
During data collection and analysis, I was very cautious in allowing participants’ racial conceptions to guide the process to reduce the likelihood that my US-based and sociologically trained racial conceptions would influence my interpretation of the data. This is why I chose to racially classify participants using Brazilian Census categories in the question for interviewer-classification of the respondent.\textsuperscript{31} I wanted to think about race and racial classification as Valadarenses did and allow Brazilian conceptions of race to overshadow my US-socialized ones while conducting this research. Furthermore, in each interview, I was very careful to focus on participants’ responses and maintained a calm voice and body language so as to not influence their responses, even when participants made (what I considered to be) blatantly racist, classist, or sexist remarks, which created some difficult moments in a few interviews. After such interviews, I wrote about my reactions when such comments were made in my fieldnotes and reviewed those fieldnotes when analyzing that participant’s transcript to minimize the influence of my personal reactions in interpreting that data.

Another way that I attempted to be reflexive about how my social identities might influence participants’ perceptions of me and how they answered questions was by asking each participant how they felt about me conducting research in GV at the end of each interview. This question was phrased as “What do you think of an American conducting this research in GV?” and was one of the final questions in the protocol.\textsuperscript{32} In response to

\textsuperscript{31} Since most Brazilians considered my skin tone to be pardo, I classified participants whose skin tones were similar to mine as pardo. If a participant’s skin tone was significantly lighter or darker than mine, I classified the individual as white or black respectively. However, in each interview protocol and corresponding fieldnotes, I took notes about each participant’s physical attributes and how I would have racially classified them in the US.

\textsuperscript{32} Initially, I planned to ask directly if I had not been black, female, middle class, or American, how this might affect participants’ responses. However, after speaking with a Brazilian colleague about the
this question, the majority of returnees and non-migrants had no particular opinion about me conducting the research. A minority expressed an opinion that conducting the research was positive, as it might make Americans more sympathetic to the experiences of Brazilian immigrants and increase mutual understanding between the US and Brazil.

Because of my physical appearance and a perception among Brazilians (gained from interviews and informal conversations) that nearly all Americans are racially white, many respondents did not believe I was American. Upon arriving for some interviews, participants blatantly told me, “I wasn’t expecting someone so Brazilian-looking” or “I was expecting a blond-haired, blue-eyed person.” Many participants expressed surprise at learning I had no Brazilian or Latin American ancestry. With my medium brown skin tone and non-chemically straightened hair texture, I self-classify and am classified by others as black in the US. However, in Brazil and in GV, most Valadarenses did not classify me as black even though I had tanned and my skin tone had gotten much darker.

To get a better idea of how respondents racially perceived me, I asked them how they racially classified me using Brazilian Census Categories and with an open-ended response at the end of each interview. Including this question was also helpful because it allowed me to better understand the nuances of racial classification in Brazil. Among return migrants and non-migrants, it was clear that the majority of participants did not classify me as black, but as pardo, the official Census category ascribed to skin tones between white and black in Brazil. Data regarding how participants’ racially classified

---

appropriate translation for this, she suggested I should not specifically mention my social identities, but include the more generic question in the protocol. Had I included the more specific question, my racial and social class self-classifications may have further influenced how participants racially classified me. I did not reveal that I self-classified as black during any interview. After some interviews (and being probed by participants), I shared my own perceptions. Many participants assumed I was a naturalized US Citizen of Brazilian heritage.
me using Brazilian Census-derived categories can be seen in Table 4. While it is possible that my being American might have facilitated participants classifying me as nonblack - as a consequence of social whitening in Brazil- I do not believe that was the case.

Table 4: How Participants Racially Classified Interviewer
(Brazilian Census-Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Returnees (%)</th>
<th>Non-Migrants (%)</th>
<th>Non-Migrants (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branco/White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preto/Black</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardo/Brown</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigena/Indigenous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Living in GV and traveling in Brazil, I learned very quickly that if I did not speak to anyone while running errands, people would assume I was a (poor) nonwhite Brazilian and treat me in a less respectful way or question my presence in middle/upper class and white social settings. Therefore, although most Brazilians did not see me as black, they certainly did not see me as white.\(^{34}\) Being perceived as nonwhite in Brazil allowed me to blend into the local population and get a better sense of how skin color and other physical attributes influence social interactions. For example, when I dined with (white) Brazilian and/or US friends in nicer restaurants, I was generally the darkest person in the establishment and other clients’ stares seemed to question my presence. However, upon speaking English or in my foreign-accented Portuguese, people were quick to ask where I

\(^{34}\) I use “Brazilians” instead of Valadarenses since I had such experiences in GV and other parts of Brazil.
was from and be very friendly after I revealed my US nationality. At times, experiences like these made me more cognizant of my privilege as an American.

As a self-identifying black person, I realized I could use my US nationality to gain social acceptance or better treatment when I felt people may have been discriminating against me, something that brown and black Brazilians cannot do. Over the course of conducting my fieldwork, I often wondered what my experience would have been like had I been a white American conducting this research. Based on conversations I had with white American friends who were also doing research in other parts of Brazil while I was in GV, I imagine I would have gotten stares while walking down the street since I would have physically stood out from most Brazilians as a “really white” person. I also doubt that my presence would have been questioned in more elite social settings and that people would not have questioned my US nationality. Therefore, for the most part, I could not access the privilege associated with being American until I made the choice to make that identity publically salient.35 In GV and Brazil, my American identity was a hidden one until I revealed it to people.

Although my identities and appearance may have influenced participants’ perceptions of me, I believe that this did not influence their interview responses. The candidness, sincerity, and depth with which return migrants and non-migrants answered questions indicated that they were not telling me what I wanted to hear as a researcher. A review of the fieldnotes I wrote and data I collected regarding interviewer effects provided additional support for participants’ frankness in discussing race and migration.

---

35 This allowed me to see if social class really was the primary factor influencing differential treatment instead of race or skin tone, as has often been argued by Brazilians (Telles 2004). From my personal experiences, I found that a nonwhite person cannot benefit from “social whitening” until stating one’s middle class, educated, or American status.
issues. Telles (2004) also documents the lack of political correctness that Brazilians have particularly when making racially offensive remarks or jokes.

**Contextualizing the Findings**

Because this dissertation examines how return migrants conceptualize and make sense of race in multiple contexts - in Brazil before immigrating, while living in the US as immigrants, and after returning to Brazil - further contextualization is needed for understanding the race-related terminology I use and interpreting the findings in subsequent chapters. Due to language and cultural differences ascribed to the meaning of the word “race” (raça in Portuguese) in Brazil and the US, I wish to clarify my use of the terms race, skin color, and racial classification in this study.

As discussed in Chapter one, race is generally associated with skin color in Brazil and Telles (2004) argues that “côr” or color is based on a combination of physical characteristics that Americans associate with race such as skin color, hair texture, and nose and lip shape. Thus, I will specifically use “racial classification” to refer to categories or words that are commonly used to distinguish individuals on the basis of the physical characteristics that Telles (2004) associates with côr in the Brazilian context, but which Americans associate with race. I will use “skin tone classification” to refer to the actual skin color in which respondents self-classified on a scale of one (light) to ten (dark). When I use the word “race,” it will refer to the social construction of race broadly in Brazil and/or in the US.

---

36 Cultural/nationality note: Based on my observations of and interactions with Brazilians in general, I have noticed that they can be brutally honest when sharing their personal or political opinions even if it offends others. On the other hand, Americans tend to be more guarded and polite rather than offend.
Although I also provide socio-historical background on racial frameworks in Brazil and the US in Chapter one, it is important to remember that returnees came from a particular context in Brazil and also experienced race in the US in a particular context. While there are nationalized racial projects and formations in both countries, how people perceive and live race is also specific to their particular locales.

Returnees’ perceptions of race in the US were influenced by the region, state, or community in which they lived and the racial/ethnic makeup of that particular context. Although the majority of returnees lived on the East Coast, their perceptions of race in their specific locations may be different in predominantly white, Brazilian, or immigrant communities. Living in a small New England town cannot be compared to living in a large city like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, or Miami. Likewise, when return migrants arrived to the US might have had an impact on their perceptions. Given the history of race in the US, it is undeniable that the pre-1960s era was very different from the 1990s.\(^{37}\) Although the black-white racial binary has historically been used to explain and interpret US race relations, the growth of the Latino population into the largest ethnic minority is shaping and will continue to shape contemporary US racial perceptions for Brazilian immigrants in the future. Thus, as time has passed and the racial makeup of the US has changed, it is important to recognize that the findings regarding return migrants’ US racial conceptions are and will not be static or exhaustive.

Return migrants’ interactions with US citizens and other immigrants may have also affected how they interpreted race in the US. Although returnees in this sample lived

---

\(^{37}\) I did not interview any returnees who were in the US before the 1960s, but merely use this time frame to demonstrate how racial conceptions and ideologies can shift over time.
and worked in the US for an extended amount of time, their most important social interactions occurred with other Brazilian immigrants. Most of the returnees I interviewed spoke little English, lived in Brazilian neighborhoods, worshipped at Brazilian churches, and worked with other Brazilians. Therefore, although they were physically in the US, the majority of them did not have significant social interactions with non-Brazilians, which Park and Burgess argue are essential for cultural (and I would argue racial) assimilation to occur:

Assimilation naturally takes place most rapidly where contacts are primary, that is, where they are most intimate and intense, as in the area of touch [socially close] relationship[s], in the family circle, and in intimate congenial groups. Secondary contacts facilitate accommodations, but do not greatly promote assimilation. The contacts here are too external and too remote (cited in Gordon 1964: 62).

Therefore, while Brazilian returnees may have observed and had minimal interactions with black, Latino, or white Americans, the majority of their social world was based in Brazilian ethnic enclaves in New England. Such limited interactions with non-Brazilians may have influenced their understanding of racial dynamics and classification while they lived in the US.

Just as racial demographics, dynamics, and discourse vary across the US, there are also regional geographic-based differences that influence Brazilian race relations (Omi and Winant 1994; Telles 2004; Bailey 2009). Telles (2004) argues that such differences are essential to understanding Brazilian society. In terms of phenotype and economic development, southern and southeastern Brazil are racially whiter and highly

---

38 Here, I refer to racial assimilation as adopting and/or practicing norms of US racial classification and racial relations (e.g. self-segregating).
industrialized while northern and northeastern Brazil have a higher proportion of blacks and browns that experience significant inequality (Telles 2004).

However, the state of Minas Gerais, where GV is located, has a population in which whites constitute only a small majority at 51.4 percent (Telles 2004). Although I was unable to access more specific Census data about the other 48.6 percent of the Mineiro (residents of Minas Gerais) population, I surmise that the majority of these individuals probably racially classify as pardo (or brown) on the Brazilian Census. This assumption is based on: (1) my knowledge of Brazilian racial classification in which most Brazilians self-classify as pardo rather than black or white and (2) my personal observations from conducting research in GV and traveling through Minas Gerais. From conversations with Mineiros and Brazilians from other states, I learned that historically Minas Gerais has been perceived as a more racially mixed state where people’s physical features fall in the middle of the black-white phenotype. Mineiros are considered to have the “moreno” or brown skin tone and dark hair that are regarded as characteristic of the Brazilian phenotype.

While I was unable to find official racial demographics for GV, my perception was that the city was predominantly moreno with a small white population and a smaller black population.39 There was also a perception among a few participants (return migrants and non-migrants) that GV was less racist than other parts of Brazil. Those participants mentioned that larger cities such as Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo probably had higher incidents of racial discrimination compared to GV, where the population was

---

39 Race data was difficult to access from the 2000 Brazilian census and local researchers I contacted also could not provide this data. Valadarenses I describe as black and white are based on US standards. By Brazilian standards, some of the Valadarenses I would classify as moreno might be considered white while some of the Valadarenses I would classify as black might be considered moreno.
more racially mixed and people generally got along very well. A small number of participants were also cognizant of the regional differences in racial demographics that Telles (2004) noted, stating that the northeastern state of Bahia was predominantly black and poor while southern Brazil was whiter and more developed.

Therefore, I would argue that the racial conceptions of return migrants (pre and post-migration) and non-migrants were influenced by the particular socio-racial context of GV. Participants’ perspectives in this study may differ from those of Brazilian immigrants who come to the US or non-migrants from other parts of Brazil. While there may be some overarching similarities in national ideals about race in Brazil, it is also relevant to consider the role of regional differences in shaping how Brazilians think about race.

Additional Concerns

One concern worth noting regarding this dissertation was negotiating the nuances of conceptualizing and conducting the project in two languages (Brazilian Portuguese and English) and from two racial standpoints (US and Brazil). Because interviews were conducted in Portuguese and this dissertation is written for a primarily English-speaking audience, I chose to only translate the portions of interviews which are included in the following chapters. Thus, it is possible some nuances were lost in translation. There were certain race-related Brazilian colloquialisms or phrases mentioned in interviews that were very difficult to translate for an American audience. For this reason, I made the decision

---

40 There are other Brazilian cities where US and return migration are also prevalent: Criciúma in Santa Catarina and Goiânia and Anápolis in the state of Goias (Siqueira and Jansen 2008).
to analyze the transcripts in Portuguese and only translate portions (as accurately and
sensibly as possible) that are presented for an English-speaking and US audience.

Related to the issue of language translation and different conceptions of race in
the US and Brazil, I found that some respondents believed the word “race” was a proxy
for racism. For them, the word raça (race in Portuguese) denoted racism and racial
inequality. Thus, participants thought I was asking them “are you racist?” when I was
actually asking them for their open-ended racial classification: “how do you see yourself
in terms of race?”41 I realized this because some respondents told me they were not racist
after I posed that particular question, one that was fundamental to each interview.42
However, when I rephrased the question to ask “how do you see yourself in terms of
[skin] color,” participants understood that I was asking for their racial classification and
responded accordingly.43 This experience when collecting data coincides with existing
literature which argues that Brazilians perceive of race as associated with skin color as
opposed to distinct racial groups that have intra-group social affinities (Bailey 2009;
Telles 2004; Nobles 2000; Silva 1996; Oliveira et al. 1985; Nogueira 1985). Differences,
such as these, in language and understandings of race in our respective social contexts
had to be bridged between participants and me over the course of this project.

I would also like to highlight the difficulty of attempting to explore participants’
racial conceptions, especially their racial classifications, at different stages of the

41 This occurred for 41 percent of returnees and 58 percent of non-migrants, demonstrating how Brazilians
sometimes conflate racial classification with racism.
42 I did not provide specific categories when I initially asked for respondents’ self-ascribed open-ended
racial classifications in the interviews.
43 I initially included “raça” in the protocol for this question since other Brazilian surveys use “raça” when
asking for participants’ racial classifications. Bailey’s (2009) analyses of racial boundaries among
Brazilians in Rio de Janeiro suggest that Brazilians interpret Census racial categories as “color categories
rather than robust racial groups” (pg. 60).
migration process. As social constructions, racial conceptions, identities, and
classifications are not static, which means they are constantly shifting and being
renegotiated as individuals move within and across different racialized social systems
(Bonilla-Silva 1997; Omi and Winant 1994). Because my focus is on Brazilian return
migrants who not only migrated from Brazil to the US and back to Brazil, but also moved
between different US locales during the US migration, how these people reflected on
their racial conceptions at different times could not be perfectly captured. As social actors
in a globalized world, these were individuals on the move within time and space.
Although qualitative and quantitative researchers attempt to explore racial conceptions
using various methods, it is not possible to measure any aspects related to race at one
particular point in time with 100 percent accuracy, since a respondent’s classification or
conception could shift before or after the question is answered.

Where quotes are incorporated in the following chapters, they were translated
from the Portuguese interview transcript and include the participant’s pseudonym, open-
ended racial self classification, gender, and age as reported at the time of the interview.
For return migrants, I also insert the US state(s) where they resided as immigrants during
their time in the US. I thought it was most appropriate to use each participant’s open-
ended racial self classification since open-ended classifications were a more accurate
reflection of how participants racially saw themselves in relation to Brazilian Census
categories. However, for some participants, there was some inconsistency between the
open-ended and census classifications, as well as between how they self-classified and
how I classified them. Whenever such an inconsistency occurred for a quoted participant,
I include a footnote to contextualize his or her racial classification given these factors. I
have also chosen to include sets of three or four lengthy quotes to demonstrate the depth and representativeness of participants’ racial conceptions across racial, gender, age, and US location (if applicable) differences.

Finally, it is important to note that the findings are exploratory and not intended to be generalizable to all Brazilian immigrants in the US or all Brazilian return migrants and non-migrants in the city of Governador Valadares. The findings presented in subsequent chapters should not be considered all encompassing, but rather a starting point for additional studies regarding the influence of US migration on racial conceptions among Brazilians.
Chapter 4
Examining Brazilian Return Migrants’ Personal Conceptions about Race in the United States

Introduction

This chapter examines Brazilian return migrants’ recollections of how race shaped their personal experiences while living in the US as immigrants. More specifically, I examine how these individuals negotiated racial classification and their personal encounters with discrimination. I found that returnees thought racial classification in the US was very different from the system in Brazilian society, where one’s racial classification had little personal significance, but rather was generally a word or category that described an individual’s skin tone. These findings are consistent with recent comparative studies on race in Brazil and the US and demonstrate that Brazilian returnees were cognizant of societal differences regarding racial classification in both countries (Bailey 2009; Telles 2004). Consequently, these differences influenced how they racially classified themselves while living in the US. There were two primary ways that racial classification took on significance and became salient for return migrants while living in the US when compared to Brazil: racial classification seemed more explicitly important in the US for determining an individual’s position in the social hierarchy and participants experienced confusion when classifying using US racial terminology, finding the Latino and Hispanic categories particularly problematic. Returnees also discussed their personal
experiences with and observations of what they perceived as racial or anti-immigrant-based discrimination while they were in the US, suggesting that such discrimination was much more blatant in the US compared to Brazil.

The transnational racial optic, which I defined in Chapter one as a lens by which migrants develop an understanding of race in the US based on racial norms from their home society, is an important way to interpret how Brazilian returnees made sense of their personal experiences race in the US. Because Brazilians come to the US with a more flexible understanding of racial classification and an experience of more “cordial” interracial interactions in Brazil compared to US citizens, Brazilians’ observations of race in the US are constantly compared to what they remembered about the social construction of race in Brazilian society. Other immigrants also come to the US with different understandings of race and thus, have to adapt upon arrival (Roth 2006; Itzigsohn et. al 2005; Landale and Oropesa 2002; Oboler 1995). In examining how the findings in this chapter relate to participants’ pre-migration perceptions of racial classification and discrimination in Brazilian society, I show that Brazilian returnees, as transnational migrants with a homebound orientation, used a transnational racial optic to develop an understanding of race in the United States.

Drawing on anecdotes and quantitative data collected from the interviews, I argue that returnees negotiated racial classification and recognized incidents of discrimination in the US using a transnational racial optic. That is, they constantly compared what they experienced or observed in the US with what they remembered about the less rigid system of racial classification and what they perceived as more class-based discrimination in Brazilian society. In analyzing the qualitative data, I incorporated
participants’ states of residence in the US to examine if there were geography-based differences in terms of racial classifications, experiences of racism, and other racial conceptions while Brazilian returnees lived in the US. Despite living in different parts of the US, I found similarities in the results presented in Chapters four and five. 44

Finding 1: Complexity of US Racial Classification

Importance of Racial Classification in US

During interviews, a recurring theme among many returnees was their astonishment at the importance of racial classification in the US. Some return migrants felt it was an obsession or a thing of US citizens to be able to place others in particular racial groups or categories. Nearly all returnees also noticed that racial groups and categories were well-defined in the US whereas in Brazil and especially GV, participants argued, it was hard to similarly define racial groups due to the racial mixture in the population.

I think this [issue] of racial classification exists more in the US. I think it is theirs [the Americans]. Here in Brazil, we don’t have this type of thing like in other countries. But there, they [the Americans] insist you’re Latino, you’re white, you’re Hispanic. I don’t understand this type of classification, it’s one of their [Americans’] things.

-Thiago, white man, 49 years, New York 45

Because of the importance they [Americans] give [to racial classification], you begin at times to question your race… Near where I lived, there was a weekly drawing to give away a breakfast. So, you fill out a form and it had name, birthdate, address, telephone, race, I don’t know why. What I felt was that there [in the US] race was more important than here in Brazil. That’s why I gave more importance to race there, because I had to respond all the time to what race I was.

-Luana, white woman, 45 years, North Carolina

44 I was unable to assess US regional differences in the quantitative data presented since I primarily used crosstabs and had a non-random sample.

45 Each quote includes the participant’s pseudonym, self-ascribed open-ended racial classification and age as reported when I interviewed them and US state of residence.
Even through the media, cinema, [and] television [in Brazil], we [Brazilians], I saw that skin color in the US is well-defined: You are white or black. If you are white, you have access to this area. If you are black, you have access to that area. It works, they [Americans] socialize but each one [group] has his space.

-Sergio, Moreno/mixed man, 46 years, Connecticut

These quotes demonstrate how returnees understood and felt about racial classification in the US. There was a perception that racial classification is a unique feature of US society and that Brazilians do not bother with such classifications or at least that these classifications have no particular social significance for Brazilians. Thiago, a very light-skinned returnee with dark eyes and brown hair who acknowledged having Italian ancestry and who I thought could have passed for white in the US, sees this focus on racial classification as an “American” thing. Luana, a female returnee with light skin and bleached blonde hair, and Sergio, a male returnee with medium brown skin and black curly hair, both discuss their perception of race as very relevant and defined in US society. Furthermore, these quotes show how Brazilian immigrants recognize the US racial system as one where racial classification is important, where each individual must be classified, and how one’s classification determines one’s access to specific spaces in US society.46

Thiago and Luana’s quotes imply a perception that returnees felt pressure from Americans to classify in one particular racial category. They also felt that requesting racial classification on various forms demonstrated an American obsession with racial categorization that does not exist in Brazil. In the second quote, Luana discussed how she began to think more about racial classification while living in the US because she was

46 Chapter five explores returnees’ perceptions of how race influences interracial relations in the US, specifically comparisons between US and Brazilian blacks and the pervasiveness of social segregation.
forced to, due to its importance in US society. These two quotes and many others like these among return migrants provide clear examples of how these individuals developed an understanding of racial classification in the US that contrasted with their perceptions of a less rigid and less important system of racial classification in Brazil. Other studies also document that racial classification is actually more fluid and less important for the basis of racial group-formation in Brazil compared to the US (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009).

The final quote speaks to that participant’s perception regarding the importance of race in social interactions. Sergio also mentioned how he and other Brazilians “learned” this from various media forms in Brazil before immigrating to the US, which is indicative of how transnational links via the media can give Brazilians some idea regarding the function and importance of race as a form of classification and stratification in the US. Roth (2006) discusses how the circulation of Latino-media (e.g. Univisión, Telemundo) from the US to Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic facilitates Latino ethnic identity construction among migrants and non-migrants in all three locations. Although these Latino media forms were less present in Brazil due to language differences, it is likely that the global dissemination of US pop culture through media and living in the US migrant-saturated culture of Governador Valadares before immigrating exposes potential migrants to notions of US racial classification before leaving. Sergio also goes on to say that this is how the US racial system works, and while there may be sporadic interracial interactions, Americans stay confined to their racial groups for the most part.

The quotes above indicate that returnees recognized the importance of racial classification in the US not only for US residents, but also for them, as immigrants. Returnees’ responses to a question which asked about the importance of their own racial
classification using US Census-derived categories in the US demonstrated that about 35 percent of returnees recalled believing their racial classification to be important or very important when they were living in the US.\textsuperscript{47} When asked to recall the importance of their pre-migration racial classification in Brazil using Brazilian Census-derived categories, 16 percent responded that their racial classification was important or very important. Therefore, there was a difference of almost 20 percentage points with regard to the importance of racial classification for returnees while in the US as compared to while they were in Brazil before migrating.

Tables 5 and 6 on the next page show comparisons between the levels of importance of racial classification for return migrants before immigrating and while in the US for each of the most populous racial categories, which were white (branco), black (preto), mixed (pardo-Brazil), and Latino/Hispanic. Since 86 percent of participants classified as branco, preto, or pardo in Brazil and 75 percent classified as white, black or Latino/Hispanic in the US, I combined the remaining categories (e.g. yellow/Asian American, Indigenous/Native American, and Other) into an overall “Other” racial category. I also show the collapsed level of importance categories to be very/somewhat important and not/not at all important in Tables 5 and 6.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} After asking each participant how he/she racially classified using the Census-derived categories, my next question was: “how important is this classification for you?” The purpose of asking this question was to learn if racially classifying in a particular way had any social significance for participants.

\textsuperscript{48} I collapsed these categories since very/somewhat important and not/not at all important were substantively the same when they were not collapsed.
### Table 5: Importance of Race before Immigrating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race before Immigrating (Census Categories)</th>
<th>Very/Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not/Not At All Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branco (white)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preto (black)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardo (mixed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarelo/Indigena/Other (yellow/indigenous)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Importance of Race in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race in US (Census Categories)</th>
<th>Very/Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not/Not At All Important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Asian American/Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both tables, it is clear that an overwhelming majority of returnees in the sample reported that their categorical racial classifications were not important. In Brazil pre-migration, this was true for nearly 84 percent of participants while in the US, this was true for 65 percent of participants. Four participants who recalled self-classifying as black pre-migration and in the US found their racial classifications to be somewhat or
very important while those who primarily self-classified as white and pardo (in Brazil) and white and Hispanic/Latino (in the US) reported a lack of importance of racial classification, which suggests racial differences in how participants rated the importance of their own racial identification. Whereas race in Brazil was important primarily for returnees who self-classified as black before immigrating, race was more important for a larger number of respondents while they were in the US. This provides additional support for the idea that living in a country that is more sensitive to racial classification may facilitate a more salient racialized identity, at least among these respondents.

While most participants did not consider racial classification to be important in either country, the perceived importance was more than twice as great in the US compared to what it was pre-migration. In Table 7, the dark gray highlighted diagonal signifies where there was consistency among participants with regard to the importance of race before immigrating and while in the US. From observing this diagonal, we can see that for at least 50 percent of participants, the importance of race remained the same in Brazil before immigrating and while in the US.

**Table 7: Importance of Race before Immigrating vs US**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Importance before Immigrating</th>
<th>Race Importance in US</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important at All</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, although there is agreement, there were also some shifts for some return migrants between race importance categories across the two contexts. The light gray cells indicate participants who initially reported their racial classification as not or not at all important in Brazil before immigrating, but who indicated their classifications as somewhat or very important in the US. That ten participants reported their racial classification as not important in Brazil and then as somewhat or very important in the US suggests that being in the US made these individuals more cognizant of the importance of racial classification, as was also indicated in the qualitative findings in this chapter. Additionally, some qualitative responses in returnees’ interviews revealed a pressure to classify in some pre-existing category such as white, black, Latino/Hispanic, Asian American, or Native American even though many participants felt those categories did not appropriately describe how they self-classified. Compared to what prevailed in Brazil, many returnees found the US system of racial classification to be very rigid and in some ways constricting. For this reason, return migrants were reminded of the fluidity and (relative) insignificance of racial classification in Brazil as a result of living in US society, demonstrating that returnees’ relied on the transnational racial optic, which facilitated simultaneously “living” race (via the negotiation of racial classification) in both countries.  

Confusion about US Racial Categories

Just as the importance of racial classification in US society was somewhat perplexing for Brazilian return migrants, US racial categories themselves were also a

49 A tabulation for the importance of race for non-migrants showed that about 17 percent thought their racial classification was very or somewhat important while 83.4 percent thought their racial classification was not or not at all important.
source of confusion. Many returnees mentioned being unsure of how to racially classify on applications for employment or school enrollment, since they felt none of the categories applied to them as Brazilians. Likewise, returnees who self-classified as white before immigrating felt they could not similarly classify in the US since white in the US is “really white” and generally referred to people with no racially mixed ancestry, very pale skin, straight blonde hair, and blue eyes. Therefore, returnees recognized that being white in Brazil, where an individual can have mixed racial ancestry and still be white, was not the same as being white in the US, where mixed racial ancestry (regardless of physical appearance) would generally exclude an individual from being considered white. Other studies of Latin American immigrants also note different conceptions of whiteness in the US and Latin America, which these migrants must negotiate (Roth 2006; Vidal-Ortiz 2004; Haney Lopez 1996).

Additionally, due to returnees’ exposure to US culture before migrating and notions about the rigidity of US racial classification acquired while living in the US, returnees presumed that being American was synonymous with being racially white. This presumption about the relationship between white racial classification and US citizenship also influenced returnees’ racial classifications, which also explains the decrease in white racial classification among returnees while living in the US. When referring to Americans in interviews, returnees indicated that in order to be American or

---

50 Literature on the one-drop rule suggests that once a “white-looking” person reveals mixed ancestry, they are no longer perceived as white by others who are aware of this ancestry (Davis 1991; Feagin 2000). At least, this was the case for racially mixed blacks (who looked white) after the Civil War and into the 20th century. Additionally, since Americans think of Brazil as a nonwhite country, self-ascribed “white” Brazilians may not be really seen as “white” in the US, especially after revealing their Brazilian nationality (McDonnell and DeLoureno 2009; Marrow 2003; Margolis 1998).
perceived as American, a person had to be white. Therefore, whenever returnees made references to Americans in interviews, I asked returnees to specify these Americans’ races to contextualize who returnees were discussing. Some returnees also told me how surprised they were to arrive to the US and see people of all colors and nationalities since they assumed the US was an all white country.

Brazilian return migrants’ confusion with racial classification in the US was a result of various factors: the absence of a “mixed” racial category on applications, recognition that their self-classification differed from how Americans racially perceived them, and being grouped with Hispanics. The latter two factors influenced Brazilian immigrants’ perceptions of the Latino and/or Hispanic categories, which were generally negative.

They [Americans] have a way of looking at each other and the Hispanics and we Brazilians recognize this. Because, for example, who[ever] looks at the Brazilian and at the Hispanic sees the difference in the shape of the head, the way they dress, many things, you understand? They [Hispanics] are very different from us, I think they’re different. And I felt like this, there are already so many Brazilian immigrants in the US, they [Americans have] this classification [Hispanic] there. Why? …Because in reality, we [Brazilians] are not Hispanic, not because I have anything against them [Hispanics], but we’re different to the point that we [Brazilians] don’t have a place [classification/category], we are without a place [classification/category] there.

-Juliana, Morena/mixed woman, 41 years, Massachusetts

I’m joking, but, no American, I think he doesn’t have a word for me. If I say that I consider myself Hispanic and in reality for the American, it’s the contrary. The American, not all of them, but the great majority think the Brazilian is Hispanic but it’s not true. We [Brazilians] don’t speak Spanish, so we can’t be classified as Hispanic. Not to discredit the Hispanics, they are like us, it’s just that the language is different. So it means that Hispanic comes from Spanish. So, I couldn’t [figure] out what I was, I’m not black, I’m not white [in the US] because white there [in the US] is really white. So, I was thinking, if I am not Hispanic then what am I? Even when my daughter went to school, there was race [on the forms]. I didn’t know, I was in doubt [about how to classify her] because [the form] had Spanish, Caucasian, Black, what else, Asian, Native American. I didn’t fit into

---

51 This created some notable research moments for me as a black American. The stereotype that Americans are racially white stems from attempts by the US government and white American society to construe the national identity of the US as a white country during the 19th and early 20th centuries through US Census racial enumeration and immigration policy. This was also related to the idea that people in the US were “Americans” even though everyone in the Americas (North, Central, South) are also Americans (Oboler 1995; Roediger 2005).
any of those categories. I left [the space] white [blank] , I would have I said I was Hispanic if I spoke Spanish or had been born in Mexico, Guatemala. I couldn’t figure this out when I was there.

-Felipe, white man, 34 years, Massachusetts & Connecticut

The Latino in the US, [people from] other countries in the US, they have a lot of problems there. We [Brazilians] see that many Americans don’t like Mexicans, they [Americans] don’t like other types [of nationalities]. So, between us Brazilians, we started, some Brazilians discriminated against Hispanics in the US. But, on the other hand we knew that this [discrimination] happens to Brazilians there. So at times, we were afraid, there was a certain indifference between Brazilians and Hispanics. Sometimes, we discriminated because there were so many Hispanics and I think that the Hispanic is also responsible for a lot of the crime in the US.

- Henrique, Moreno/Mixed man, 27 years, Massachusetts

Each of these quotes demonstrates returnees’ personal experiences with being confused by the US racial classification system. Of particular importance is the reference to the Latino/Hispanic category that is often ascribed to Brazilian immigrants in the US. I perceived both Juliana and Felipe to have light to medium brown skin tone, and both expressed an inability to classify using US racial categories: they felt they “did not have a place” to classify. Although the Hispanic category is listed on the US Census and on other forms, some Brazilian immigrants initially resisted classifying as such because they do not speak Spanish and some were reluctant to identify with a group that they perceived as very marginalized in the US.

The last quote suggests that Henrique perceived that Americans strongly disliked and negatively stereotyped Mexicans. Henrique also acknowledges that Brazilian immigrants discriminate against Hispanics whom he and other returnees perceived to be responsible for crime in the US. Other return migrants mentioned their perception of

52 Although this participant self-classified as white (open-ended and using Census categories) before and after migrating, he self-classified in the US as “neither white nor black” (open-ended). Due to his darker skin tone (equal to or darker than mine), I did not classify him as white as the interviewer in the American or Brazilian context.
negative stereotypes about Hispanics as a primary reason (in addition to language) for not wanting to classify as Hispanic. Of the participants who recollected hearing anything about race in the US before immigrating (62 percent), none of them recalled specifically hearing anything about Latinos, Hispanics, or those categories, which would suggest that return migrants learned and internalized negative stereotypes about members of this group after arriving to the US. Some of those stereotypes included a perception that Hispanics were viewed as illegal immigrants and as being involved with drug trafficking.

When asked more specifically about whether they would classify as Latino and/or Hispanic, returnees demonstrated less resistance to the Latino category than the Hispanic category. Returnees recognized that Brazil was a part of Latin America and felt the Latino category was appropriate for that reason. However, even in those cases, returnees mentioned their preference to be identified as Brazilian to distinguish themselves among immigrants from Latin America. Despite identifying differences between Brazilians and Hispanics and attempting to distance themselves from Hispanics, these Brazilian returnees were also cognizant that Americans viewed them as Hispanics. Some also expressed concern that negative perceptions of Hispanics would negatively influence Americans’ perceptions and treatment of Brazilians. These findings are consistent with results from other studies that examine Brazilian immigrants’ perceptions of the Latino/Hispanic categories (McDonnell and Lourenço 2008; Martes 2007; Marrow 2003). My research contributes to these previous studies by demonstrating that returnees have strong recollections about resisting Hispanic ethno-racial classification and recognizing the negative stereotypes and marginalized position of Hispanics in the US even after returning to Brazil.
A look at the data regarding returnees’ self-classification (using US Census-derived categories and open-ended responses) and how returnees felt others racially classified them in the US (perceived external racial classification) demonstrate additional findings with regard to returnees’ perceptions of the Latino/Hispanic category. Figures 1 and 2 show returnees’ recollections of their racial classifications before immigrating and while in the US. The distribution of categories looks very different in these pie charts. While 49 percent classified as white, 25 percent as brown, and 12 percent as black using Brazilian Census categories, 38.8 percent classified as Hispanic/Latino, 28.6 percent as white, 8.2 percent as black, and 16.3 percent as “Other” using US census-derived categories. These numbers suggest that returnees’ racial classification was different in Brazil compared to the US, especially among those who self-classified as white. Furthermore, the majority of returnees classified in a category that does not even exist in Brazil and one that they acknowledged having very limited awareness of until they arrived in the US.

Figure 1: Race in Brazil Pre-Migration

(Brazil Census)

Figure 2: Race in US (US Census)
These pie charts also show how returnees classified when provided with specific racial categories. Table 8 shows crosstabs (with percentages) of returnees’ recollections of their pre-migration racial classification and their classification while in the US, to demonstrate the shift between racial classification categories for many respondents, especially those who self-classified as white in Brazil before migrating.53

Table 8: Brazilian Racial Classifications (Pre-Migration) vs US Racial Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race before Immigrating-Brazil (Census Categories)</th>
<th>Race in US (Census Categories)</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branco (white)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preto (black)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardo (mixed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outro (other)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes categories such as Asian American (amarelo), Native American (indigena)

53 To run this cross-tabulation, I recoded the racial categories to have the same values (e.g. branco =1, white =1, etc). Since the white and black categories are on both the Brazil and US censuses, I recoded them with the same values. Although the pardo (brown) category does not exist in the US, I recoded it to coincide with the Latino/Hispanic category since the majority of participants classified in this category in the US, indicating that they felt this was the category that most closely fit with how they perceived themselves. Additionally, Martes (2007) and Hollinger (2000) argue that US and Brazilian census-based categories can be aligned in this way since they are officially sanctioned categories and represent “colloquial” racial categories in both countries. I collapsed the remaining self-classifications into an overall “Other” category. Though the US Census asks individuals of Hispanic origin to classify ethnically as Hispanic and also racially (e.g. black, white), I combined the categories “Hispanic/Latino” in my protocol for two reasons. First, existing literature on Brazilian immigrants indicates that they have exposure to both terms in the US and are generally externally classified as Hispanic. Second, some returnees used the terms interchangeably during pre-test interviews.
I have highlighted the diagonal in dark gray so it is easier to see the frequencies and percentages for the categories in which the pre-migration and US self-classifications are in agreement. From looking at the frequencies, it is clear that some returnees’ racial classifications changed in the US. Perhaps the most notable finding is that nearly half (42 percent) of individuals who self-classified as white in Brazil pre-migration self-classified in the Hispanic/Latino categories in the US. Furthermore, among those who self-classified as “pardo” before immigrating, about 42 percent self-classified as Latino/Hispanic, nearly 17 percent as white, and 33 percent as “Other” while living in the US, indicating that more than half of pardos preferred to not self-classify as Latino/Hispanic in the US.

While the categorical racial classifications provide information regarding how return migrants self-classified in the US, Table 9 shows how participants self-classified when given no prompts or categories. The range of categories returnees used to self-classify when not given specific categories demonstrates Brazilians’ less rigid norms for racial classification. However, once asked to classify using Census categories, the majority of participants classified as Latino/Hispanic. Although roughly 40 percent of the sample ethno-racially self-classified as Latino/Hispanic using US census categories (see figure 2), only 10 percent identified as Hispanic (either solely or in combination with another category) and 6 percent identified as Latino (either solely or in combination with another category) when asked for an open-ended racial classification in the US. These bolded and highlighted categories can be seen in Table 9.
Table 9: Open-Ended Racial Classifications in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Moreno</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Yellow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Brazilian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian/Latina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Classify</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not White or Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not White or Black, Foreigner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed, Yellow, White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return migrants most frequently self-classified as mixed (26 percent) and white (22 percent) when not given specific racial categories in which to classify.\(^{54}\) Note that while these open-ended self-classifications reflect the categories in which most individuals self-classified (as mixed and white) before immigrating (see figure 1), the number of returnees who self-classified as white in the US is still much lower when compared to pre-migration Brazilian Census category classifications.\(^{55}\) These different numbers between open-ended and Census categorical classifications reflect returnees’ norms to not classify in specific categories, especially the Latino/Hispanic category.

\(^{54}\) In each section of the interview (e.g. before, during, after immigration), I asked participants to racially self-classify with no prompts (open-ended) and then asked participants to self-classify using Brazilian or US Census-derived categories where appropriate.

\(^{55}\) Returnees’ open-ended racial classifications before immigrating were: 35% Mixed (some form); 39% white (some form); 10% black; 4% Neutral/normal; 4% Yellowish; 4% Did Not Classify; 2% Latina. “Mixed (some form)” includes returnees who self-classified as moreno/a, pardo/a, or mulatto while “white (some form)” includes those who self-classified as branco or brasileiro branco (white Brazilian).
unless prompted to do so. Although these self-classifications are important in
demonstrating how return migrants negotiated racial classification in the US, another
important factor was how others externally classified them.

Previous studies on identity formation, especially racial and ethnic identity, argue
that externally ascribed classification can shape internal or self-asserted classification and
identity claims (Nagel 1994; Cornell and Hartmann 1997; Jenkins 1994; Barth 1969).
Although individuals, in this case Brazilian returnees, have the agency to self-classify in
a manner of their choosing, external forces in the social world (e.g. people, classification
norms) can also ascribe a classification to an individual (Nagel 1994; Cornell and
Hartmann 1997; Roth 2006). This process is usually influenced by the power of the social
actor and that of the external social forces. Given that Brazilian immigrants are generally
undocumented, do not speak English, work in low-skilled jobs, and are immigrants, their
lack of social power in the US makes it difficult for them to assert a classification that
aligns with their pre-migration classifications and is socially accepted in the US. I asked
return migrants how they believed other people, more specifically Americans, classified
them in the US: 62 percent of returnees said they felt they were classified as Hispanic, 16
percent as white, 10 percent as black, and 12 percent as “Other.”

Due to returnees’ more fluid norms for racial classifications and the influence of
external classification on self racial classification, I was curious to see if their self-
classifications aligned with how they felt Americans perceived them. Therefore, I ran
crosstabs between returnees’ own classifications and perceived external racial
classifications by others in the US, and the results can be seen in Table 10. I found that
there was some agreement, especially for those return migrants who self-classified as
black (N=4) and Latino/Hispanic (N=16). However, there was much more variation for those who self-classified as white or “Other”: 50 percent of those who self-classified as white and nearly 60 percent of those who self-classified as “Other” believed they were classified by Americans as Hispanic/Latino.

Table 10: Self-Ascribed vs. External Racial Classification in US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Ascribed Racial Classification</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic/ Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Self-Ascribed vs. External Racial Classification in US

While this data provides some evidence that external classification may have influenced returnees’ self classifications in the US, closer examination of the three factors that influenced these individuals’ open-ended racial classifications in Brazil before immigration and in the US also shows the influence of perceived external classification on returnees’ classification choices. Table 11 includes the three factors that returnees reported as affecting their open-ended classifications in both countries. The question which asked about the factors influencing open-ended classification was phrased: “When you classified as (open-ended response), what factors did you take into consideration in 1\(^{st}\), 2\(^{nd}\), and 3\(^{rd}\) place?” There were seven answer choices: (1) skin color; (2) hair; (3)
other physical characteristics—eye color, nose, mouth, etc.; (4) your family-parents, grandparents; (5) how other people see you; (6) none/nothing; and (7) other. Under each factor, the top three characteristics by frequency report are included.

**Table 11: Factors Influencing Open-Ended Racial Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Migration</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>In US</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Tone</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Skin Tone</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Phys. Features</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Other Phys. Features</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of Table 11 reveals that perceived external racial classification (operationalized as “how others see me”) may have had a stronger influence on returnees’ open-ended racial classifications in the US than it did in Brazil before immigrating. Looking at the light gray cells in the table, we can see that external racial classification only appeared as a top characteristic under the third most important self-reported factor, with 18 percent of participants reporting this as something that influenced their pre-migration classification, but only in third place. However, external racial classification was a top characteristic under all three factors while returnees lived in the US: 1st factor-14 percent, 2nd factor-18 percent, and 3rd factor-20 percent.
When we consider that returnees classified predominantly as Latino/Hispanic using US Census-derived categories and that returnees felt they were classified by others as Hispanic/Latino, there is a strong possibility that external classification had some influence on returnees’ classification choices in the US. Therefore, although self classification is important in identity formation (for the purposes of accommodation or resistance to ethno-racial categories), the findings in this section suggest that most returnees self-classified as Latino/Hispanic due to external racial classification, which shaped their racial classification choices (Nagel 1994; Cornell and Hartmann 1997; Hall and DuGay 1996; Bailey 2009). Despite returnees’ negative perceptions of Hispanics and their preference to classify as Brazilian when given the option, Brazilian returnees found that they were ascribed Latino/Hispanic membership due to the presumed homogeneity of the Latino/Hispanic label as referring to all individuals of Latin American ancestry.

Studies of other Latin American immigrants, particularly Dominicans and Puerto Ricans, also demonstrate a resistance to US racial classification. However, those immigrants, like Brazilian return migrants in this study, recognize that such resistance is difficult to counteract due to the pervasiveness and significance of rigid racial classification in US society (Roth 2006; Itzigsohn, et al. 2005; Duany 2002). Roth (2006) provides a description of the process by which panethnic identity formation occurs based on existing literature. She argues that such formation develops among ethnic groups in three stages: (1) ascription by external social actors who see group members as homogenous; (2) accommodation in which the ethnic group conforms to panethnic label for self-classification, and (3) identification with the panethnic label as the ethnic group
politically mobilizes around common structural conditions (Cornell 1988; Espiritu 1992; Okamura 1981; Sanders 2002). However, Roth also argues that the accommodation stage does not necessarily mean that an ethnic group completely agrees with the pan-ethnic label ascribed to the group:

Accommodation often follows quickly [after the ascription stage], as individuals within the group initially assume the panethnic label in order to conform to the expectations of outsiders, including the state. This does not imply acceptance of those labels, but merely the need to interact with a society that organizes itself on the basis of such classifications (pg. 198).

Based on the data presented above, Brazilian returnees in this study underwent the ascription and accommodation stages in that they recognized that they were ethno-racially classified as Latino/Hispanic and subsequently self-classified in this category while living in the US. However, it is likely these individuals self-classified as Latino/Hispanic due to external pressure to conform to US racial classification norms. Because these individuals did not remain in the United States, it is difficult to know whether or not they underwent the identification stage. However, as migrants who returned to Brazil, it is possible to explore the attachment these individuals had to US racial categories by examining if they continued to self-classify as Latino/Hispanic after the US migration, which I do in Chapter six.

Return migrants’ confusion with US racial categories were related to typical perceptions of more fluid racial classification in Brazilian society, showing another way that Brazilians transnationally linked racial perceptions in the US and Brazil using a transnational racial optic. The qualitative and quantitative findings in this section indicate that although returnees’ racial classifications and importance of race shifted while living in the US, their constant comparisons between race in Brazil and the US helped them
negotiate their racial classification in the US. Many of the qualitative interview anecdotes demonstrate support for the idea that returnees in this sample relied on pre-migration and therefore transnational racial ideas to navigate racial classification in the US.

Additionally, even though there were categories which were the same in the US and Brazil (e.g. white, black), Brazilians understood that these terms meant different things in the two countries. This was revealed by returnees who self-classified as white in Brazil before immigrating, but self-classified as Latino/Hispanic in the US due to the realization that they were not “white” in the US. Likewise, they also recognized that the black racial category was a catch all for anyone with black racial ancestry regardless of phenotype. Therefore, not only did return migrants realize that the phenotype and ancestry assigned to racial nomenclature differed between both countries, but also that this classification was much more important in US society than Brazilian society.

My results suggest that returnees derived the importance of race and racial classification in the US by comparing it to the lack of importance these characteristics had in Brazil. Having a Brazilian socialized framework of race helped returnees recognize how different and important racial classification was in the US. Thus, their recognition of such differences provides support for my argument that Brazilian returnees used a transnational racial optic to negotiate racial classification in the US.

Finding 2: Experiencing Racial or Anti-Immigrant Discrimination

The second way in which Brazilian immigrants discussed their personal perceptions of race in the US was related to experiencing racial and/or anti-immigrant discrimination. As stated before, many returnees mentioned hearing about overt racial
discrimination in the US before immigrating. However, some were very shocked to be the victims of such discrimination when it occurred. The quotes below recount some returnees’ experiences of discrimination while living in the US.

Where I worked with Brazilians, I have a friend that lived in the US for 20 years who told me, “you are black, whites won’t like you here.” He told me this… [and later] this is what happened to me, a white guy wouldn’t give me a job because I was black. But, he didn’t tell me… he told me he didn’t have any money [to hire another worker]. But, he didn’t say it was because I was black, he didn’t say anything. But, my friend got the job and told me he [the boss] didn’t like blacks. Why didn’t he like the work of a black? I am a good worker, I’m honest, I don’t fight, I don’t say anything. But, there was a problem with him [the boss].

– Fernando, black man, 42 years, Massachusetts

I think like this, they [Americans] constantly watch you in the store, when you go in a store, as soon as you arrive and you don’t know how to properly speak English, people would laugh at us. And, I felt bad, they were the type of people that followed me around to see, I wasn’t going to steal anything.

– Bianca, Morena woman, 29 years, New Jersey

So, I felt a little bit of discrimination…when I worked as a salesperson, one time I did business with an older American man. Because I had lived there [in the US] for many years, I didn’t have [speak with] an accent…some guys that I worked with called me on the radio [walkie talkie] and said “I need you to do a job for us.” [in Spanish] So, when I answered him in Spanish, this old guy took the contract…he looked, got his check, and asked me “are you Hispanic?” And I said “no, I am Brazilian, but I have lived here for many years.” So… he tore up the check and the contract and said “get out of my house, you Hispanic son of a b****…He heard me speaking Spanish [with my friend]…and said “get out of my house, Hispanics aren’t welcome in my house.” I didn’t know if I should laugh or cry and I got nervous…I had never experienced anything like that [before].

– Rafael, white man, 31 years, Florida

As the quotes show, Fernando, Bianca, and Rafael recalled experiencing what they considered to be racism, anti-immigrant discrimination, or a combination of the two during their time in the US. Half of the sample (N=24) reported that they themselves

56 This participant self-classified as morena (open-ended), but as white using Brazilian Census categories before and after migrating.
57 This respondent self-classified as white (open-ended and with Brazilian Census categories) although his skin tone was almost as dark as mine and I would not have considered him white in the US.
58 In this section, I based my analysis on what participants perceived to be discriminatory behavior, whether or not it aligns with legal definitions of discrimination in the US.
had experienced discrimination of some form in the US. These returnees felt this discrimination stemmed from their racial classification, lack of English language proficiency, or being perceived as Hispanic and illegal. Although the other half of the returnee sample did not report directly experiencing discrimination, they reported observing or knowing other people (e.g. Brazilians, Americans of different racial groups) who experienced discrimination.

Fernando’s quote is a poignant example of racism experienced by a self-identifying black Brazilian whose friend blatantly told him that a particular boss would not like or hire him because he was black. Fernando’s friend, a white Brazilian, was hired. Since both men were Brazilian immigrants, it can be inferred that the participant’s race was probably the basis for discrimination described in the first quote. Given the history of black-white race relations in the US and my perception that Fernando would have been perceived as black in the US because of his dark brown skin and short curly hair, Fernando’s experience with racism is not unusual. Table 12 shows the distribution across racial categories of returnees’ recollections of discrimination in the US.

59 There were two open-ended questions in the interview that directly asked participants about discrimination in the US. The first was, “did you at any time experience what would be considered racism in the US?” The second question was, “at any time in your social relationships, have you felt discriminated against in the US or Brazil? If so, do you think you were discriminated against because of your race or skin color?” I reviewed each participants’ responses to each of these questions in the transcripts to see what specific forms of discrimination were identified both in the US and Brazil.
Table 12: Experiences of Discrimination by Racial Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race (US Census)</th>
<th>Experienced Discrimination (any kind)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among half of the participants who recalled experiencing discrimination of any kind, the distribution across racial classifications was varied. The majority of participants who self classified as white and black and about half of those who self-classified as Hispanic/Latino and “Other” reported experiencing discrimination in the US.

While Fernando’s quote describes an example of race-based discrimination, Bianca's quote includes a reference to language and being followed around stores, which indicates how her status as an immigrant may have played a role in her being ethnically profiled. While race could have also been a factor in this particular situation, the respondent references her lack of English proficiency as a way in which being a Latin American immigrant influences Americans’ perceptions of her.

Finally, Rafael’s quote shows an experience that represents an intersection of racial and anti-immigrant discrimination. It appears that Rafael may have been perceived by his American client as white until he spoke Spanish with some other clients via walkie talkie. As soon as this occurred, the American client refused to do business with Rafael.
and told Rafael to leave his home since “Hispanics were not welcome.” The reference to language (e.g. speaking English without an accent but also speaking Spanish), identifying as Brazilian, and being labeled as a Hispanic seemed to be factors that elicited a strong racist and anti-immigrant response from that particular American. Although Hispanics and/or Latinos are considered ethnic groups, most Americans see them as a monolithic racial group, which was apparent in this particular example.

In the last two quotes, language was a social marker which unveiled each returnee’s status as an “other” or outsider in American society. Many returnees recognized the importance of language proficiency in shaping their immigrant experiences in the US. Sixty-one percent of returnees spoke little or no English and it is likely their limited English might have inhibited their ability to recognize verbally racist behavior when it occurred. However, returnees told me they were able to observe nonverbal cues such as body language and voice volume to detect discrimination. For example, some returnees mentioned being followed around stores or Americans raising their voices in anger or impatience when immigrants could not understand English. Return migrants also mentioned having a “feeling” of discomfort or unease in certain interactions with Americans that signaled racial or anti-immigrant discrimination.

As a result of the September 11th attacks and attempts to fight terrorism through using extensive background checks and securing national borders (particularly the one with Mexico), some Americans’ distrust of presumed and perceived outsiders has resulted in an increase of racialized anti-immigrant sentiment and racist attacks against individuals perceived as non-American (Pulido 2007; Huber et. al 2008; Jonas 2006; Jaret 2002). Furthermore, the growth of the Latino community due to the increase of
immigration from Latin America, and recent debates on immigration reform have further fueled animosity towards Latinos regardless of their immigration status in American society (Pulido 2007; Huber et. al 2008; Jonas 2006; Jaret 2002). As mostly undocumented immigrants (76 percent of my returnee sample), many return migrants spoke of living in fear and being “racially” profiled by police who often stopped and asked them for their immigration papers since they “looked illegal.” Some of these encounters with police resulted in arrests, after which returnees were turned over to immigration enforcement and subsequently deported. According to returnees, this happened on various occasions in Massachusetts towns with large Brazilian communities where police departments have been granted immigration enforcement duties.

Because Mexican immigrants and (some) Mexican Americans have traditionally been perceived as illegal and as not being “American,” other ethnic groups who “look” Hispanic are also presumed to be undocumented, which influences how Americans treat them. Brazilian return migrants recognized very quickly that Latinos/Hispanics broadly and Mexican immigrants and (some) Mexican Americans especially were highly marginalized in US society. Returnees also recognized that most Americans could or would not distinguish ethnicities among Latinos/Hispanics, which resulted in returnees being classified in these categories and identified as “looking illegal.” Furthermore, many returnees felt that American employers took advantage of their undocumented labor by underpaying them and threatening to report them to the office of Immigration Customs and Enforcement (ICE) if they complained of unequal treatment. Therefore, language, immigration status, and “looking” illegal were factors related to experiencing anti-immigrant discrimination while in the US.
When I asked returnees if experiences of racial and/or anti-immigrant discrimination in the US would be considered racism in Brazil, the majority of them commented yes. However, they were also quick to say that Brazil is a more welcoming society and that immigrants have been well-received and incorporated into Brazilian society. This is one of the reasons returnees were surprised to experience (when they did) blatant forms of discrimination in US society despite hearing accounts of discrimination from other return migrants before immigrating themselves. Here again, Brazilians’ reflections of experiencing discrimination in the US are contrasted with their recollections of the lack of overt racial or immigrant-status-based discrimination in Brazilian society.

**Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrates two ways Brazilian returnees viewed US race relations through a transnational racial optic, focusing on the complexity of negotiating racial classification in the US and experiences of racial and anti-immigrant discrimination. Using interview excerpts to show an overview of returnees’ perceptions, I demonstrate how those perceptions could be transnational in the sense that these individuals negotiated race in the US based on their conceptions of race in Brazilian society.

For most returnees, negotiating racial classification in the US was very confusing. The US system of racial classification seemed illogical as compared to that in their home country. Brazil’s Census includes a racially mixed category in which most Brazilians self-classify, whereas the US Census currently allows individuals to check off more than
one racial category. The negotiation of racial classification while living in the US also demonstrates that returnees developed an understanding of US racial ideals, particularly with regard to figuring out which individuals can classify in specific categories and learning negative stereotypes about certain ethno-racial groups.

It is also possible that living in the US not only made returnees’ racial classifications more salient, but also activated their national identities. Due to the historical national ideology of racial democracy and intense national pride in Brazil, being Brazilian generally supersedes all other identities (Telles 2004). Margolis (2007) argues that living abroad changes the point of reference for Brazilians’ national identity. Whereas metropolitan or region-specific identities (e.g. being from Rio or Minas Gerais) are more salient while living in Brazil, immigrating to another country facilitates an emphasis on Brazilian national identity. The activation of Brazilian national identities while living in the US may also trigger national Brazilian ideals about race despite the particularities that exist in different regions of Brazil. Therefore, when returnees talked about their personal experiences of race in specific locations in the US, their statements were national comparisons of racial dynamics in the US and Brazil that may not have completely reflected the local context in which they were living in the US.

While negotiating their racial classifications in the US was at times challenging, returnees also gave candid recollections about their perceptions and/or experiences of

---

60 Checking off multiple racial categories on the US census may not be feasible for Brazilian immigrants. Due to Brazil’s longer history of interracial marriages, it may be difficult to identify each parent as belonging to one distinct racial group (as conceptualized in the US). Therefore, the official mixed category on the Brazilian census allows for such flexibility and more variation. However, given the ethno-racial demographic shifts in the US and some researchers’ arguments that the US racial system will experience a “Latin-Americanization” of racial classification, or that racial boundaries will be realigned into a black-nonblack binary, it is possible that ethno-racial categories on future US censuses will shift to reflect these changes in the US racial system. These changes will have implications for how Brazilian immigrants racially self-classify using US Census categories in the future.
discrimination in US society. Once again, these opinions about discrimination in the US were compared to perceptions regarding discrimination in Brazil, demonstrating the transnational racial optic. Returnees could only talk about racial or anti-immigrant discrimination in each context by comparing what they witnessed or experienced in both countries. Whereas return migrants could not recall hearing about such blatant displays of discrimination or describe with detail the manifestations of racism in Brazilian society, they were able to provide examples of what they considered to be racism in the US.

Brazilian returnees’ status as primarily undocumented and nonwhite immigrants in the US placed them in a more vulnerable position that made them more susceptible to the type of overt race or immigrant-based discrimination that many said they had not recalled experiencing in Brazil before immigrating or after returning. Thus, the ability to recognize discrimination in the US was directly related to their inability to articulate more concrete types of racial or anti-immigrant discrimination in Brazil. This provides additional support for my argument that returnees rely on a transnational racial optic when attempting to personally understand and negotiate race in the US.

In returnees’ personal experiences with racial classification and discrimination in the US, they experienced a constant internal dialectic between what was happening in the US and what they had experienced in Brazil. This internal dialectic is the transnational racial optic, which shaped how they perceived their lives in the US as it related to race. Although these Brazilian return migrants physically lived in the US for a number of years, their minds were constantly on Brazil during the US migration. They spoke of “saudades” or longing for family and home and making plans to return. This characteristic is what is unique about this study sample; these Brazilians completed the
US migration project and did return to Brazil. Thus, in staying mentally connected to Brazil, these individuals’ perceptions of race in the US were shaped by that transnational relationship, suggesting returnees’ use of the transnational racial optic.
Chapter 5
Examining Brazilian Return Migrants’ Societal Conceptions about Race in the US

Introduction

While Chapter four explored Brazilian return migrants’ personal experiences negotiating racial classification and encounters of discrimination while living in the US, this chapter examines their thoughts about how race functions in US society on a broader level. By this, I am referring to how a person would respond to being asked, “when you think about race in the US, what comes to mind?”. I was interested in learning what returnees generally thought about race in the US, aside from their personal everyday experiences.\(^{61}\) While living in the US, returnees noticed aspects about the stratification of different racial groups and interracial relations that they considered to be characteristic of the way race works in US society. Just as the racial democracy ideology was (and in some ways is still) considered to characterize and explain interracial relations in Brazilian society among everyday Brazilians, returnees perceived that racial separation and strife were (and are) synonymous with race in the US.\(^{62}\)

---

\(^{61}\) Questions I asked in the interview were: (1) Do you think there is a difference between race in Brazil and the US?; (2) Before immigrating, did you hear anything about race in the US?; and (3) In what ways do you think race in Brazil and the US are similar?.

\(^{62}\) As discussed in Chapter one, although racial democracy ideology is still prevalent among everyday Brazilians’ perceptions of race in Brazilian society, this does not mean that Brazilians deny the existence of racism in Brazil (Bailey 2009).
Due to the prevalence of immigration between Governador Valadares (GV) and primarily the northeastern United States and the global transmission of the US’ tumultuous history of race relations through the media (in the form of films, books, etc.), Valadarenses came to the US with preconceived ideas regarding how race functions in US society, especially on the topics of the history of segregation, tense relationships between blacks and whites, and the presence of overt racial discrimination. When I asked Brazilian returnees if they had heard anything about race in the US before immigrating, 62 percent responded yes, that they had heard about race in the US from other return migrants, as well as from the global dissemination of American pop culture, and primary school lessons. These returnees believed there was extreme racial segregation and animosity between whites and blacks, that US blacks lived in separate neighborhoods and had separate institutions, that there was anti-immigrant sentiment, and that America was a country full of blonde-haired and blue-eyed whites before immigrating. These ideals represent their societal perceptions and stereotypical presumptions of the social construction of race in US society.

Most returnees knew their status as primarily undocumented and nonwhite immigrants might influence their experiences in US society. Although return migrants had preconceived notions about race in the US before they migrated, recollections of their experiences in the US revealed that returnees’ societal conceptions about race in the US fell within two domains: the different social positions and attitudes of US and Brazilian first question asked in the section which focused on racial conceptions in the US.

---

63 This open-ended question was phrased as “did you hear anything about race in the US before immigrating? And if so, where did you hear these things?” Participants primarily responded yes or no. I asked participants who said yes to elaborate on what they had heard. This question was the first question asked in the section which focused on racial conceptions in the US.
blacks and the lack of social integration among different ethno-racial groups in the US.\textsuperscript{64}

These two findings illustrate how Brazilian return migrants broadly thought about race in the US and provide further evidence that returnees used a transnational racial optic to note societal differences in race in both countries.

**Finding 1a: Comparisons between US and Brazilian Blacks- Socioeconomic Characteristics\textsuperscript{65}**

In the interviews, questions asking returnees to compare their perceptions of racism in the US and Brazil usually elicited responses in which returnees compared US and Brazilian blacks. For the most part, this finding was representative across the sample regardless of gender, race, and state of residence differences. However, a closer examination of differences in returnees’ ages, lengths of stay, and years of arrival in the US demonstrated some differences. Return migrants who made specific comments comparing US and Brazilian blacks were generally: (1) less than 30 years old at the time of the first US migration; (2) in the US for five years or less; and/or (3) arrived in the US between 1990 and 2006. However, it is also important to note that returnees in these categories comprised nearly 80, 47, and 61 percent (respectively with regard to these demographics) of the sample.

\textsuperscript{64} See Chapter one for a definition of racial conceptions as used in this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{65} This is a relative comparison focusing solely on the relationship between US blacks and Brazilian blacks. It is important to note that since there is more wealth distribution, less poverty, and a larger middle class in the US than in Brazil, US citizens are in a much better socioeconomic position overall than Brazilians. US blacks, as US citizens, have been able to benefit from the country’s economic power in a way that Brazilian blacks have not, despite Brazil’s emerging global reputation as an up-and-coming economic powerhouse. It is also important to mention that these interviews were conducted before the election of US President Barack Obama in November 2008. It is possible that his election might have influenced participants’ responses had the data been collected after the election and inauguration of Barack Obama.
Furthermore, 31 of 49 (63%) returnees mentioned a common societal perception that Brazilian blacks are poor, uneducated, and have limited opportunities.\textsuperscript{66} Sixteen of forty-nine (30%) of return migrants also voiced their surprise upon seeing well-dressed US blacks who lived in nice homes, drove luxury cars, and were highly educated, especially when compared with Brazilian blacks. These same returnees also commented on the higher level of physical attractiveness of US blacks compared to Brazilian blacks. Other returnees also believed US blacks had more power and wealth than US whites based on personal observations of and limited interactions with blacks in the workplace and residential settings:

\begin{quote}
…I think that the black American is very important in the US and in Brazil, he [Brazilian black] is inferior. [With regard to] social class, at work, in life, in films, they [US blacks] have more of a chance. Here [in Brazil], the poor population is more black. Here the black Brazilian is inferior. The black American valorizes himself. And in Brazil, they [Brazilian blacks] don’t have the value that exists there [in the US for blacks]. He has more opportunities than the Brazilian, to rise up and be something. Here, this doesn’t exist.

-Luiz, black man, 43 years, New Jersey
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
We [Brazilians] would say that Americans don’t like black people, but after I was there living in the country, I came to see that this wasn’t the case because I knew a lot of blacks there. The majority of them have better lives than whites. I lived in an apartment complex, every black person had a nice car and every white person had an ugly car. So, at times, I didn’t understand this, I said to myself “my God.”…There in the US, the white sometimes fights with the black because the black has more power. I don’t know if you noticed this there, the black is well dressed, has nice cars, lives in nice places. I was sometimes perplexed by this. It was something I couldn’t resolve.

-Mateus, Moreno/mixed man, 42 years, Rhode Island
\end{quote}

Generally, here [in Brazil] people of color [non-whites] do not have a good financial condition, they have a very bad financial situation. There [in the US], it is different... there are many blacks with a financial situation much better than whites. Even those [blacks] without a good financial situation, I think it’s very interesting,... they dress and present themselves very well. They take care of their hair, I think the black person there is marvelous. Here [in Brazil]...is completely different. There, blacks dye their hair, they take care of themselves. Maybe it’s because of their financial situation or something, but [Brazilian] blacks don’t worry about their physical appearance or anything like that. They

\textsuperscript{66}Such comments also included negative ideas about blacks that are prevalent in Brazilian society such as them being violent, uneducated, and the subject of racist jokes. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter seven which examines return migrants (post-migration) and non-migrants’ perceptions of race in GV (specifically) and Brazil (broadly).
[US blacks] are different, there [the US] is different. Blacks there are much prettier than blacks here, they make many efforts to make themselves physically beautiful.
   -Jéssica, white woman, 32 years, Massachusetts

I think that in the US, even though there’s [racial] prejudice, I think that the [US] black has more opportunity, even with prejudice. But, it’s because they [US blacks] struggled and fought for this. I think the black is more present in institutions, in jobs. I think they benefit more than those [blacks] in Brazil...I think that the [US] black, he fights a lot for his dignity. If he senses prejudice in any situation, he tells it and fights. In Brazil, low [marginalized] people lower their heads and stay quiet. It’s the type of thing, that I got scared when I saw [US] blacks in nice cars, you know really expensive cars? I saw that and it scared me because I was thinking this isn’t common in Brazil: “look, the black here can drive a nice car and the black in Brazil can’t.” I was thinking... “those blacks [are] extremely chic (laughs) and beautiful.” And this is something that Brazil doesn’t really have.
   -Gustavo, white man, 37 years, Massachusetts

While these quotes demonstrate that returnees of various racial classifications definitely noticed the different social positions of US and Brazilian blacks, it is also clear that returnees made generalizations about both groups based on their limited interpersonal encounters with, observations, and stereotypes of them in each country. What is also clear from these quotes is that returnees did not have a concrete understanding of the history of US race relations or the institutional and societal manifestations of US racism, given that they made statements such as: “many blacks with a financial situation much better than whites.” They had no knowledge or awareness of the social position (with regard to education, income, and other disparities) of US blacks as a whole relative to the entire US population. Additionally, returnees assumed that US blacks’ ability to participate in mainstream consumption patterns was an indicator of stable and high social class.

While the size of the US black middle class has increased significantly in the last few decades, members of this group are in the minority among US blacks; their class status is more tenuous and their wealth is significantly lower than their white counterparts.
(Lacy 2007; Patillo-McCoy 1999; Shapiro 2004; Conley 1999). However, since US blacks can financially participate more readily than Brazilians, return migrants saw such purchasing power as unusual when compared to their recollections of blacks in Brazil.

Due to the highly unequal distribution of wealth, low wages, and the high prices of imported goods in Brazil, the majority of Brazilians, especially those with darker skin tone, have very little money, let alone purchasing power for luxury consumer goods. Return migrants’ perceptions of the US were based on their observations of what they considered to be indicators of a more equal, albeit still highly stratified, wealth distribution and larger middle class in the US. Since historically there has been more access to credit for the purpose of making expensive purchases like homes and cars (compared to Brazil), US citizens of various ethno-racial backgrounds are able to purchase what Brazilians consider “high social status” items. In fact, a number of returnees recalled how they were able to purchase items like DVD players, large screen televisions, and cars while living in the US. Even though they admitted the cost of living in the US was more expensive compared to Brazil, return migrants discussed how the ability to earn dollars and the cheaper cost of merchandise allowed them a purchasing power they did not have in Brazil. Returnees constantly commented that everyone in the US, even blacks, could purchase certain products.

Although mention of US blacks’ heightened socioeconomic status was consistent in these particular quotes, the reference to US blacks’ physical beauty compared to Brazilian blacks in Jéssica and Gustavo’s quotes is also worth examining. In the third quote, Jéssica, a woman with very light skin tone and black slightly curly hair that I thought could be considered white in the US, refers to the physical appearance of US
blacks and connects it to their financial condition, showing the relationship between
social class and one’s ability to “beautify” him or herself. The focus on physical
appearance and the attention given to the body in Brazilian culture has been well-
documented, particularly since Brazil is well-known internationally for plastic surgery
and other cosmetic procedures to enhance beauty (Adelman and Ruggi 2008; Segatto and
Furtuoso 2006).

While living in GV and traveling throughout Brazil, I noticed a significant
number of hair salons, fitness centers, plastic surgery clinics, aesthetic centers (primarily
for women for hair removal, non-surgical fat-reduction, and facials among other
services). Although these businesses ranged in price from cheap to very expensive so that
Brazilians of various social classes could participate, it appeared that mostly middle and
upper class (whiter) Brazilians had the time and resources to patronize such businesses
and “take care of themselves.” With average household incomes that are lower when
compared to the US, a distribution of wealth that is lower, and a poverty rate that is much
higher, most Brazilians are unable to participate in “beautification” processes even if they
are widely available.

Therefore, due to structural racial and economic inequality in Brazil, darker
Brazilians for the most part do not have the leisure time or resources to invest in their
physical appearance as do their “white” counterparts. This is probably why Jéssica
described in detail how she feels US and Brazilian blacks differ in appearance: “they
dress and present themselves very well, they take care of their hair, they make many
efforts to make themselves physically beautiful.” However, she also recognizes that
social class may play a role in this process. Likewise, Gustavo in the fourth quote, who
also had very light skin tone and slightly balding straight black hair, also described US blacks as beautiful and “chique” in Portuguese, which means “chic” in English. In Brazil, when someone is described as “chique,” it means very fashionable, well-dressed, and presentable. Returnees rarely used these words to describe Brazilian blacks.

When I asked more specifically about comparisons between US and Brazilian blacks, returnees overwhelmingly described Brazilian blacks as poor, disadvantaged, and more inclined to violent or criminal behavior. Although no return migrant directly stated that Brazilian blacks were not beautiful, the emphasis on the beauty of US blacks implies that there is something unattractive about Brazilian blacks. Given the importance of social class, beauty, and appearance in Brazilian society, the elevated socioeconomic status of US blacks could play a role in this perception of difference.

The first and last quotes also reference the political activism of US blacks and how marginalized groups, especially Brazilian blacks, accept their lower social position in Brazilian society. About 20 percent of returnees specifically mentioned the political activism of US blacks compared to their Brazilian counterparts. Telles (2004) argues that the perceived system of cordial interracial relations in Brazil persists as long as blacks know their place. Thus, as long as Brazilian blacks remain overwhelmingly poor and uneducated, are perceived to be complicit in their own racial oppression, and do not challenge the existing system, Brazilian interracial relations can remain “harmonious.” Bailey (2009), Telles (2004), Marx (1998), and Davis (1991) argue that the system of

---

67 Notice how Brazilians’ stereotypes of Brazilian blacks are similar to widely held stereotypes of US blacks in US society.

68 “Whiter” physical features such as lighter skin tone and straight hair are perceived as markers of physical beauty despite the emphasis on racial mixing and acceptance of black ancestry in Brazil. See Chapter two for more information on the preference of whiter physical features in Brazil.
overt and legal racism in the US facilitated the development of a solid black racial identity which was essential for political mobilization against racist US laws and policies. However, the absence of racism in a similar form in Brazil has made it difficult to consolidate the same type of race-based identity among Brazilian blacks and browns. Such an identity was crucial for attacking overt racism in the US, where blacks were considered a monolithic group regardless of having mixed racial ancestry. Therefore, while 20 percent (N=9) of the returnees I interviewed noticed and praised the political involvement and anti-racist activism of US blacks, almost half of return migrants (N=22) criticized the self-segregation of US blacks. Yet, both of these attributes developed in response to the manifestation of racism in the US.

Finding 1b: Comparisons between US and Brazilian Blacks-Being Racist

Although return migrants discussed how US and Brazilian blacks had different socioeconomic positions, returnees also perceived differences in the racial attitudes among these groups. Approximately 44 percent of respondents (N=22), of various racial classifications, mentioned a perception that US blacks were self-segregating and more racist compared to Brazilian blacks:

The blacks in the US, I see that they themselves separate themselves from whites, I found that strange there. I don’t know if that’s because here in Brazil we are mixed. It could have to do with discrimination, but it’s more personal. No one talks to you or leaves their neighborhood. For instance, there are some parts in some states that only have black places or white places, isn’t that true? And I find this very strange, one thing that doesn’t exist here [in Brazil]. Thank God.

–Juliana, Morena/Mixed woman, 41 years, Massachusetts

Black racial identity was consolidated among US blacks with and without racially mixed ancestry as a result of the one-drop rule (Davis 1991). There was no intermediary racial group (such as browns) in the US as there was in Brazil.
There is racism everywhere. There is racism with the black in Brazil, here it exists, but not to the degree as it does in the US. I don’t see it, that is my opinion. The black in the US likes his own place, he doesn’t mix much either. You see blacks in all social classes, but in general, the black, at least in New York where I live[d], he has his own neighborhood, his own club, his own music. This is what I saw, they claim they are not racist, but I see that they stick together to a certain degree. They are people with much culture, tremendous artists, the [black] middle class associates together in one place. That is what I saw in New York, I don’t know about other places.

- Ricardo, white man, 50 years, New York

Look, I think, it’s like I told you before, from what I saw, it seems that the black there [in the US] is more racist than the white. And like I said at times, I don’t know if it is different now because it’s been years [since I was in US]. I cleaned, I worked cleaning a house and they [the owners] were black, they didn’t have any type of relationships with whites. They lived, I don’t remember the name of the place, but there were only blacks in that area, all the houses were mansions and I thought it was funny that they had 4 cars that were all red...And one day, I heard a conversation and they said they were black and didn’t want to mix with anybody...I noticed this there, I don’t know what you think, but I noticed that the black seems to want to be better than the white...

– Letícia, black woman, 45 years, New York, New Jersey, & Massachusetts

Each of these quotes provides particular examples of returnees’ perceptions that US blacks are perpetrators and not the victims of racism. Many return migrants mentioned that blacks were self-segregating and chose to separate themselves from whites in neighborhoods, schools, and churches among other locations. It also seemed that middle/upper class blacks especially participated in this behavior. For many returnees, observing that blacks lived in separate communities and had separate institutions was perceived as racist or prejudiced. 

Racista and préconceito were the specific Portuguese words returnees used to describe this behavior.

Although returnees noticed this particular behavior among US blacks, respondents reported that segregation was less marked for whites and other ethnic groups in the US. In some interviews, I asked returnees if they felt it was racist or self-segregating for Brazilian immigrants to live in Brazilian communities, work primarily with Brazilians, and attend Brazilian church services to which they responded no. Even though various
ethno-racial groups live in homogenous communities either due to residential segregation or personal preference, US blacks were singled out as the racist group for participating in the same behavior.

Since returnees relied on Brazilian racial norms to negotiate race in the US, they more readily noticed this behavior among US blacks as a result of lower residential segregation levels in Brazil. Because there are more African-descended individuals in Brazil than in the US and return migrants reported a perception that Brazilians of all colors live in racially mixed communities, returnees thought the large presence of US blacks living in certain neighborhoods was racist. Returnees may have thought that US blacks are more separate due to the more stark and visible difference in US residential segregation levels. Additionally, some return migrants mentioned having negative interactions with US blacks, which also shaped their perception that US blacks are most racist. A few returnees, especially those who were lighter, spoke of being mistreated by US blacks in the workplace since their black colleagues believed they were white:

There were situations where I felt discrimination for having lighter skin because I had a friend at work who was very dark and certain employees would only greet her. I thought this was racism, that employees her color [blacks] would greet her and never greet me…Especially, there was a boss who had an office, when I cleaned, he wouldn’t even say “good morning.” He was black, he never looked directly at me. [But] when my friend cleaned, he spoke and joked with her and wouldn’t say anything to me. So, I felt discriminated against, I felt horrible, by the fact that I had lighter skin… I couldn’t believe that was happening.

- Fernanda, black woman, 30 years, Florida

It is clear from Fernanda’s quote that she believed she was being mistreated

---

Although this returnee self-classified as black (open-ended) at the time of the interview, she classified as white using Census categories in Brazil and the US. She also thought other Brazilians classified her as white. As the interviewer, I classified her as morena on the questionnaire (interviewer’s classification of interviewee) because she looked more racially mixed than black or white in the Brazil.
because of her physical appearance. In noticing the differential treatment she and her
darker colleague experienced, she felt that blacks on her job were discriminating against
her. What is also interesting about this particular quote is that the participant self-
identified as black when I interviewed her although she has lighter skin and medium
curly (dyed) blonde hair. Although Fernanda self-classified as black when I interviewed
her, she recollected self-classifying as white in the US. This demonstrates the complexity
of trying to capture individual’s self-racial classification at different periods in addition to
how others - in this case US blacks on her job - externally perceived her.71

Brazilian return migrants’ perceptions of US blacks as racist revealed again their
lack of awareness about the history of racial inequality in the US. Due to overt racist laws
which prohibited blacks (regardless of social class) from living in particular communities
or attending certain schools, blacks were forced to develop their own educational,
religious, and cultural institutions in the US (Feagin 2000). This process also developed
among other racial/ethnic minorities who were similarly excluded from participating in
mainstream society and facilitated the development of race and ethnicity-based identities
(Tuan 1998; Espiritu 1992; Almaguer 1998; Feagin 2000; Telles 2004; Marx 1998; Davis
1991). As a result, the development of minority-serving institutions, organizations, and
communities are a legacy of the more legally racist past in the US when certain groups
did not have access to formerly exclusively white and male institutions. Thus, returnees’
lack of awareness regarding the historical plight of racial inequality for blacks made it

71 I briefly discuss the consistency of racial classification for returnees over the migration process in
Chapter five. While the inconsistency of this participant’s racial classification raises a series of concerns
that are important for understanding Brazilians’ racial classification choices, discussion of this
inconsistency will not be treated here, as it is beyond the scope of this chapter. Furthermore, such
inconsistency in racial classification is unique to this particular participant sample.
possible for them to place the blame of what they perceived as racist behavior squarely on US blacks’ shoulders.

Return migrants used a transnational racial optic to compare the social behavior of US and Brazilian blacks: returnees felt that blacks in Brazil were more cordial and willing to interact with Brazilians of all colors. The quotes above make references to Brazilian blacks living in harmony with fellow Brazilians in the same communities. Most returnees often said that Brazil overall and GV specifically were more spatially racially mixed compared to the US, and that there was no such thing as black neighborhoods and white neighborhoods or black cities and white cities. Because of their pre-migration conceptions of interracial social and residential integration in Brazil, returnees noticed very quickly the social and physical distance between blacks and whites in the US, which is consistent with the findings of studies on racial residential segregation in the US (Massey and Denton 1993; Charles 2003; Emerson et al. 2001; Harris 1999).

Although there have been fewer studies of the impact of race on residential segregation in Brazil, Telles (2004) finds that such levels are significantly lower than those in the US. Yet, he also finds that the intersection of social class and race influences Brazilians’ residential choices. For example, since middle class Brazilians are predominantly white, they live in middle class communities in the city center (downtown) with other middle class Brazilians who are predominantly white. However, there may also be a smaller number of nonwhite Brazilians residing in those neighborhoods. On the other hand, Telles finds that nonwhites are much more likely than whites to have lower life chances, be more physically distant from the middle class, and live in poverty. Telles’ findings of the predicament of Brazilian nonwhites with regard to
residential segregation were not reflected among most returnees and certainly not in the quotes listed above. There is a general perception in Brazilian society that social class inequality trumps racial inequality (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009). This perception makes it difficult for Brazilians generally – and returnees in this study specifically – to recognize that racial residential segregation exists, and to perceive how it works in Brazilian society. This perception also explains why return migrants noticed self-segregation among US blacks more readily than among Brazilian blacks. Here again, is another example where returnees rely on a pre-migration and thus a transnational racial optic of Brazilian society – specifically, Brazilian blacks’ social and residential integration - to interpret US blacks’ self-segregating behavior.

In GV, there has been no study of racial residential segregation to my knowledge. However, as a black American sociologist who lived there for a year, I certainly noticed that lighter/whiter Brazilians lived closer to the more expensive city center while darker/blacker Brazilians lived in the poorer periphery surrounding the city. Because of my social class, I could afford to live in a nice apartment building close to the city center; all of my neighbors were white by Brazilian standards. Furthermore, as a researcher, most of my social connections were middle/upper class and white while the empregadas or domestic helpers in their middle class homes were exclusively black by US and Brazilian standards. This was also the case when I traveled to other major Brazilian cities. Leticia, a very racially conscious Afro-Brazilian, had this to say about her

---

72 The financial support I received to conduct this research provided an income that was significantly higher than most Brazilians who earn the monthly minimum wage of $267.
73 Chapter two discusses more specific race-related observations I noticed living and conducting research as a self-identifying black American in GV. I also include some experiences of how I was treated before and
perception of how racism exists in GV:

So, at times, many times, there is prejudice. For example, if you go to the periphery [suburbs], in the periphery, it’s funny, it seems like there are more blacks than whites and what are they [the blacks]? They are discriminated against because really many of them are involved in drugs, you understand?

-Leticia, Black woman, 45 years, New York, New Jersey, & Massachusetts

Leticia’s quote suggests that racial residential segregation exists at least in GV, if not more broadly in Brazil, albeit to a much smaller extent than in the US. When considering the Brazil/GV-US comparison in terms of residential segregation, historically middle class US blacks were denied the opportunity to live in (white) middle class communities. However, the manifestation of institutional racism combined with income inequality in Brazil prevents many Brazilian blacks from living in middle class neighborhoods, even in the absence of residentially racist legislation. More recent research suggests that US neighborhood racial composition still influences white Americans’ residential choices: while the percentages of Asian and Hispanic residents do not affect white Americans’ neighborhood preferences, the percentage of black residents does, regardless of residents’ social class (Emerson et. al 2001). Research on US residential segregation suggests that for the most part, whites do not want to live in the same neighborhoods as blacks (Massey and Denton 1993; Emerson et.al 2001; Harris 1999; Charles 2005; Krysan 2002). Thus, returnees’ perceptions that US blacks live in separate communities by choice is not completely accurate.

While research suggests that some middle class blacks do choose to live in predominantly black communities, such preferences are an attempt to avoid white
hostility they may face in predominantly white neighborhoods (Lacy 2007; Krysan 2002; Charles 2005; Krysan and Farley 2002). Furthermore, research also shows that as more blacks move into predominantly white communities, the neighborhood racial composition changes since whites move away from such communities (Lacy 2007; Massey and Denton 1993). Brazilian return migrants also did not understand the role of white flight or whites’ preference to live in white communities when identifying US blacks as the perpetrators of residential and social segregation.

With regard to returnees’ perceptions of US blacks reported in this section, other studies of Brazilian immigrants also mention their shock at seeing high status blacks who stand up to racial injustice in the US (Marrow 2003; Margolis 1998). Additionally, due to the importance of social class in Brazilian society, it is also possible that returnees had more positive opinions of US blacks, at least when it came to socioeconomic position and appearance, than Brazilian blacks because higher social class or the appearance of this enhances one’s social prestige in Brazil and in some cases, may socially “whiten” individuals (Telles 2004; Schwartzman 2007). On the other hand, some returnees were also critical of what they perceived as racist and self-segregating behavior among US blacks, which they felt was not as present among Brazilian blacks. The findings presented in this section are another example of how a transnational racial optic influenced returnees’ understanding of the US racial system and shaped their interpretation of the social position and behavior of US and Brazilian blacks.

Finding 2: Lack of Social Integration in the US

While return migrants noticed differences between the socioeconomic positions and attitudes of US and Brazilian blacks, they also readily observed a lack of social
cohesiveness and unity among Americans of different colors, which was very different from their perceptions of interracial interpersonal relations in Brazil. Various studies indicate that Brazilian race relations have historically been more cordial among people of different “races,” as rates of nonwhite-white intermarriage are significantly higher and racial residential segregation rates are significantly lower compared with the US (Telles 2004; Schwartzman 2007). Therefore, many returnees (nearly 60 percent) were shocked by the amount of social segregation in US society since they were accustomed to interacting with Brazilians of all colors in their home country.74 Even though those social interactions may have been colored by unequal and sometimes invisible and/or unacknowledged race, class, and gender dynamics, levels of interracial sociability are indeed much higher in Brazil.

Upon their arrival and after living for some time in the US, returnees observed the extent to which different ethno-racial groups were separated residentially and in informal interactions. Although return migrants reported mostly working with other Brazilian immigrants, they also sometimes worked with other Latino immigrants, whites, and blacks. However, aside from these professional interactions, about 60 percent (N=29) of returnees reported primarily interacting with other Brazilian immigrants in their respective cities.75 While return migrants were aware of this segregation among various groups, black-white segregation was most visible. Sixty-six percent of returnees specifically mentioned their perception that US blacks and whites do not like or marry each other and live in separate communities compared to 26 percent (N=12) who

74 29 of 49 returnees specifically mentioned being surprised by separate neighborhoods, churches, and institutions in the US, specifically noticing the ones frequented by US blacks.
75 This percentage represents nearly 70 percent of returnees who reported their first state of residence as being one with large Brazilian immigrant communities.
recollected perceiving tense US race relations without identifying specific groups. Forty-two percent (N=20) also recalled hearing about black-white relations in the US from other return migrants in GV before immigrating to the US. Thus, returnees received information about US race relations before arriving and used this information upon arrival to make sense of the US racial system. Such statistics provide further evidence that Brazilian return migrants rely on the flow of transnational information in existing immigrant networks to negotiate race in the US before and after their arrival. The quotes below demonstrate some returnees’ recognition of the US racial divide.

This is something I mentioned before, that I see there [in the US], a separation… that we don’t have a lot of here… You don’t see many white friends with blacks in the US. It seems, there are exceptions, but generally, the [racial] groups are more separate…

- Juliana, Morena woman, 41 years, Massachusetts

I think that in the US there exists a very sharp and visible racial separation as I’ve already said before... For example, they, this separation that exists, the black community there, I don’t know if it’s like this everywhere, but at least where I was, and the white community, they didn’t mix. And here [in Brazil], no, here my neighbor is black. For me, it’s great and there [in the US], I think it’s somewhat difficult to mix. I don’t know, at least it was like that [when he was there].

- Eduardo, white man, 45 years, Florida and Connecticut

..The most interesting thing here in Brazil [is that] a black marries a white. I did not see this at all in the US. So, this intrigued me a lot. Not one day did I see a black with a white person there. I didn’t see it, I’m telling you like this, a normal person like us [Brazilians] walking in the street, a black and a white, I didn’t see it.

- Fernanda, black woman, 30 years, Florida
In the US there’s a difference in the sense that, at times, there’s a Jewish person that
doesn’t like a Hispanic, there’s a Hispanic that doesn’t like an American, a Puerto Rican
that doesn’t like an American, the American doesn’t like Puerto Rico.

-Henrique, Pardo/Mixed man, 28 years, Massachusetts

Each of these quotes represents four different levels of sociability in which return
migrants noted social segregation among US ethno-racial groups: (1) friendships; (2)
racially segregated communities/institutions; (3) interracial marriage; and (4) general
dislike of other ethno-racial groups. Telles (2004) documented the higher levels of
cordial relations with regard to the first three categories in Brazil as compared to the US.
Because returnees were accustomed to living in Brazil, where it was more common to see
cross-racial friendships and marriages and people living in racially diverse communities
(especially among poorer Brazilians), their observations of minimal interracial social
interaction in the US reflected a sharp contrast to Brazil. While Juliana, who provided the
first quote, spoke specifically about the lack of interracial friendships she observed, the
second quote from Eduardo referenced a “sharp and visible separation” between blacks
and whites. Eduardo, who has light skin tone and could pass for white in the US, went on
to make an explicit US-Brazil/GV comparison in stating that he currently has a black
neighbor in GV, which he sees as a good thing. Eduardo’s quote shows his recognition of
what he considered to be a more visible social distance between different racial groups in
the US which he did not notice in Brazil.

Whereas the first two quotes discuss lack of interracial friendships and racial
residential segregation, the third focuses on lack of interracial marriage between different
ethno-racial groups in the US. During the part of the interview when the third quote was
made, Fernanda’s voice changed, becoming louder and more expressive as she talked
about this. She was one of the few returnees who said that she had not heard anything about US race relations before immigrating. Fernanda expressed shock and disbelief upon witnessing the lack of interracial cohesiveness in the US, particularly as it related to intermarriage and interracial friendships.

While most returnees were quick to say that Brazilian society was more socially integrated than the US, about 28 percent specifically reported a perception that there was extensive intermarriage between Brazilians of all colors compared to the US. However, although research suggests that there is more intermarriage in Brazil, it is less common between blacks and whites. Browns (morenos/pardos) tend to be a buffer group and marry blacks and whites (Schwartzman 2007; Telles 2004; Petrucelli 2001). Marriage to whites among browns and blacks is more likely to increase as socioeconomic status increases, since whites are overrepresented at higher socioeconomic levels in Brazil (Schwartzman 2007; Telles 2004). Therefore, while it is true that black-white interracial marriage occurs at higher levels in Brazil compared to the US, socioeconomic status plays a role in facilitating that process more so than in the US (Fu 2008; Wang and Kao 2007; Batson et. al 2006). Even though intermarriage does not occur as often in Brazil as Brazilians think it does, returnees definitely observed that intermarriage, especially between blacks and whites, was much less common in the US when compared to what they remembered of their pre-migration lives in Brazil and what they observe in their current Brazilian lives as return migrants.

Finally, the last quote mentions Henrique’s observation that different US racial groups do not like or get along with each other, which he felt was very different from Brazil. For him and others, the notion that one American would dislike another American
because of race or skin color was astounding. This was very difficult for returnees to understand while living in the US. They constantly referenced the positive social interactions between Brazilians of all colors and attributed this success to Brazil’s history as a racially mixed country.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has examined what Brazilian return migrants thought about race in the US as it related to the social positions of and interactions between racial groups, more specifically blacks and whites. As returnees adapted to life in the US as immigrants, they noticed two things that differed significantly from Brazilian society. First of all, they perceived that US blacks had more structural opportunities and were more socioeconomically and visibly incorporated into the mainstream of US society. However, returnees also felt US blacks were self-segregating and more racist compared to Brazilian blacks. Second, return migrants thought US society was much less interracially integrated than Brazil. These two findings demonstrate explicit comparisons between both societies, which are transnational and also show that returnees negotiated race in the US using a transnational racial optic.

In interviews, whenever return migrants spoke of the social division they observed in the US, they almost always compared it to Brazil, indicating that Brazilian society was more racially mixed in terms of social interactions with regard to friendships, neighborhoods, intermarriage, and general interracial camaraderie.76 As has been

---

76 Bailey (2009) also finds that white, brown, and black Brazilians share less racially polarized ideas about racial inequality and affirmative action in Brazil compared to US.
indicated in previous studies, Brazilians are more accustomed to cordial (although highly unequal) interracial relations (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009; Schwartzman 2007). Thus, what returnees personally observed and experienced in the US made them more cognizant of the more amicable relationships between Brazilians of different colors. The salience of tense relationships as well as visible physical and social segregation between Americans of different races provided a broad contrast between US and Brazilian society in this regard. Therefore, the recognition of the lack of cordial interracial relations in the US when compared to Brazil was another indicator of how Brazilian immigrants used a transnational racial optic to make sense of how race works in the US from a broader standpoint.
Chapter 6
The Return: Brazilian Return Migrants’ Post-Migration Conceptions of Racial Classification in Brazil

Introduction

Since Chapters four and five explored Brazilian return migrants’ conceptions about race in the United States during the period that they resided there, Chapters six and seven examine their perceptions of race in Brazilian society after returning from the US. Therefore, the final two empirical chapters directly address my two research questions: (1) how does immigration to the US change racial conceptions for Brazilian return migrants after returning to Brazil?; and (2) Do returnees “bring back” racial ideals from the US and what influence does extensive US migration have on racial relations in Governador Valadares? While the first question explores changes in racial conceptions as they relate to returnees’ understanding of their own racial and skin tone classifications, the second question focuses on examining how returnees observe and make sense of race and racism in Brazil after having lived in the US and if they remit US racial ideals to GV. In other words, the second question attempts to delve into how the experience of living in the racially-polarized US influences how returnees understand and interpret racial relations, and discrimination in Brazil after having returned from the US.

The findings in Chapters six and seven are organized around four themes that correspond with my two research questions and examine returnees’ pre and post-migration perceptions with regard to: (1) how returnees understand racial classification as
a social process and reality; (2) how returnees negotiated their own racial classifications; (3) how returnees conceptualized race and racism in Brazil; and (4) how do returnees’ post-migration racial conceptions influence returnees’ relationships with non-migrants. In referring to racial classification as a social process, I assess how returnees conceptualized and defined racial classification an on intrapersonal and cognitive level to see how their definitions of racial classification aligned with those in existing literature on race in Brazil. In referring to racial classification as a social reality, I explore how Valadarenses racially classify themselves, aside from how they define racial classification (as a social process) in their contemporary lives.

To more effectively investigate the influence of US migration on the racial conceptions of the 49 return migrants in Chapters six and seven, I include data from my comparison sample of 24 non-migrants, each of whom was a relative of a return migrant.77 Although the focus remains on returnees’ re-negotiation of race in Brazil in, I incorporate non-migrants’ racial conceptions where appropriate to highlight differences between these groups. While Chapter six primarily focuses on the first and second themes, Chapter seven examines the third and fourth themes. In these chapters, I also show that the transnational racial optic is not consistently used or present in returnees’ re-negotiation of racial classification and relations in GV after the US migration. The transnational racial optic is less influential among returnees with regard to the first and second themes concerning returnees’ contemporary racial classifications which I explore in Chapter six, primarily when making comparisons between returnees and non-migrants.

77 Please see Chapter three and the appendix for more information on how the non-migrant sample was selected and the interview protocol.
However, closer examination of changes in racial and skin tone classifications as an influence of the US migration yields more promising support for returnees’ use of the transnational racial optic. The findings in Chapter seven with regard to the third and fourth themes examining returnees’ qualitative post-migration racial conceptions do provide additional support for the transnational racial optic among returnees.

In the first theme, I examine how returnees understood racial classification as a social process delving into how they defined racial classification and the factors they considered in making racial classification choices. Findings related to this first theme suggest that returnees primarily associated racial classification with actual skin tone. I demonstrate this relationship by examining changes in returnees’ skin tone classifications over the course of the migration and exploring a perception among returnees that sun exposure (or lack thereof) could change skin tone and thus influence their racial classifications in Brazil and the US. To determine if non-migrants share a similar perception regarding sun exposure facilitating changes in racial classification, I also incorporate non-migrants’ skin tone classifications, compare them with those of their return migrant relatives, and show that non-migrants report darker skin tone classifications than return migrants.

With regard to the second theme concerning returnees’ negotiation of racial classification as a social reality, I examine returnees’ recollections of their categorical racial classifications before, during, and after the US migration to assess if US migration facilitated changes in those classifications. My findings indicate that while living in the US did not change most returnees’ categorical racial classifications, as pre and post-migration classifications were nearly identical, slightly fewer returnees self-classified as
white after migration, as compared to before migration. I also include racial classifications from the non-migrant sample and compare those with returnees’ racial classifications as reported when I interviewed them (post-migration) to explore similarities in racial classification among 24 returnee and non-migrant family-matched pairs. I show that for the most part, while there were not major differences in categorical racial classification for returnees and their non-migrant relatives, fewer returnees self-classified as white compared to non-migrants.

Finally, I conclude my exploration of the second theme by specifically examining the relationship between racial classification and skin tone classification for returnees. I analyze returnees’ skin tone classifications at each retrospective migration stage to assess differences in skin tone across racial categories. In other words, I explore if white returnees reported having lighter skin tones than did brown or black returnees before, during, and after migration. My findings demonstrate that white returnees consistently reported lighter skin tones than brown or black returnees.78

Return Migration Demographics

Before exploring the intricacies of returnees’ post-migration racial classifications, I think it is important to briefly discuss the reasons return migrants decided to go back to Brazil. As is generally the case for Brazilian immigrants, especially those from GV, immigration is considered a route to social mobility for their post-migration lives in Brazil. Thus, most Brazilians who emigrate leave Brazil with the intent to return. The

78 I did not examine “race-based” differences in skin tone classifications for non-migrants since the non-migrant sample was much smaller than the returnee sample.
migration is seen as temporary and as noted in Chapter two, this process is referred to as “Fazer À América,” in which Brazilians temporarily migrate to the US for two to five years to work and save money so they can purchase houses or cars, among other goods, upon their return to Brazil (Margolis 1998; Siqueira 2006). Among Brazilian return migrants in this sample, the average length of stay in the US was almost eight years, which was much longer than has been suggested in previous studies.\(^79\) Brazilian return migrants came back to Governador Valadares for four primary reasons: (1) documentation status concerns, or fears of or actual deportation: 25 percent (N=11); (2) family reasons: 57 percent (N=28); (3) reached immigration goal: 8 percent (N=4); and (4) other reasons: 12 percent (N=6).\(^80\)

The earliest year any participant returned to Brazil was 1989 and the latest year was 2008. Despite the span of about 20 years between the return of the earliest- and latest-returning migrants, the findings across these respondents with regard to racial conceptions were similar. Though nearly 80 percent of the returnees I interviewed went back to GV after the year 2000, a substantial amount of time had passed for some migrants between their return from the US and when I conducted interviews with them in 2007 or 2008.\(^81\) Therefore, I included two separate sections in the interviews to account for differences in racial conceptions that might have occurred as time passed: (1)

\(^79\) This is probably due to the fact that previous studies were conducted when the US economy was stronger and migrants could reach their financial goals in a shorter period of time, which would mean spending less time in the US.

\(^80\) Although some of these reasons were overlapping for some returnees, these values represent the first reason returnees provided for returning. Many returnees mentioned missing their family in combination with having undocumented status as being reasons for return. In such cases, I counted the primary reason for return as family-related.

immediately after returning from the US and (2) at the time of the interview. The questions that focused on racial and skin tone classifications and the importance of those classifications were worded the same in both of these sections. However, the interview section which focused on returnees’ racial conceptions at the time of the interview had more questions about Brazil-US comparisons as well as subtle and direct questions to try to elicit the impact of immigration on how returnees thought about race.

**Racial Classification as a Social Process: Defining Racial Classification and Factors for Racial Classification**

As suggested in the existing literature on the social construction of race in Brazil, race has primarily been associated with a Brazilian’s skin color, which has facilitated more fluid racial classification there. Therefore, I asked return migrants and non-migrants the following question: “Do you think race and skin tone are the same?” After respondents answered “yes” or “no,” I asked them why they responded in that particular way. This question allowed to me ascertain to a certain extent how Valadarenses’ definitions of racial classification coincide with the broad perception that racial classification is equivalent to skin tone as has been indicated in previous studies. I was curious to see if returnees and non-migrants would similarly respond to this question. I

---

82 See appendix for English interview protocol.
83 Although I used the word race or raça in this particular question in the interviews, I was referring explicitly to racial classification. Telles (2004) suggests that the word côr or color is equivalent to racial classification in the Brazilian context. My use of the word côr in this question instead of race or raça would have been confusing for participants. Furthermore, the question would have been worded as: “Do you think color (côr) and skin color (côr da pele) are the same?” In Chapters six and seven, I use the term “racial classification” to refer to categories or words generally distinguish individuals on the basis of the physical characteristics. I use “skin tone classification” and “skin tone” interchangeably to refer to actual skin color. I use “race” to refer to the social construction of race broadly in Brazil.
surmised that returnees may have internalized a US definition of racial classification as indicated by referring to both skin color and ancestry.

About one-third of return migrants (33%) and non-migrants (37%) believed racial classification was the same as skin tone. Further review of the qualitative responses to this question indicated that return migrants and non-migrants primarily defined racial classification as skin color or as related to an individual’s nationality, ancestry, or origin. Of non-migrant respondents who agreed that racial classification was skin color, further examination of their qualitative responses suggested that four non-migrants thought I was asking if they believed people of different colors and races were equal.

Table 13 shows some of the other ways that both groups of participants defined race, and I have highlighted skin color and nationality, the most frequently cited definitions in light gray. Thus, most participants define racial classification as related to nationality or ancestral origins and there are very few differences between return migrants and non-migrants.

---

84 One return migrant is missing from these tabulations because she did not definitively answer the question.
85 Participants’ use of the word “ancestry” in interviews referred to ancestral origins as related to a specific continent such as Africa, Europe, or Asia. I felt this was different from how Americans describe their ancestry as related to a particular country (e.g. Ireland, Nigeria) and racial group (e.g. “I have white ancestry”) because participants’ responses did not correspond to a specific country or racial group.
86 Responses included comments such as: “God made everyone the same but of different colors” or “I believe a white and black person can both be intelligent.” This suggests they misinterpreted the question.
87 I rounded percentages up or down to nearest integer, which is why the non-migrant percentages add up to 99 instead of 100. BRMs= Brazilian return migrants; NMs = Non-migrants.
Table 13: Defining Race- Return Migrants vs Non-Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>BRMs (%)</th>
<th>NMs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skin Color</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality/Ancestry/Origin</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Ideology, Genetics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While exploring how returnees and non-migrants defined racial classification is one way to assess the influence of US migration for return migrants, examining the factors return migrants and non-migrants considered when reporting their open-ended racial classifications may also be helpful for investigating the influence of US migration on returnees’ racial conceptions. As reported in Chapter four, returnees’ responses revealed that perceived external racial classification by others (e.g. “how others racially classify me”) had more of an influence on their racial classifications while they lived in the US, as compared to the pre-migration factors of skin tone, family, and hair texture that they reported as being important factors for their pre-migration racial classifications. Thus, I wanted to see if perceived external racial classification was also important for returnees when reporting their racial classification at the time of the interview. These results can be seen in Table 14.  

88 Only the categories with the top three percentages are reported under each factor. The values for one return migrant are missing for factors two and three because she was only able to provide the first factor.
Table 14: Factors Influencing Return Migrants and Non-Migrants’ Open-Ended Racial Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skin Tone</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Skin Tone</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other Physical Features</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Physical Features</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Physical Features</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>How Others See Me</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I found that external racial classification was still prominent for returnees when I interviewed them in GV, appearing as one of the first (8%) and third (22%) factors they considered when racially classifying themselves. However, for non-migrants, external racial classification was only mentioned as a third factor (17%). For both groups, skin tone, hair texture, and family were the first factors considered, suggesting the importance of physical features when determining one’s racial classification, which is consistent with Telles’ (2004) suggestion that racial classification in Brazil is associated with skin tone and hair texture.

The results for returnees reported in this section and in Chapter four regarding external racial classification as factors for migrants’ racial classification in the US and post-migration provide support for the influence of the transnational racial optic on returnees’ racial conceptions in contemporary GV. Before immigrating to the US, returnees recollected that “how others saw them” was the third factor considered for racial classification, whereas external classification was a first and third factor while they lived in the US and after the US migration. Furthermore, when compared to non-
migrants, for whom external racial classification does not appear to be a primary factor, it seems that living in the US as racialized immigrants made external racial classification more salient for returnees’ racial classification compared to pre-migration factors. Even though most return migrants went back to Brazil many years ago, these findings suggest that returnees still rely on external racial classification to racially classify themselves in their contemporary lives in GV.

**Racial Classification as a Social Process: Exploring the Relationship between Sun Exposure and Skin Color**

Return migrants and non-migrants both defined racial classification as related to skin tone, and reported skin tone as the primary factor they used when racially classifying. In this section, I explore a perception that was prevalent among returnees: that sun exposure could change skin color and consequently an individual’s racial classification. While reviewing the qualitative data that captured returnees’ self-ascribed racial classifications after they had just returned from the US, I noticed a trend emerging that was unlike anything I had ever read before in the literature on the social construction of race in the US, Brazil, or in general. I found that returnees spoke about racial classification as something that could change based on one’s exposure to the sun – or lack thereof. Returnees felt that being in the sun would darken one’s skin tone and thus facilitate a change in their racial classification. Conversely, returnees felt that not being in the sun or in a cold climate, such as that of the New England region in the United States, could lighten a person’s skin tone and thus facilitate a whitening of their racial classification. It was sometimes confusing to hear participants speak of racial
classification, a social construction that is often related to skin tone and other physical features, as something that could change due to being in or out of the sun for prolonged periods of time.  

This idea, that an individual’s racial classification can change by virtue of one’s skin tone changing, coincides with the Brazilian racial conception that racial classification is considered to be primarily a function of an individual’s skin tone (Telles 2004; Degler 1986; Marx 1998). Of forty-nine return migrants, 19 (39 percent) specifically mentioned feeling that their racial classifications immediately after returning from the US were different because their skin tone lightened in the US due to the cold climate. Because their skin color was paler and lighter in the US, these returnees felt their post-migration racial classifications in Brazil also lightened:

Wow! I was transparent white. [People said] ‘Hey white woman, white woman’… I felt horrible, like an ET [alien]. I said ‘where is my color?’ I think it’s because I didn’t get much sun [that I became] that way, transparent because here, our [Brazilians] color is beautiful, the skin is so beautiful [because of its color]. So, I felt really really white, when I arrived, I was horrified. I went to the pool everyday to get some sun…Today I’m morena because I get a lot of sun…[but] when I arrived from the US, I was white.  
- Fernanda, black woman, 30 years old, Florida

There [in the US], I was so white, I was so light... We arrived here in Brazil and people said ‘wow! Look at how white you are, wow! Because here [in Brazil], there is a lot of sun.  
- Ana, Light Morena woman, 45 years old, New Jersey

Look, they [other Brazilians] always teased me, “You got lighter? The time you stayed in the US, you are white!” They commented. I said, “no, it’s the climate...And I have a sister that told me “wow, you were so black/dark when you left here to go there, you

---

89 This would be similar to stating that one’s racial classification darkens due to tanning in the summer and whitens due to lack of sunlight in the winter.
90 This returnee self-classified as black when I interviewed her, but recalled self-classifying as morena (open-ended) immediately after returning from the US. However, she classified as white using Census-derived categories in Brazil and the US. The amount of inconsistency between the open-ended, categorical, and perceived external racial classifications for Fernanda was specific to her and was not as extreme for other participants.
“They [people] used to call me, I had the nickname “preto” [black]. My sister said [when I returned] ‘I don’t like you black, I like you white.’

-Stefane, Morena woman, 43 years old, Virginia

These quotes demonstrate some returnees’ perception that sun exposure or climate can change a person’s skin color and thus, their racial classification. However, Stefane’s quote implies that whiter or lighter skin tone is more highly regarded in Brazil despite most Brazilians’ insistence that racial classification is not important in Brazilian society. Additional literature on race in Brazil also indicates that despite the prevalence of racial democracy ideology in which African, European, and Indigenous contributions to Brazilian culture and society are acknowledged, whiter physical features are still the norm for assessing beauty (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009; Twine 1998). The fact that Stefane’s sister commented that she liked her sister better “white” than “black” provides a glimpse into the importance of skin tone, and therefore racial classification, at least with regard to physical appearance, in Brazil. At the same time, the respondent in the first quote, Fernanda, comments that the unique or sun-kissed skin tone of Brazilians is one of the things she considers to be beautiful about Brazilians and that her lightened skin tone in the US made her feel like an alien and un-Brazilian. Therefore, there are conflicting ideas about skin tone and racial classification among Brazilians revealed in these quotes.

Since many returnees expressed a perception that sun exposure can change skin color and thus racial classification, here I show findings regarding how returnees classified their skin tones during the migration process. In each section of the interview which contained questions about racial conceptions, I asked returnees “how do you  

—

91 I personally experienced this on my first trip back to GV in June 2009 after having completed fieldwork in November 2008. Because I had been in the US for the winter of 2009, I lost the deep tan I had while living in GV. Valadarenses commented on how much lighter or “whiter” I had become.
classify your skin tone on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being lightest and 10 being darkest?" Since this variable was a 10 point scale, I treated it as a continuous variable and calculated returnees’ average skin tone classifications at each stage of migration: before migration, while living in the US, immediately after returning, and at the time of the interview. Those averages can be seen in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Returnees’ Average Skin Tone Classifications During Migration Process**

On average, returnees reported having the darkest skin tones while living in the US and at the time of the interview. They also reported, on average having their lightest skin tones immediately after returning from the US, which suggests that mere change of location, weather, or context may have influenced how returnees classified their skin

---

92 Sometimes participants classified their skin tones between 2 integers. In those cases, I indicated that their skin tone was halfway or 0.5 between the 2 integers respondents gave. See Chapter three and appendix for more information on how the interviews were structured.
tones. These findings also show that the biggest mean difference of 0.6 points occurred between returnees’ residence in the US and immediately after their return to GV.\textsuperscript{93}

The results of returnees’ average skin tone classifications reported in figure 3 indicate shifts in skin tone for these individuals. However, closer examination of the skin tones reported for each individual returnee demonstrated that 30 returnees (61 percent) retrospectively reported different skin tone classifications between at least two of the migration stages.\textsuperscript{94} Of these 30 returnees, 11 of these individuals (37\%) did indeed report a darker post-migration skin tone, as compared to before immigrating.\textsuperscript{95} The self-reported skin tone classifications of each return migrant can be seen in table 15.

Lorena is a returnee with very light skin tone, light brown eyes, and straight (dyed) blonde hair whose skin tone classification changed. She reported a darker skin tone classification at the time of the interview than she retrospectively reported before immigrating: she self-classified her pre-migration skin tone as 4, her US skin tone as 3, her skin tone immediately after returning as 1, and her skin tone at the time of the interview as 6.\textsuperscript{96} In table 15, I have highlighted in dark gray the pseudonyms and skin tone classifications of the 11 returnees who, like Lorena, reported darker skin tone classifications at the time of the interview. To indicate the 19 returnees who reported different skin tone classifications at least two retrospective migration stages, I have

\textsuperscript{93} Since this was a nonrandom sample, I could not test the statistical significance of these differences.
\textsuperscript{94} I examined and calculated each returnee’s mean skin tone over the course of migration by adding their skin tone self-reports at each retrospective stage (e.g. pre-migration, US, immediately after return, and at the time of the interview) and dividing them by four. Closer examination of each returnee’s skin tone classifications at each stage made it easier to determine which returnees self-classified using the same number on the scale before, during, and after migration.
\textsuperscript{95} These individuals represent 22 percent (11/49) of the entire returnee sample.
\textsuperscript{96} I have not listed Lorena’s racial self-classification because she does not believe in using racial categories to classify herself or others. She described herself as a member of the “human race.” However, I thought Lorena could have passed for white in the US.
bolded and italicized their pseudonyms and skin tone classifications. The remaining 19 returnees reported the same skin tone classification at each migration stage, which was the case for Haroldo, a returnee with dark skin tone, black eyes, and short black hair who self-classified as black, who self-classified his skin tone as 7 before, during, and after migrating.
Table 15: Returnees’ Skin Tone Classifications at Each Retrospective Migration Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>SkinBI</th>
<th>SkinUS</th>
<th>SkinAR</th>
<th>SkinNow</th>
<th>Skin Tone Mean</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernanda</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinicius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natália</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luana</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flávio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronaldo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luísa</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antônio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrique</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SkinBI= Skin Tone before Immigrating; SkinUS= Skin Tone in US; SkinAR= Skin Tone after returning; SkinNow= Skin Tone at Time of Interview; Change= Change in Skin Tone
While conducting fieldwork and before doing these analyses, I expected that I would see the biggest difference between pre-migration and post-migration skin tone classifications to indicate a shift as a consequence of having lived in the US. I had hypothesized that being exposed to the US racial system and white Americans, whom returnees considered to be “really white” with their very light skin tones, would make returnees more cognizant of their darker skin tones even after returning to Brazil. Although comparisons between returnees’ pre-migration and post-migration skin tone classifications did not reveal the biggest difference, the results indicate that returnees reported skin tones that were somewhat darker (0.25 points) at the time of the interview than their pre-migration classifications. Such results provide support for my previously stated hypothesis regarding returnees’ exposure to the US racial system. It is likely that returnees reported darker skin tones post-migration due to being in GV, where the sun’s rays are stronger and darken skin tone. However, returnees recollected having lighter skin tones in the same tropical climate of GV before migrating. This finding that living in the US and encountering “really white” Americans subtly influenced returnee’s post-migration skin tone classifications, which provides evidence for returnees’ use of the transnational racial optic in reporting their post-migration skin tones.

To contextualize the changes in skin tone classification among returnees, I briefly discuss non-migrants’ perceptions about sun exposure facilitating changes in racial classification. I also incorporate and compare their skin tone classifications with their returnee relatives. Although 39 percent of returnees expressed a belief that their racial classification could change due to sun exposure, only three non-migrants (12 percent) shared this perception. Overall, non-migrants in the sample did not convey this belief or
did not communicate it in the interview. I also found that non-migrants self-classified on average at 5.3 points on a 10-point scale, with the lightest skin tone reported at 3 and the darkest at 8. When compared to return migrants’ skin tone classifications as reported at the time of the interview (mean = 5.2), there was no difference between the two groups.97

Although returnees and non-migrants similarly self-classified their skin tones, many more returnees (40 percent) discussed the relationship between skin color and climate. Given this finding, I examined the data for gender and “racial” differences since previous research has demonstrated that skin tone is more socially significant among women and ethno-racial minorities in the US (Rockquemore 2002; Landale and Oropesa 2002; Hunter 2002; Rezende 2004; DeCasanova 2004; Telles 2002). I ran a matrix query in NVivo to examine the relationship between the perception that sun exposure changes skin color and returnees’ categorical racial classifications: (1) in the US; (2) immediately after returning to Brazil; and (3) at the time of the interview.

I found that for racial classification at each stage of migration, returnees who self-classified as white mentioned that the sun or climate could change skin color more than returnees who self-classified as non-white.98 Of the 19 returnees who expressed an opinion that having more exposure to the sun could darken one’s skin color, eight self classified as white (branco), four as black (preto), five as brown (pardo), and two as “Other” at the time of the interview.99 Before conducting these analyses, I thought that

---

97 Statistical significance could not be assessed due to small sample size and non-randomness of sample.
98 Since questions on racial classification at the time of the interview represent returnees’ most current racial conceptions, I will only highlight the findings with regard to the relationship between sun exposure changing skin color and returnees’ racial classification at the time of the interview.
99 “Other” refers to returnees who self-classified as yellow (amarela), Indigenous (Indígena), or “Other” using Brazilian Census categories. Since the number of returnees who self-classified in these categories were small compared to the other racial classifications (e.g. white/branco, black/preto), I report these values
nonwhites would have been more likely to express this belief in the relationship between skin tone and sun exposure. However, these results indicate the opposite.

With regard to gender, the results showed that female returnees commented or remarked on the sun’s ability to change skin color more than male returnees. Of the nineteen returnees who mentioned this relationship, seven were men compared to twelve women, or almost twice as many. This finding indicates that men and women differentially think about racial classification and skin tone. Existing literature on gender and racial classification suggests that women are generally more likely than men to lighten their racial classifications, both in Latin American countries and among ethnic minorities in the US (Rockquemore 2002; Landale and Oropesa 2002; Hunter 2002; Rezende 2004; DeCasanova 2004; Telles 2002; Telles 2004).

While these results indicate that returnees’ gender and racial classification influenced a perception that sun exposure can change skin color and therefore racial classification for returnees, I conclude this section by discussing overall changes in skin tone classification as it relates to the perception that sun exposure can change skin color. As could be seen in Figure 3, the largest difference in skin tone classification occurred between when returnees lived in the US and immediately after returning to Brazil. Therefore, it appears that the act of returning to Brazil influenced how returnees reported their skin tone classifications. Furthermore, returnees’ reported darker skin tone classifications the longer they remained in Brazil after the US migration, which further supports their perception that sun exposure can change skin tone.

---

together in this chapter. Based on US racial classifications, of the nineteen respondents who expressed the opinion that sun exposure could change skin color, seven self-classified as white, six as Hispanic/Latino, and six as “other.” Based on racial classifications immediately after returning to Brazil, nine self-classified as white (branco), two as black (preto), four as brown (pardo), and three as “Other.”
Data on returnees’ skin tone classifications were also contradictory. Even though returnees felt they were lighter in the US due to lack of sun exposure, they also reported having darker skin tones (mean in US = 5.3) while living in the US. Upon returning home however, they classified their skin tone as lighter, despite entering GV where there is more sun exposure. Perhaps this was because returnees, especially those who self-classified as white before migrating, felt they were darker relative to white Americans, who they perceived to be *authentic* whites and lacked the racially mixed ancestry that many white Brazilians acknowledge having.

Furthermore, the ability to self-classify as white in Brazil despite having a racially mixed background and darker skin tone also played a role in returnees’ pre-migration and post-migration skin tone classifications. Living in the US among “very light” white Americans and encountering a more rigid racial system where mixed racial ancestry generally excludes individuals from white racial categorization encouraged returnees to reflect more on their own skin tones and “their place” in the US racial system. At the same time, because returnees associate the tropical climate of GV and Brazil with darker skin tone, having less sun exposure facilitated skin lightening, which some returnees felt also lightened their racial classification. These findings also suggest that mere change of location or context may have influenced how returnees classified their skin tones.

**Racial Classification as Social Reality: Exploring Categorical Racial Classification**

The previous findings in this chapter have demonstrated how returnees developed an understanding of racial classification as a social process and a social reality through their definition of racial classification as indicative of skin color and something that can
change based on sun exposure. In this section, I continue to explore racial classification as a social reality by specifically focusing on and comparing returnees’ categorical classifications at two stages: (1) US versus Brazil post-migration and (2) Brazil pre-migration versus Brazil post-migration. An exploration of racial classification via these comparisons will provide some insight into how the US migration influenced returnees’ post-migration racial classifications.

To account for possible differences that occurred over time as migrants re-adapted to living in GV since their return to Brazil, I compared returnees’ categorical racial classifications at two time periods: (1) US versus Brazil immediately after return and (2) US versus Brazil at the time of the interview. There was consistency across the racial categories between returnees’ US and post-migration classifications. The results for the comparison between returnees’ racial classifications in the US and at the time of the interview can be seen in Table 16.

Once again, the dark gray diagonal indicates where there is agreement in racial classification while the light gray cells show where there were shifts.

---

100 Pre-migration versus US racial classifications were examined in Chapter four.
101 I am only reporting results for returnees’ racial classifications in the US vs. Brazil at the time of the interview since those frequencies are very similar to those returnees retrospectively reported immediately after return. These similarities suggest that the time between returnees’ immediate return and the time of interview did not facilitate a major change in their racial classifications.
Results in Table 16 suggest hardly any shift for returnees who classified as white or black in the US. The biggest shift appears to be for those returnees who classified as Latino/Hispanic in the US and classified as white at the time of the interview in Brazil. This shift indicates a return to their original pre-migration classification as white.102

The objective of this dissertation was to examine if immigrating to the US changed returnees’ racial conceptions, assessed here as their racial classification. Therefore, I compared returnees’ pre and post-migration racial classifications at two time periods: (1) pre-migration versus immediately after return and (2) pre-migration versus time of the interview. Because there was not much of a difference between returnees’ racial classifications immediately after return and at the time of the interview, I present results for their racial classifications pre-migration versus immediately after returning to Brazil, which can be seen in Table 17.

---

**Table 16: Racial Classification in the US vs Racial Classification at Time of Interview***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race in US</th>
<th>Race -Time of Interview</th>
<th>Branco</th>
<th>Preto</th>
<th>Pardo</th>
<th>Other**</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Race in US=US Census Categories, Race -Time of Interview = BR Census Categories
** Other includes Asian American, Native American, and Other Classifications

---

102 See the results in Chapter four for pre-migration vs. US racial classifications.
Table 17: Pre-Migration Racial Classification vs Racial Classification
Immediately After Return*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Pre-Migration</th>
<th>Race After Return</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other**</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branco/White</td>
<td>Branco</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pardo/Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pardo/Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Race Pre-Migration and After Return = BR Census Categories
** Other includes Yellow, Indigenous, and Other Classifications

These results show high consistency between pre and post-migration classifications, particularly since the dark gray diagonal shows a percentage of at least 83 percent for returnees. This means that a large majority of returnees self-classified in a Brazilian Census racial category after the US migration that was very similar to the category in which they retrospectively classified before immigrating. However, it is also important to note that slightly fewer returnees (N=3) self-classified as white at the time of the interview (43 percent) as compared to those who self-classified as white before immigrating (49 percent).\textsuperscript{103} Therefore, living in the US did not generate lasting changes in most returnees’ post-migration racial classifications. Leaving the US and returning to Brazil allowed returnees to feel that they could self-classify in the same manner as they

\textsuperscript{103} Refer to the last cell in the first column of Table 16 for 43 percent “white” racial classification at the time of the interview in this Chapter. See Figure 1 and Table 8 in Chapter four for pre-migration “white” racial classification.
did before immigrating since those classifications would be externally validated in Brazil in a way that they were not in the US, especially for white returnees.\textsuperscript{104}

While there was not a large shift between pre and post-migration classifications, there was evidence that some returnees’ racial classifications changed while living in the US, especially for those who self-classified as white before immigrating. This is consistent with Roth’s (2006) stages of identity formation in which immigrants are ascribed membership to and accommodate self-classifying in a particular US ethno-racial category. This sample of Brazilian returnees, especially those who self-classified as white pre and post-migration, but as Latino/Hispanic while living in the US, experienced the accommodation stage. However, because there was not a large shift in returnees’ pre and post-migration classifications, these individuals did not undergo the identification stage by authentically embracing the use of the Latino/Hispanic terms or developing a sense of camaraderie with other Latinos while living in the US.\textsuperscript{105}

Furthermore, my examination of the post-migration open-ended racial classifications (not presented here) only revealed that one return migrant self-classified as “Latina” after returning to GV. This demonstrates further evidence that returnees’ categorical racial classifications as Latino/Hispanic in the US were accommodations to US ethno-racial classification norms while living in the US and not, an identification with the Latino/Hispanic categories in the US.

\textsuperscript{104} I also ran crosstabs to explore the relationship between returnees’ self-ascribed and external racial classification (by others) immediately after returning and at the time of the interview. Based on the consistency in the diagonals at these retrospective migration stages, it appears that there was most consistency between returnees’ self and perceived external racial classifications at the time of the interview while there was least consistency when returnees lived in the US. Those results are not presented here since I am most interested in exploring returnees’ self-ascribed classifications here.

\textsuperscript{105} See Chapter four for returnees’ perceptions of Latinos and the Latino/Hispanic categories while returnees lived in the US.
Comparing Returnees’ and Non-Migrants’ Racial Classifications

Because there was high consistency between returnees’ racial classifications before and after migration, I explored how returnees’ post-migration classifications coincided with those of their non-migrant relatives. Examining similarities in racial classification among members of the same family would be another way to explore the influence of US migration on returnees’ racial conceptions. I surmised that if a return migrant self-classified as white pre-migration and then as nonwhite after migration while his/her non-migrant relative classified as white, such a shift might indicate a shift in classification influenced by migration.

I compared returnees’ racial classifications (as reported at the time of their interviews) with those of their non-migrant relatives. These racial classifications provided the most recent post-migration data for returnees, as opposed to the recollections of their racial classifications before migration, while living in the US, and immediately after returning to GV. Furthermore, for consistency across the two samples, I thought it was most appropriate to compare returnees’ classifications at the time of the interview with non-migrants’ classifications at the time of the interview. I provide graphical representations of non-migrants and return migrants’ categorical racial classifications in Figures 4 and 5. When looking at both pie graphs, it is clear that most returnees and non-migrants self-classified as white, with 11 percent fewer returnees self-classifying as white compared to non-migrants. A higher percentage of returnees self-classified as black and brown compared to non-migrants. These results suggest that, overall, more returnees self-classified as non-white than did non-migrants.
For closer examination of differences in racial classification among returnees and non-migrants, I have included a cross-tabulation of the frequencies for the 24 return migrant and non-migrant matched pairs in Table 18. The dark gray-highlighted diagonal indicates where there is agreement between the racial classification of each non-migrant and his or her return migrant relative.
Table 18: Self-Ascribed Racial Classification-Return Migrants vs. Non-Migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Migrants' Racial Classifications</th>
<th>Non-Migrants' Racial Classifications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow/Indigenous/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Yellow/Indigenous/Other

A closer look at the dark gray diagonal suggests some consistency between 11 return and non-migrant pairs. The light gray cells where there is not agreement indicate where return migrants' self-classified in a different category from their non-migrant relatives. Among the returnee and non-migrant family matched pairs, there are very few differences in white racial classification while more returnees self-classified as black compared to non-migrants.

Since there are some differences in classification for return and non-migrants, could these differences be related to US migration? After all, fewer return migrants than non-migrants self-classified as white. Additionally, anecdotal evidence in Chapter four suggested that returnees became aware that being white in Brazil was not the same as being white in the US.\textsuperscript{106} Given the small sample of matched pairs and the previously reported findings that showed no differences in pre and post-migration racial

\textsuperscript{106} This is for the comparison between the total return migrant and non-migrant sample as shown in Figures 4 and 5.
classification for returnees, it is risky to solely rely on differences in racial classification between return and non-migrants as indicative of a change in returnees’ racial classification due to US migration. Furthermore, another factor to consider is that it is possible for members of the same family to racially classify in different categories that coincide with skin tone and phenotypical differences in Brazil. This also makes it risky to assess the validity of racial classification among family members as an influence of US migration (Telles 2004). However, this provides further evidence, even if it has limitations, that there may have been subtle shifts in returnees’ pre-migration versus post-migration racial classifications, particularly for those who self-classified as white before immigrating to the US and did not self-classify as white after returning to Brazil.

A slight decline in returnees’ post-migration racial classifications as white and results indicating that more returnees self-classified as nonwhite compared to non-migrants, indicates minimal support for the influence of the transnational racial optic in returnees’ post-migration racial classifications. As revealed in the results presented in Chapter four, returnees became aware that being racially white in Brazil was not equivalent to being racially white in the US while living in the US. The findings in this section regarding post-migration racial classification suggest that a different conception of white racial classification in the US may have been a consideration in returnees’ contemporary racial classifications, especially for those who self-classified as white pre-migration. If this is the case, my findings indicate that returnees subconsciously brought

In the US, it is less common for members of the same immediate family, such as siblings, to racially classify in different categories unless their parents are of different racial groups (e.g. one black, one white). In such cases, the siblings may identify as biracial, but it would be unusual for one to self-classify as black and the other as white. Various factors influence racial classification for biracial individuals in the US (Qian 2004; Qian and Lichter 2007; Roth 2005; Xie and Goyete 1997). However, this may change as the interracial marriages and unions between different racial groups increase in the US.
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back this perception about white racial classification (in the US) after returning to Brazil, which influenced their post-migration racial classifications.

**Importance of Racial Classification for Returnees and Non-Migrants**

Past research on race in Brazil suggests that racial classification is not very important for Brazilians, and some return migrants in this project reported that racial classification was more important for them in the US than in Brazil pre-migration. Comparing the importance of racial classification for non-migrants and returnees might also demonstrate the influence of US migration on returnees’ racial conceptions. After respondents reported their open-ended racial classifications, I asked how important that classification was for them. Eighty-three percent of non-migrants and 86 percent of return migrants felt their open-ended racial classifications were not or not at all important.¹⁰⁸

Another interview question that assessed the importance of racial classification for participants asked “which [identity] classification is most, 2nd most, and least important?” The closed-ended response options were: being Brazilian, man or woman, social class, race or color, and nothing. For most return migrants (57%) and non-migrants (50%), race or color was considered the least important classification. Likewise, both groups reported being Brazilian as the most important classification (45 percent of returnees and 42 percent of non-migrants). These findings are highlighted in Table 19.¹⁰⁹

---

¹⁰⁸ There were not race-based differences for these findings.
¹⁰⁹ 1 return migrant is missing from these tabulations because she had to cut the interview short and did not respond to these questions.
Table 19: Importance of Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Return Migrants</th>
<th>Non-Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Important</strong></td>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Most Important</strong></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Least Important</strong></td>
<td>Race/Cor</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings in this chapter indicate very few differences between return and non-migrants, suggesting that US migration did not influence post-migration racial classification for returnees in this matched pair sample. Where there were differences - more return migrants self-classified as non-white compared to non-migrants, and perceived external racial classification as a factor for racial classification among return migrants - these differences did not appear to be large. Assessing the statistical significance of these differences was not possible given the small number of matched pairs and the non-randomness of both samples. However, these findings suggest that return migrants, even after US migration, did not feel that racial classification was important to them and felt that being Brazilian superseded other social identities. Therefore, these results align with the existing literature which argues that nationality has more importance for Brazilians than race or any other social identity (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009). Since the same literature also suggests that social class has more importance for
individuals and facilitates social inequality (more than race) in Brazil, it is surprising that social class was not reported as a more salient social identity for return migrants or non-migrants. Rather, social class was second to race as the least important social classification for both groups. At this point, it is not clear why my findings regarding the importance of social class for returnees and non-migrants do not align with past research.

*Examining the Relationship between Racial and Skin Tone Classification for Returnees*

In this section, I examine if white, brown, or black return migrants classified their skin tones in different ways before, during, and after migration. Since I treated skin tone as a continuous variable and racial classification as a categorical variable, I was able to calculate the mean skin tone classifications for each racial category at each migration stage. The results presented in Table 20 are meant to hint at some possible racial differences in skin tone classification for these respondents and are not intended to be generalizable to a larger group of return migrants in GV.\(^{110}\)

**Table 20: Return Migrants’ Skin Tone Classifications across Racial Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skin Tone Means at Migration Stage</th>
<th>Racial Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Migration</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{110}\) The “Browns/Latinos” column refers to returnees who self-classified as brown in Brazil before and after migration and who classified as “Latino/Hispanic” while living in the US.
When examining the table from left to right, it appears that returnees who self-classified as white retrospectively reported the lightest skin tones compared to nonwhite returnees at each migration stage. For the mean skin tones for blacks and whites, black returnees reported skin tones that were nearly twice as high as those of white returnees. The skin tone means also demonstrate that returnees who self-classified as “Other” retrospectively reported having skin tones between whites on one side and browns and blacks on the other side.

When examining the table from top to bottom, returnees’ retrospective skin tone means increased in the US and then decreased immediately after returning to Brazil. Skin tone means reported at the time of the interview suggests increases and decreases depending on the racial category. While white, “Other,” and brown returnees’ skin tone means were higher at the time of the interview compared to immediately after returning, there was a slight decrease for black returnees. Closer examination of pre and post-migration skin tone means also indicate slight decreases for white and black returnees while “Other” and brown returnees’ skin tone means slightly increased. Given that returnees overall retrospectively reported lighter skin tones immediately after returning and darker skin tones at the time of the interview, these results coincide with their perceptions regarding the sun’s ability to change skin tone and thus race.

Over the migration process, returnees as a whole retrospectively reported darker skin tones in the US and at the time of the interview. However, there were differences between returnees in different racial categories. These findings provide further support

111 The statistical significance of these differences cannot be calculated due to the non-randomness of the sample.
for the idea that living in a racially polarized society like the US as a person who is externally perceived by others to be nonwhite (in this case Brazilians from a racially mixed society) may make a person more aware that they have darker skin tone compared to the predominant white American population.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how returnees perceived race in Brazilian society after the US migration by examining how they understood racial classification as a social process and a social reality, and how those classifications compared to those of their non-migrant relatives in GV. I explored Valadarenses’ perceptions of racial classification as a social process by investigating how they defined “race” or racial classification in GV and what factors influenced their racial classification. I then explored Valadarenses’ perceptions of racial classification as a social reality by assessing returnees’ retrospective racial classifications at each migration stage to look for differences that would illustrate the influence of the US migration. I also incorporated and compared non-migrants’ racial classifications to those of returnees and examined the importance of racial classification for both samples.

For returnees and non-migrants, I demonstrate that racial classification is defined as skin tone and ancestry, and that both groups consider skin tone to be the primary factor when racially classifying themselves. Additionally, the exploration of returnees and non-migrants’ skin tone classifications also reveal that both groups reported similar skin tone means at the time of the interview. For returnees, findings also indicate that immigrating to the US may have facilitated a darkening of skin tone and that on average
they lightened their skin tone classifications immediately after returning to GV. Further examination of returnees’ average skin tone classifications revealed that their post-migration skin tones were darker than their pre-migration skin tones. However, closer analysis of each individual returnee’s skin tone classifications at each retrospective stage indicated that only 11 returnees (22 percent of the sample) reported having a skin tone that was darker after migrating than it was before migrating. These results provide minimal evidence for the transnational racial optic since living in the US among “really white” Americans could have influenced how returnees classified their skin tones after returning to GV.

There were also differences across racial categories, especially since black returnees consistently reported the darkest skin tone means at each migration stage with white returnees at the other end of the scale. Brown and “Other” returnees’ skin tone means were consistently in between those of black and white returnees. While there were these “racial” differences in skin tone for returnees and hardly any difference between returnees and non-migrants’ skin tone means, returnees reported a perception that sun exposure could change their skin tone and thus their racial classification, which was consistent with how they reported skin tone classifications, especially immediately after returning to GV.

I also demonstrated how returnees and non-migrants racially classified when provided with Brazilian and/or US census-based categories. While pre- and post-migration racial classifications were nearly identical for returnees, there were perceptible shifts in those retrospective classifications when returnees lived in the US. Furthermore, there were no major differences between returnees and their non-migrant relatives’ racial
classifications as reported at the time of the interview. However, fewer returnees overall self-classified as white compared to non-migrants. I also show that perceived external racial classification had more of an influence on returnees’ racial classifications than it did for non-migrants.

Furthermore, the finding regarding how sun exposure can change an individual’s skin color and thus their racial classification is another example of the complexity encountered in returnees’ understanding of racial classification as a social process and social reality in Brazil after the US migration. This finding deserves more attention, particularly when considering that returnees reported their darkest skin tones while living predominantly in the northeastern US, which is known for cold winters. Although returnees felt that living in a less sunny climate could lighten their skin tones, their racial and skin tone classifications in the US did not coincide with that perception. Yet, upon immediately returning to Brazil, returnees reported lighter skin tones and many returnees who self-classified as white before immigrating re-classified as white. These individuals felt that losing their tans in the US resulted in “whitening.”

Thus, these two different and conflicting findings regarding sun exposure and changes in racial and skin tone classification suggest that the racial context of the environments in which returnees lived influenced their classifications in each place. Returnees recognized that although their skin may have lightened due to lack of sun exposure in the US, that lighter skin tone alone did not influence how others racially classified them in the US. Nonetheless, nationality, immigration status, and other factors also played a role, as has been indicated in results presented in Chapters four and five.
If the idea that sun exposure could change racial classification were to hold, returnees would have had to report lighter skin tones in the US. Instead, they on average reported their skin tones at the darkest levels in that context, further demonstrating that returnees developed an understanding of race in the US that prevented many of them (especially self-classifying whites) from being perceived as white in the US. However, upon returning to Brazil where racial classification is less rigid and gradations of skin color can be the basis for white racial classification, it seems that returnees felt they could lighten their skin tone and racial classifications in GV. In that context, their skin had lost some of its pigmentation and people on average were darker in GV. Thus, returnees accommodated to US racial classification norms while living in the US, as Roth (2006) suggests can occur for immigrants in the US, and for the most part, reverted to their pre-migration racial and skin tone classifications which were mostly consistent with Brazilian racial classification norms after returning to GV.

In examining the complexity and contradiction of returnees’ perception that living in a sunny (or not so sunny) climate can change skin tone and thus racial classification, returnees were aware of their racial context and primarily made decisions about racial and skin tone classifications based on where they were. Additionally, based on the findings comparing racial and skin tone classifications between returnees and non-migrants in this chapter, I argue there are mixed findings regarding whether returnees make use of the transnational racial optic to negotiate “finite” measures of racial classification and the importance of racial classification in GV. Comparisons between returnees’ and non-migrants’ racial classifications reveal that fewer returnees than non-migrants self-classified as white. With regard to the possible influence of US migration
on returnees’ post-migration racial classifications, as compared to their pre-migration classifications, I found that a few returnees who self-classified as white before migrating did not classify as white in GV post-migration.

In terms of skin classifications between returnees and non-migrants, this comparison did not yield major differences. However, after examining the average (for the returnee sample) and individual skin tone classifications at each retrospective migration stage, I discovered that on average most returnees reported darker skin tones post-migration. For individual skin tone reports, I found that while the majority of returnees did provide different skin tone classifications between migration stages, only a small minority (22 percent) did report darker skin tones after migrating. Such findings suggest that the transnational racial optic influenced some returnees’ post-migration racial classifications and skin tone classifications when we consider returnees’ perceptions of racial classification in the US as reported in Chapter four.

Thus, the findings in this chapter suggest that while returnees accommodated to the racial classification norms in the US as immigrants, for the most part, they had a stronger identification with Brazilian racial classification norms after returning instead of US ones. However, it is possible that an exploration of the qualitative data related to how returnees describe their post-migration perceptions of race and manifestations of racism in Brazil as compared to the US may yield additional nuances of the transnational racial optic. This will be explored in Chapter seven.
Chapter 7
Contemporary Life in GV: Conceptions of Race among Return Migrants and Non-Migrants

Because like I said, whoever goes [to the US] has this perception, when you return, [it’s] with a more open mind. [you] see that there is not only this [life in GV], you see that there [in US] there are blacks, there are other races [in addition] to Americans, like Latinos, people from other countries. So, I think our [migrants’] minds become more opened and upon returning, we share this with our families and I think we end up opening [the minds] of many people.

–Bianca, Morena Woman, 29 years, returnee

[Return migrants] are treated differently. Everyone that goes [migrates], independent of color, but the black too, if they return with money in a privileged situation, they are treated very well. If he is black, it’s as if his color disappears. He still is black, but he is no longer poor. This person is no longer ashamed, on the contrary, he [now] has a car. [So] he is good, it’s as if [people forget] he never had anything [before].

–Rosângela, Black Woman, 54 years, non-migrant

These two quotes demonstrate one return migrant and one non-migrant’s thoughts on how US migration directly and indirectly influences the lives of all Valadarenses (residents of Governador Valadares) regardless of whether they migrated to the US or not. Valadarenses who migrate and return come back with a different perspective, gained from living in the US and their observations of and limited interactions with people from different backgrounds there. In both returnee and non-migrant interviews, respondents agreed that migrants return with “a cabeça diferente” or a different head or mindset. Bianca, the first respondent, mentions how returnees share their “open-mindedness” with non-migrants through conversations about life in the US. Thus, non-migrants tangentially experience life in the US via return migrants’ stories and
experiences abroad. While Bianca reflects on becoming more open-minded, Rosângela, a non-migrant, comments on how US migration improves the financial conditions of return migrants regardless of race, going so far as to suggest that the blackness of black return migrants “disappears” by virtue of their acquiring financial success, although having lived in the US – regardless of any financial gains- also enhances an individual’s social prestige in GV.

If the general perception in the community is that return migrants come back to GV with a different mindset, are they socially, culturally, and economically different compared to their pre-migration selves? How do these differences influence their interactions with non-migrants? Bianca and Rosângela’s quotes expressed ways that returnees come back to GV as changed individuals and another goal of this dissertation was to examine the role of immigration in changing return migrants’ post-migration racial perceptions in Brazil. In this chapter, I explore how extensive migration and return migration influences Valadarenses’, particularly return migrants’, perceptions of race relations and racism in Brazilian society.

While the migration stream between GV and the US has heavily influenced the economic stability and socio-cultural conditions in the city, the findings presented in this chapter examine in what ways racial remittances, which I defined in the introductory chapter as the transmission of US racial ideals to GV via return migrants, are transmitted to and exchanged among returnees and non-migrants in GV. Furthermore, the findings in this chapter address the second research question posed at the beginning of Chapter six: Do returnees “bring back” racial ideals from the US and what impact does extensive US migration have on racial relations in Brazil? Thus, the exploration of how perceptions of
race relations in GV are shifting due to the influence of migration may also show how returnees and non-migrants view GV racial dynamics with a transnational racial optic. My examination of qualitative responses to a series of questions regarding racism in Brazilian society reveals significant differences between returnees and non-migrants that are indicative of how returnees rely on the transnational racial optic to negotiate their post-migration perceptions of racial inequality in Brazil.

**Perceptions of Racism in Brazil**

In this section, I delve into returnees and non-migrants’ perceptions of the manifestations of racism in Brazil by relying on participants’ qualitative responses to the interview questions below.

1) Do you think racism exists in Brazil? If so, how?

2) What are your perceptions of race and racism in GV? How does that compare to the rest of Brazil?

I also assess participants’ responses for differences that may shed light on how US migration might differentiate these perceptions across groups. I found that nearly all return migrants (90%) and all non-migrants (100%) think racism exists in Brazil. Yet, many respondents insisted that they personally were not racist and got along with people of all colors. In those interviews, participants were quick to say that they had grown up with blacks and even had black ancestry and relatives. Therefore, it was impossible for them to be racist because of their close social ties to blacks. Furthermore, participants perceived that racism had to be associated with overtly discriminatory behavior, which is
consistent with Telles’ (2004) and Twine’s (1998) examination of Brazilians’ perceptions of racism. Therefore, it was more difficult for returnees and non-migrants to recognize the structural manifestations of and implicit behaviors associated with racism. Such perceptions of racism in Brazil aligned with racial democracy ideology, which will be addressed below.

*Racial Democracy in Brazil*

Nearly all literature exploring race in Brazil has argued for or against the existence of Brazilian society as a racial democracy: a country with a racially mixed and phenotypically varied population coexisting in racial harmony.\(^{112}\) One of the most recent works on this topic by Stanley Bailey (2009) argues that while Brazilians are aware that systemic racial inequality exists, they perceive of racial democracy as an ideal yet to be realized in Brazilian society. In other words, Brazilians feel that racial democracy is an ideology that Brazilian society aspires to although it does not currently exist. After spending countless hours interacting with, living among, and interviewing Valadarenses, it was clear that these individuals recognize racism as a huge problem in Brazil that they strongly detest. However, many quickly proclaimed they were not racist.

Most return migrant and non-migrant responses that hinted at racial democracy did not specifically mention the term “racial democracy” or “democracia racial.” However, the way respondents talked about race in Brazil were indicative of the tenets of racial democracy as denoted in the literature. In such conversations, respondents specifically expressed the perception that there are no separate or rigidly defined racial

\(^{112}\) For more specifics on racial democracy ideology, please see Chapter two.
groups as a consequence of extensive racial mixing between African, European, and Indigenous peoples. A famous Brazilian phrase explains the presumed prevalence of racial mixture in the population: “todo têm um pé na cozinha,” which literally translates to “everyone has a foot in the kitchen.” This phrase alludes to the perception that all Brazilians have at least one drop of black blood and African ancestry due to the magnitude of slavery in Brazilian history. Notice how Mauricio’s quote below simultaneously mentions the presence of African blood in the whole Brazilian population, that blacks are treated marginally in Brazil, and also that the respondent is not racist because he is a lawyer:

Lots [of racism exists in Brazil]. Look, it’s hard to explain because in reality, whether he wants to [admit it] or not, every Brazilian has a little black blood. There’s no way to deny this because it’s part of our colonization. Isn’t that true? But, unfortunately prejudice exists, prejudice exists against blacks in our country. They [blacks] are not seen like other people. I don’t see them that way because whether we want [to admit it] or not, we are a black people because of our colonization. I don’t have a problem with this because in law [occupation] you can’t be prejudiced because you have to deal with all types of people without discriminating [in terms of] race, color, ethnicity. In relation to the law, everyone is equal. So, in my point of view, I am not prejudiced.

-Mauricio, Moreno Man, 24 years, non-migrant

Although Mauricio’s quote suggests the prevalence of racial mixture in the Brazilian population, many Brazilians believe racial classification is fluid and that an individual can acknowledge having racially mixed ancestry while simultaneously self-classifying as white. Nonetheless, proponents of racial democracy ideology have generally overstated the amount of racial mixing that has occurred between recent German and Italian immigrants in Southern Brazil and “nonwhites,” propagating an assumption that all Brazilians (including these white immigrants who did not racially mix
to the same extent) all have African ancestry, which is not the case (Telles 2004; Skidmore 1993). Furthermore, such assumptions regarding racial mixture among all Brazilians underemphasize that racial democracy ideology was disseminated as a way to racially whiten or dilute the African and Indigenous elements out of the population (Telles 2004; Dulitzky 2005; Skidmore 1993, 1990). However, despite the emphasis on whitening that was associated with racial democracy and the reality of less interracial mixing between European immigrants and nonwhite Brazilians, everyday Brazilians of various skin tones still believe that all Brazilians are racially mixed. This belief was prevalent among Valadarenses I interviewed.

Among 24 non-migrants, I coded the responses of 11 non-migrants (46%) as being related to racial democracy. Of those 11, eight (13%) discussed racial democracy in the traditional sense, indicating a perception that all Brazilians are racially mixed, have African ancestry, and have high rates of white-nonwhite intermarriage. Furthermore, due to extensive racial mixture, these non-migrants felt there were no definitively separate racial groups in Brazil:

Because here in Brazil, there is lots of racial mixture, you know? And because there’s this mixture, there are people who are not very light and not very dark. So, they’re in the middle here...I think this mixture is in the middle, not on one side or the other.
- Isaac, Moreno man, 22 years

My maternal great-grandfather was black, so I am not completely white, you understand? There’s mixture here [in my family]. Only my maternal great-grandfather was black but for example, my great-grandparents on my dad’s side were of Portuguese descent. So there’s mixture, in Brazil, it’s very mixed. So, why do I classify like this [as white], because of skin color I think.
- Marcela, white woman, 34 years

Because generally, in my daily interactions, to be sincere I don’t consider myself white because I am the granddaughter of a black on one side, from my dad, [my grandfather] is

---

113 In the 1920 and 1930s, Brazilian congressional bills and constitutional amendments sought to respectively prohibit and limit the immigration of “any colonists ‘of the black race’ and Asians to further whiten the Brazilian population (Skidmore 1990, 23).
black. So, I don’t see myself [as white]. So, I am in defense of that side because I never knew my grandfather, only by photo…I see myself as morena but others see me as white.  
–Lara, Morena woman, 52 years

The other three non-migrants whose responses I coded as indicative of awareness of ideas of racial democracy did not align with previous notions of how racial democracy has been defined. For example, one non-migrant commented that while there is a perception that many Brazilians of different colors marry each other, she feels that interracial marriage between blacks and whites is not as prevalent as most Brazilians think:

The people I know always relate differently to each other. For example, a woman will marry or find a good boyfriend in my family like this, the husband is black and the woman is much lighter. But, generally, where I go, the social rules, you don’t see this, you always see the two races together. The woman is white, the man is white. The man is black and so if his wife. I don’t see this [mixing as] much. [But among] the people closest to me, there is [racial] mixing.  
- Marcia, Parda woman, 26 years

Contrary to the broader conception of racial democracy as indicative of a fluidity of racial classification and lack of racial groups in Brazil, another non-migrant commented believing that Brazilians see race in black and white and categorize individuals as such based on their skin tones in spite of racial mixture:

Here in Brazil, you are white or black. I am not white [but] generally people say, “look you are white.” But, I’m not white, white normally is another color….Racism exists, but normally people see [race] in black and white. I think it is much simpler, I don’t know, than …black, white, yellow, brown…We [Brazilians] are all mixed. I am the daughter of, my ancestors are Italians mixed with Portuguese, and there’s Indian too. My dad was white with very light skin and hair, his hair was very bad [kinky]. The mixture in my family is varied.  
–Ligia, Parda woman, 47 years

Therefore, while most non-migrants expressed perceptions of racial democracy as it has been discussed in existing literature, it is also clear that at least some non-migrants recognize the prevalence of racism in Brazil and believe that blacks are highly
disadvantaged. While non-migrants acknowledge that Brazilians are racially mixed, it is very clear to them who the blacks are and how they are disadvantaged in Brazilian society, which is consistent with Bailey's (2009) work on racial democracy.

Return migrants’ perceptions about racial democracy coincided with those of the non-migrants, echoing similar sentiments about the prevalence of racial mixture in Brazil and how race is less important in Brazil compared to the US. I coded the responses of N=37 returnees (76%) as related to racial democracy and reviewed those responses once more to see if additional themes developed. Return migrants’ perceptions regarding racial democracy or lack thereof in Brazil can be seen in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racially Mixed</td>
<td>20/37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Integrated</td>
<td>10/37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Racial Democracy</td>
<td>4/37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Interracial Relationships</td>
<td>2/37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks as Servants</td>
<td>1/37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two themes listed in the table indicate returnees’ perceptions that Brazil is racially mixed and integrated and thus suggest that Brazil is a racial democracy:

We [Brazilians] all have a foot in the kitchen [black ancestry] because my dad was a little lighter than you and my mom is very white. So, I consider myself white, but I have a little bit, I have a foot in the kitchen.

–Felipe, “White but not 100% white” man, 34 years
My color here in Brazil, I am classified as white. Now we know that in Brazil there is a lots of racial mixture and no one is totally white here…There are many people [who look] completely white but [have] black blood…The white is very different huh? The Brazilian has a body shape that is different,… has the shape of the black…So I am classified as white, but I know very well that in my family, we have African, black [ancestry].

–Lorena, Human race, woman, 40 years

Because the white in Brazil, my [skin] color and my hair is classified as white in Brazil. So, you move to moreno and to black, in between moreno and black there are even more colors like ‘cafuso, mameluco’, in the Indigenous culture. I am not involved in this because we don’t have really white people in Brazil. This type of white doesn’t exist in Brazil like in America. So, my color in Brazil is considered white…You are morena here in Brazil, not black…

–Ricardo, white man, 50 years

All of these quotes provide examples of the cognizance of racial mixture and therefore presumed racial integration in Brazil. I say presumed because respondents, both returnees and non-migrants, discussed the prevalence of racial mixture in the Brazilian population as indicative of racial integration in the broader society. Notice how Felipe, the first respondent, refers to racial mixture in Brazil as all Brazilians, regardless of phenotype, “having a foot in the kitchen.” Furthermore, all of the quotes imply that there are not “really white” people in Brazil because of all of this mixture. Implicit in these quotes is that white Brazilians are not “really white” compared to whites in the US, indicating yet again how returnees make comparisons between both countries and rely on a transnational racial optic to discuss aspects of race in each context. Finally, the references to informal specific “racial” categories such as “cafuso” and “mameluco,” which refer to racially mixed individuals with a combination of African, Indigenous, and European ancestry and have no analogues in English, also indicate the fluidity of “racial” classifications between black and white, which are also related to racial democracy.

114 As the interviewer, I classified this participant as white by Brazilian US standards and thought she could have passed for white in the US.
While the majority of return migrants expressed perceptions consistent with racial
democracy (like the majority of non-migrants), the last three themes in Table 21 indicate
that a few returnees’ responses do not align with commonly held perceptions about racial
democracy. Some returnees mentioned that black-white interracial dating or marriage is
not allowed or desired in their families and made comments which suggest that Brazil is
not as socially integrated as previous studies on racial democracy indicate:

Look, the great majority of people don’t give importance to this [but] there are
blacks that don’t accept a white living in their neighborhoods. Similarly, there
are many whites who don’t like, for example, a white father that [doesn’t want]
a black man to date his daughter, but in my opinion, I see that there’s
discrimination on two parts [both blacks and whites].

–Sergio, Moreno man, 46 years

Generally speaking, people feel more threatened when they’re in a place where
there are more blacks than whites, as if blacks are more [predisposed] to
violence, robbery… I think there is a certain racism, not strong, but I think it
exists, a hypocrisy.

–Luana, white woman, 45 years

I always denied this, that we [Brazilians] are all equal, no, no. [With sarcasm]
We are in a racial democracy, in Brazil there isn’t prejudice. No, this is not true,
this is a lie [spoken with seriousness]. It’s an ideological lie. In the past and
[now] I continue to experience [racism] because there isn’t a racial democracy in
Brazil. I am a person that has social ascent in Brazil because I am a college
professor. But, this doesn’t take away any risk of experiencing racial
discrimination…

–Lucas, black man, 43 years

Quotes from these returnees imply that residential segregation, opposition to
interracial relationships, and fear of black Brazilians exists, and that a racial democracy,
as traditionally defined in the literature, is not a reality in Brazil, at least not for them.
Notice how Luana and Lucas’ quotes characterize the perception of Brazilian society as a
racial democracy as hypocrisy or a lie. The use of such words indicates that these
returnees recognize that while there is an attitude among Brazilians that everyone is equal
and racism is minimal or “not strong” in Brazil, racial inequality does exist in the country
and is particularly directed at blacks.
Thus, the majority of return migrants and non-migrants do perceive Brazil as a racial democracy in the sense that it is racially mixed and hard to separate Brazilians into rigid racial categories (as is done in the US). However, individuals whose responses were indicative of racial democracy also expressed a belief that racism was a problem in Brazilian society that still needed to be addressed and rectified. Participants’ acknowledgement of racism in Brazil is inconsistent with racial democracy ideology as originally conceived by Gilberto Freyre (1933), who believed that in Brazil’s racial democracy, there were no separate races and thus no basis for systemic racism. Nevertheless, Valadarenses’ perceptions of racial democracy overlap with Bailey’s (2009) theoretical interpretation of racial democracy, in which he argues that Brazilians see racial democracy as a goal for Brazilian society that has yet to be attained instead of as an ideology that has already been fulfilled.

Conversely, a small minority of returnees and non-migrants felt that Brazil was not a racial democracy at all and referred to incidents of racism as evidence for this. Therefore, the exploration of perceptions of racial democracy among returnees and non-migrants did not reveal differences between the two samples, suggesting that the US migration did not influence return migrants’ perceptions of Brazil as a racial democracy, indicating little evidence of the transnational racial optic.

**Anti-Black and Cordial Racism in Governador Valadares and Brazil**

Since nearly all return migrants and non-migrants reported that racism exists but that racial democracy is partially a reality in Brazil, this section explores participants’ perceptions of manifestations of racism. Returnee and non-migrant responses provided
anecdotal evidence that support other statistical and anecdotal data regarding racial
ingquality in Brazil and negative perceptions of blacks in Brazilian society (Bailey 2009;
Telles 2004; Dzidzienyo 2005; Sansone 2003; Guimarães 2001; Fry 2000; Marx 1998;
Twine 1998; Andrews 1992). During interviews, return migrants and non-migrants
discussed racism as something that primarily affected blacks. Yet hardly any participants
admitted to being racist or practicing discriminatory behavior. When I asked participants
how racism exists in Brazil or for examples of what they perceived as racist behavior,
their responses indicated that racism and negative sentiments about blacks were prevalent
in GV specifically and Brazil broadly. It was sometimes confusing to reconcile how
Valadarenses could proclaim that Brazil was a racially mixed society where cordial
relations existed between all Brazilians and simultaneously acknowledge that blacks were
perceived as poor, violent, and disadvantaged. However, such proclamations demonstrate
the paradoxical relationship between positive interracial interactions and negative
structural conditions for blacks in Brazilian society, as highlighted in Telles’ horizontal
and vertical relations theoretical explanation of Brazilian race relations. Responses from
return migrants and non-migrants about manifestations of racism in Brazil revealed a
number of themes, which can be seen in Table 22.  

115 One returnee is missing from the table since the interview had to be cut short. Four returnees (8%) reported believing that no racism exists in Brazil.
Table 22: Manifestations of Racism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Migrants</th>
<th>Non-Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-black Racism</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class &gt; Race</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks=Self-Segregating</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Appearance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Concrete Example</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that both returnees and non-migrants cited anti-black racism as one way that racism exists in Brazil. Among return migrants, this was the most prevalent form of racism reported. More specific examples of anti-black racism from return migrants and non-migrants focused on discrimination against blacks in employment or schooling, in everyday social encounters (e.g. racial profiling, dating), and perceptions of blacks as violent or poor. Both groups also identified particular jokes made about blacks as indicative of racist behavior. Related to this was a presumption about the social position of blacks in GV and Brazil: blacks are generally perceived to be poor or thieves. Non-migrants felt it was difficult for blacks to get decent jobs since there is a preference for people with a good appearance or “boa aparência”, which one non-migrant described as “white and blonde.”

In terms of work, the black has more difficulty finding a good job compared to a white person. Here, I can be capable, [but] between me and a blonde, the blonde will get the job even if she doesn’t have the same capability as me. Because here, appearance in the majority of places comes first. Just like this story I told you, they [employers] don’t put “good appearance” in the job ad…[but] at any rate between a black and a white, the white will have advantages in relation to work or anything else.

-Rosângela, black woman, 54 years

Many returnee and non-migrant responses about blacks also suggested that blacks are not welcome in certain social spaces such as wealthy neighborhoods or expensive restaurants, and their presence is questioned when they enter such spaces. One
returnee and one non-migrant provided lengthy examples related to blacks being expected to use the “service” elevator instead of the “social” elevator in expensive apartment buildings. Blacks are generally assumed to be the domestic help (of middle class or wealthy white residents) who should only use the service elevator. Another returnee provided an example related to people questioning the validity of a black person in a high-powered position or of a wealthy background, mentioning that people believe the black person did “something” (possibly illegal) in order to acquire that position.

[In] institutions, yes [there’s racism]. In Brazil, the black is usually a domestic worker and making minimum wage with the worst jobs. So, there’s prejudice, he is considered less capable, less intelligent in Brazil… And you can see in all of Brazil that blacks are excluded, they’re in the favelas, they’re living poorly on the periphery. So, I think that Valadares doesn’t differentiate much, maybe here it’s a little worse since there are fewer opportunities to find work.

–Gustavo, white man, 37 years, returnee

It’s like I said. In high society, they think that if you’re black, you have to be a domestic [worker] or have a service job [like a maid]. They don’t treat them [blacks] like other people, you know? As much in the high social class and in the middle class too. Because it’s difficult in our country to see a black as an economist or mayor, you know? Our country, I can’t remember having a black president.

–Mauricio, Moreno man, 24 years, non-migrant

How can I explain this? I think this way, tranquil, I don’t have problems in relation to this [being racist]...[but] I know that the black here in Brazil has much difficulty in ascending to elevated social classes, as much as in school as in work, [there’s] much discrimination. It’s not that I feel this way [discriminate], but I see the white as more privileged in our country. It’s a latent racism in Brazil. Latent, you understand? Latent means somewhat hidden…politically correct: ‘everything’s good and all’ but deep down, there is [racism]. Have you noticed this? Not that I act like this, but this is my perception.

–Douglas, white man, 36 years, non-migrant

Each of these quotes illustrates perceptions of the difficulty and social marginalization blacks experience in Brazil. Also notice how Douglas, the third respondent clearly tells me three times that he is not racist or does not discriminate against blacks while he explains how he perceives that blacks are treated in Brazil. This
demonstrates again how Brazilians recognize the prevalence of racism in Brazil yet feel that they are not conscious perpetrators of racist behavior.

There was also a perception among non-migrants and return migrants that blacks are often the punch-lines of many jokes and popular Brazilian phrases. One that both groups constantly cited in interviews was “fazer o preto” or “serviço de preto”, both of which loosely translate to “doing something black or in a black way.” Both phrases generally indicate doing a task incorrectly or ineffectively. Regardless of the expression used, participants commented that there is a negative connotation attached to both in referencing poorly done work - as related to the inferior quality of tasks done by blacks. Another common expression respondents shared with me was “preto, pobre, e ladrão,” which translates to “black, poor, and thief.” This phrase also indicates a broad perception that Brazilian blacks are socially marginalized and participate in deviant behavior. The quotes below demonstrate the use of these phrases.

For example in Brazil, there’s a very weighted term that I’ll tell you, if you see a black person stopped [in the streets], he is a suspect. If you see him running, he’s a thief. You see? There are some humiliating phrases that people use… [Racism] exists tranquilly. People discriminate, it’s all veiled. It’s not face to face, but it’s veiled. There is racism.

--Camila, Mixed woman, 48 years, returnee

Generally they say “black, poor, and thief.” So this is a form of prejudice…And when people notice social class, generally they’re talking [about] blacks. And at times, people say “ah, this service here wasn’t done right, it’s black, it’s something a black did.” So, they say that at times. I think it’s to humiliate people.

--Carolina, Morena woman, 44 years, returnee

In terms of [skin] color, [there’s] lots of discrimination based on color. People making little jokes in the sense of really humiliating others: ‘look, there goes the little black woman [neguinha] or the black cleaning woman [empregadinha] only serves that purpose, or if a black occupies a high-powered social position, people wonder how he could have done it? Just because he’s black. They don’t value him for what he offers or what he knows or what he could contribute…I think Brazil is very racist.

--Marcela, white woman, 34 years, non-migrant
Although participants who referenced these jokes recognized they were racist, there was also an acknowledgement that Brazilians are a “fun” people who like to make “harmless” jokes at the expense of socially disadvantaged people: blacks, the poor, or the physically or mentally handicapped. I also noticed this and how such behavior is considered a fun part of Brazilian culture or “brincadão” during my time in Brazil. Such “racist” cultural activities are not considered “racist” by most Brazilians, especially since some Brazilians will make such jokes and preface them by saying “I’m not racist.” This finding regarding the prevalence of racist jokes aimed at Brazilian blacks is also consistent with Telles’ (2004) study of Brazilian race relations:

Racial humor and racist jokes are part of this [Brazilian] culture and are generally taken in stride with other types of humor. Racial humor is based on common stereotypes and naturalizes popular images held of blacks by downplaying their seriousness…A sense of political correctness, which often acts informally to censor such jokes in the United States, is relatively absent in Brazil” (pg. 154).

While return migrants and non-migrants provided detailed and explicit examples of anti-black racism in Brazil, they also acknowledged that racism is covert or hidden. Such racism has been referred to as “cordial racism” in existing literature since it is not direct or “in your face,” but rather more subtle and implicit (Telles 2004; Bailey 2009; Twine 1998). The quotes below indicate some of these perceptions about racism in Brazil.

Here, the racism is more like a mask, everyone says no [they’re not racist], but the majority is. At times they say they are not racist, but, they don’t really mean it. For instance, my grandfather, he’s white, almost transparent, blue eyes, and descended from Italians and I have a cousin [who] is very brown, she looks like an Indian. And he practically disowned her saying that she is black and things like that. Thank God he didn’t make this comment to my daughters who are very brown. But, you notice there are people who talk very openly but the majority don’t even though they are [racist].  

-Giovana, Light morena woman, 35 years, non-migrant

It’s very disguised. It’s like hidden, why? Because for example, I see this, but I don’t participate in this. If you have a job, like a secretary in a school and there’s a person with
a light appearance [skin tone], tall and a morena person, normally people say [the white] was chosen for her résumé and many times it’s because of appearance. I don’t do this, but I notice this when there’s an important job.

–Lorena, Human Race woman, 40 years, returnee

Giovana and Lorena’s quotes suggest that while people may say they are not racist, they may hold racist beliefs about individuals, which influences their social and professional interactions with people. The first quote demonstrates an antipathy towards “black” phenotype within racially mixed families while the second quote implies that lighter skin is definitely preferred for jobs. These quotes are also particularly informative when we consider the number of returnees and non-migrants who told me they were not racist during interviews, which indicated that such individuals were not aware of the conscious and subconscious ways that well-intentioned and self-proclaimed “non-racist” people “participate” in racist behavior.

Although return migrants and non-migrants spoke at length about their broader perceptions of racism in Brazil, I also asked about manifestations of racism specific to Governador Valadares given the city’s reputation as an “American city” in Brazil. In interviews, I noticed that a few returnees and non-migrants expressed a belief that GV is less racist compared to other parts of Brazil. Therefore, I more carefully analyzed all participants’ responses to questions about racism for specific references to GV and discovered that 41 percent of return migrants and 58 percent of non-migrants felt racism in GV and Brazil were pretty much the same.

Six non-migrants (25%) thought that GV was less racist than other parts of Brazil, particularly larger cities with larger black or white populations. These non-migrants referred to Bahia and Rio, states that have larger black populations, and mentioned there
was probably more racism in such areas for that reason. Among returnees, only two (4%) felt that the south was more racist than GV. Due to the presence of German and Italian immigrants, many of whom came to Southern Brazil after World War II, there is a perception that racism is more prevalent in that region of the country (Telles 2004). The non-migrants who felt GV was less racist also referred to southern Brazil as more racist for reasons already stated. These same respondents also thought GV was more racially mixed than other parts of Brazil, which is why they believed there was less racism in the city. Seventeen return migrants (35%) and four non-migrants (17%) had no specific opinion or did not mention a specific difference. Therefore, it appears that once again, there were no major differences between return migrants and non-migrants with regard to perceptions of anti-black and cordial racism in GV specifically, or in Brazil more broadly.

Changes in Returnees’ Racial Conceptions of Brazil

Since the findings discussed in previous sections of this chapter reveal hardly any differences in returnees’ and non-migrants perceptions of racial democracy and manifestations of racism in Brazil, in this section I examine if living in the US had some influence on how returnees responded to the quantitative and qualitative questions regarding their post-migration conceptions of race in Brazil. To examine potential shifts, I reviewed and analyzed returnees’ responses to specific questions that focused on their recollections of US-Brazil comparisons after these individuals returned from the US.116 I

---

116 These questions were in the section of the interview that focused on post-migration racial conceptions at the time of the interview.
felt the following interview questions would provide an overarching idea of how returnees’ racial conceptions in Brazil may have changed due to having lived in the US. The rest of this section will address those results in relation to how respondents qualitatively and quantitatively answered these questions.

(1) After living in the US, has your perception about the [skin] color of people here in Brazil changed or not changed? This was a closed-ended question and the answer options were: (1) yes-did change or (2) no-did not change. For returnees who affirmatively responded, I asked how their perceptions changed.

(2) Do you think your racial classification changed as a result of immigrating to the US? This was an open-ended question and returnees initially responded yes or no. For those who answered yes, I asked them to describe these changes.

(3) After living in the US, would you say your opinion [or how you define or think] about race or [skin] color changed in any way? This was an open-ended question and returnees initially responded yes or no. For those who answered yes, I asked them to describe these changes.

(4) Has your perception of racism in Brazil changed after living in the US? This was an open-ended question.

(5) In what ways do you think racial issues in Brazil and the US are similar or different? This was an open-ended question.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{117} To analyze questions 1-3, I ran crosstabs to tabulate yes vs. no responses. Next, I closely reviewed the open-ended responses for returnees who responded “yes” to questions 2 and 3 and have reported the prevalent or most frequently cited themes from those responses. I similarly analyzed the open-ended responses for questions 4 and 5.
With regard to the first question, I wanted to see if living in the US had influenced how returnees perceived the skin tone or racial classifications of Brazilians in Governador Valadares after the US migration. Returnees mentioned an awareness that being white in the US was different from being white in Brazil and that their own racial classifications changed by virtue of having less exposure to the sun in the US. Therefore, I wondered if returnees might still classify other Brazilians using more fluid racial classifications or if they would use US-based racial classifications for fellow Brazilians. Return migrants’ responses to this question revealed that there was no change for most of them. Nearly 82 percent responded that their perceptions of other Brazilians’ skin tones had not changed as a result of immigrating to the US.

Given that findings in Chapters four and six indicated shifts in returnees’ racial classification while in the US, I explored if returnees were conscious of any shifts that may have occurred. This is why I included question two in the interviews: 88 percent of returnees answered no, that their racial classifications had not changed due to US immigration, suggesting that returnees were conscious that there were no shifts in their racial classifications. To some extent, this is accurate when considering the consistency between pre-migration and post-migration racial classifications for these individuals shown in Chapter six. However, when considering that 88 percent of returnees responded no, it also appears that they were not aware or did not voice how much their racial classifications shifted in the US compared to their pre- and post-migration classifications. This is especially the case for returnees who self-classified as Latino/Hispanic in the US and had classified as white, brown, or “Other” before and after the migration.
When examining question three to assess possible changes in returnees’ opinions of if their racial classifications or skin colors changed as a result of US migration, I found more mixed results. Thirty-seven percent (18/49) responded yes, that their opinions had changed. A closer look at the qualitative responses for returnees who affirmatively responded to this question indicated that their opinions or ideas about race changed in four primary ways. First, these individuals’ perceptions changed in relation to the US versus Brazilian black comparison: some felt that US blacks were more positively valued, visible, and politically active in US society than in Brazil. However, a few people also commented noticing that US blacks were more self-segregating. This finding is consistent with those discussed more explicitly in Chapter five. A second way returnees felt their racial opinions shifted was in the benefits they felt they gained from minimally interacting with people of different backgrounds in the US: returnees learned they were capable of living in another society and interacting with different kinds of people, which was something they felt they had not done in GV due to the ethnic and cultural homogeneity of the city.

Next, some returnees felt that living in the US altered their perception of the importance of race and racial classification: they felt racial classification in the US was very rigid and very black and white. Many commented that they did not want to give racial classification the same importance it had in US society. Some also thought that race structured or had an important impact on life in the US, especially with regard to interracial social interactions, which returnees felt was not the case in Brazil. Finally, some returnees felt that living in the US made them more cognizant of social inequality in Brazil. These returnees recognized that skin color is important in Brazilian society,
although not to the same extent as in the US, where racial classification is given priority and people are discriminated against because of their race, gender, or other social identities.

In terms of question 4, “has your perception of racism in Brazil changed after living in the US,” 39 percent (19/49) said yes, that their opinion about racism Brazil changed after living in the US. Overall, returnees who felt their perceptions of racism in Brazil changed after living in the US had the following to say: (1) that racism in the US was greater and/or more visible than in Brazilian society, (2) that Brazilians do pay attention to physical appearance (skin tone, hair, appearance) and social class collectively which can result in discrimination, and (3) that they returned to GV more open-minded from having interacted with different types of people and being in a place where they felt “law” and government functioned for its citizens.

In response to the final question comparing “the racial issue” or questão racial in Brazil and the US, I noticed that returnees consistently mentioned three themes: the extent of racism, perceived level of segregation, and importance of social class and physical appearance in each country. With regard to the extent of racism in Brazil and the US, returnees reported conflicting ideals. While 22 percent (11/49) reported thinking that Brazil and the US were similar in terms of perceived levels of racism, 25 percent (12/49) felt that there was either no racism in Brazil or that it was less visible compared to the US. Another 16 percent (8/49) actually felt that the US was less racist than Brazil due to the perceived higher social position of US blacks and there being more effective

---

118 Eight percent (4/49) of returnees did not know how to respond to this question and it was left blank in interviews.
anti-discrimination laws. However, 14 percent (7/49) perceived the US to be more interracially segregated compared to Brazil. Finally, 10 percent (5/49) thought that socioeconomic status and physical appearance (e.g. quality of clothing, hair styles, skin tone) were more important and the basis of social division in Brazilian society relative to the US. Some returnees’ qualitative responses indicative of the themes from all of the questions can be seen below.

We come back more sensitive and aware that we don’t have this prejudice with color, if a person is white, black, or American…We learn not to give value to these things [because] everyone is normal…We become less prejudiced in terms of race and color.

- Stephane, Morena woman, 43 years, Virginia

My racial classification didn’t change, what changed was how people see [racial] classification, how other people classify…I learned a little bit that they [Americans] don’t give much importance to skin color. I thought this was good for me so I could grow to learn this. Not that I discriminated against anyone, but for the fact that the Brazilian has this characteristic of sometimes judging others based on skin color. I learned that we [Brazilians] should never do this in our thinking. So, it [immigration] helped me grow.

- Antônio, Pardo man, 38 years, Connecticut

I think the American people are not so, they are not as racist as Brazilian people. They respect the black people more than the Brazilian ones. There is um… a commercial [with Ronaldinho the soccer player]. So the, his mother is black and she was waiting for the elevator. And she’s black, of course and she’s old…and was poor, very very poor. Now, she’s rich because [of] her son… So, she was waiting for the elevator, I, I imagine that uh, a very rich place going to her apartment maybe. And then there was a, a woman… a very fancy, blonde, beautiful, rich woman…Then the woman looked at her and like, up and down and said…”the service elevator is the other one.” So the [white] woman was trying to say that…she [the black woman] didn’t belong [in that place]. But of course, it was because the woman was black. And then, the woman, the black woman look[ed] at her said nothing and then she went to the [social] elevator. Only because the woman was black, she [the white woman] thought the woman was poor.

- Amanda, white woman, 33 years, Connecticut

In the US, you have more opportunities than in Brazil… in jobs. You can accomplish things, there are not the problems with race. In Brazil, whoa, the Brazilians are more racist.

- Sabrina, black woman, 31 years, Florida

Everything is different there. I lived there 5 years and I didn’t socialize with them [Americans]…I perceived that they don’t like immigrants and Brazil receives immigrants very well, especially Americans in Brazil…There we are poorly received….Perhaps the US is more prejudiced in terms of color and immigrants…I don’t think Americans look at social class. [In Brazil] social class is everything, education, clothing, everything.

- Erika, Morena woman, 27 years, Massachusetts
Based on these quotes and the findings in this section, returnees clearly had mixed perceptions regarding race in Brazilian society after living in the US. In some ways, a few returnees were conscious that their personal perceptions of race (with regard to their own and others’ racial classifications) and broader understanding of how race functioned in GV specifically and Brazil broadly shifted as a result of having immigrated to the US. However, the majority of returnees were not aware of how their ideals about race changed. The various responses to these open and closed-ended questions get at the murkiness of researching how people’s thoughts about race shift due to moving between very different racialized contexts. For returnees, it was clear that there were some distinct differences between Brazil and the US in terms of the racial issue or what Brazilians call the “questão racial.” Since both countries do have different histories of race, living in the US confirmed and/or negated some of the preconceived notions that returnees had about race in each society before immigrating to the US and after returning to Brazil. The process of immigrating did influence some returnees’ perceptions about how race functions in each country, particularly with regard to the social position of blacks and the perceived importance of skin color and social class.

These findings about returnees’ perceptions of how their racial conceptions changed also demonstrate evidence of the transnational racial optic. For returnees who reported a change in their perceptions of race and social inequality, the recollections of their lives and their perceptions of social stratification in the US were at odds with what they observed in GV after returning. Their recognition of Brazil as a more socially unequal society where an individual’s social class, physical appearance, and inability or
apathy to fight for one’s rights further marginalize Brazilians. This is in contrast to the US where some returnees perceived that all people regardless of race or social class had more opportunities for social mobility and had legal recourse if they experienced discrimination.

While these returnees had similar views about race in Brazil before immigrating to the US, it appears that the transnational experience of migrating to the US and then returning to GV magnified these returnees’ recognition of how race and inequality are manifested in Brazil. As stated before, many returnees’ responses about race and racism in each context elicited comparisons between Brazil and the US. Thus, returnees were trying to reconcile their perceptions of race in each context when answering interview questions. In relying on such comparisons between Brazil and the US to verbalize their perceptions of race in both countries, I would argue that the transnational racial optic, a lens that allowed them to juxtapose race “here and there,” helped them negotiate and interpret race, racial classification, manifestations of racism, and racial relations in GV post-migration.

Influence of US Migration on Race in GV

When I first conceptualized this project, I was very interested in learning if the back and forth migratory movement of Valadarenses between GV and the US was influencing racial dynamics and relations between return migrants and non-migrants. Interestingly, my results on this topic are the most informative in this chapter and for the project overall since they demonstrate if US racial ideals can be remitted to GV and what influence such ideals have on social relations in GV. To explore this issue, I closely
examined returnees and non-migrants’ responses to the following qualitative and open-ended questions:

(1) Non-migrants- Did your return migrant relatives mention anything about race or color in the US after returning to GV? If so, what?

(2) Non-migrants- Do you think these immigrants come back different or “Americanized” in any way? How so?

(3) Return migrants and Non-migrants- How do you think immigration between GV and the US has affected life in GV? Socially? Culturally? Race relations? The importance of race or skin color for Valadarenses?

These questions were the most effective way to assess how information about race in the US is transmitted from return migrants to non-migrants and to examine the various ways GV, as a transnational social field, is changing due to migration. In analyzing responses to the third question, I paid particular attention to direct and indirect references to race or skin color from participants. By this, I mean that there were some comments participants made that they may not have associated with race, but that I, as a sociologist, associated with race. To better illustrate differences between returnees and non-migrants, especially non-migrants’ perceptions of how migrants return differently, I present these findings in two separate sub-sections, one for non-migrants and the other for return migrants.

Non-Migrants

In response to the first question, most non-migrants (63%) reported that issues of race in the US had not been discussed with returnee relatives after they returned from the
US. However, nine non-migrants (37%) affirmatively responded and suggested that returnee relatives had shared some aspect of race in the US. While these non-migrants did not give very detailed responses, their responses fell along these themes: (1) that there was prejudice against Latinos and Latin Americans in the US; (2) Brazilians did not want to be confused with Hispanics; (3) the US is racially different without further specifics; (4) blacks and whites do not mix well socially in the US (e.g. little dating or marriage, conflicts); and (5) there are people of different races in the US as there are in Brazil. All of these “themes” were mentioned by at least one person. However three people noted the first theme. The quotes below indicate some of these perceptions.

When I spoke with my sister? She said she never experienced any racism. The only thing she said was that there, the Brazilian works a lot, like this because [employers knew] she was an immigrant, knew that she was in the country illegally, they work a lot. But [she didn’t experience] racism.

–Olivia, white woman, 19 years

[The return migrants] have talked [about race/color in the US]. They said they are just as discriminated against [there in US] as they are in our country... Because it seems to me that the black communities in America, they protest more than [blacks] in Brazil, you know? It seems that they [US blacks] don’t get along very well with the white community. There, it seems that the racial question is a bit more serious than here…Yes [relatives experienced discrimination] but, not due to skin color [race, but] for being immigrants, for being Brazilians, for being Valadarenses primarily because you should already know that the Brazilian city that has immigrants in the US is Governador Valadares. So, it’s complicated, there’s lot of discrimination there.

–Mauricio, Moreno man, 24 years

Look, this is what I think, the Brazilian in general, he discriminates against Hispanics, Puerto Ricans in the US… Many times [the perception you get] from Americans, I have never been there, but the idea that Americans don’t really like Hispanics, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, from Hispanic America. [So]The Brazilian doesn’t like to be confused with Hispanics.

–Douglas, white man, 36 years

He [brother] interacted and worked with blacks and confirmed what we [Brazilians] already knew from TV, that the black American, he doesn’t get involved, for example, in a romantic relationship, a black American, with people of another color. Why? Because he suffered a lot in the past, we’ve see[n] a lot in movies that when a man and woman want to date, if he’s of a different race than her, it’s like an affront to the family. And here, it’s beyond being an affront to the family, the black in relation to the white, the Japanese, or a person of a different race…the black, the black American family acts this
way, the black acts this way, the majority don’t get involved [romantically] with a person of another race.

–Hugo, black man, 48 years

Each of these quotes references non-migrants’ perceptions of race in the US as conveyed to them by return migrant relatives or Brazilian media. These references to perceptions of race in the US align with those described by returnees in Chapters four and five: experiences of anti-immigrant discrimination, interracial or ethnic animosity, residential segregation, and Brazilians’ negotiation of being perceived as Hispanics. Thus, it seems that returnees in this study shared US racial ideals with non-migrants relatives that were consistent with their personal and societal perceptions of race in the US.

With regard to question two about migrants returning differently from the US, 88 percent (N=21) of non-migrants reported feeling that returnees did come back different and in some ways "Americanized" after the US migration. I categorized non-migrants’ responses to this question as positive, negative, or neither positive or negative. Of the 21 non-migrants who believed their migrant relatives returned differently, 67 percent thought these were negative differences. Non-migrants mentioned that some returnees: have difficulty readapting to GV, return money-hungry, have left behind children and family, and complain a lot about GV and Brazil as poor, corrupt, and disorganized. Some of the most common phrases non-migrants used to describe return migrants were: “voltam fechados”: they return closed off; “se sentem superiores”: they feel superior to non-migrants; and “são insuportáveis”: they are insufferable. However, there were two non-migrants who thought that migrants returned differently in a positive way, commenting that migrants return more resourceful with knowledge of another country, a
desire to fight for their rights, in better financial shape, and better manners (e.g. social and driving etiquette). The remaining three non-migrants did not believe migrants returned any differently after having lived in the US.

Of the 21 non-migrants who felt that returnees were different post-migration, only four had responses that were race-related. In two of those responses, non-migrants commented that migrants return “whiter” due to the climate.119 The other two non-migrants mentioned that returnees benefit from living in the US among different groups of people and from observing blacks who fight for their rights, whereas in Brazil this is not the case. So, these two non-migrants believe returnees benefit from this and it helps them in their interactions with people in GV post-migration.

A little bit in terms of color, my sister was white when she returned, much whiter. She didn’t get much sun [in the US], she was super white with very light skin and also much lighter hair and the way she talked was definitely a consequence of the time she spent there.

– Giovana, Light morena woman, 35 years

They [migrants] return and we interact with them. They return very white and also return, [some] others return more respectful [manners/etiquette]…It’s because of the climate, it appears to remove their color or something.

– Rodolfo, “Normal white” man, 39 years

When they return, they complain about everything because “the US is like this.” One thing they brought from there in addition to the Dollar Store and McDonalds is lawsuits. It’s interesting, fighting [standing up for one’s self] is part of the American culture, to fight for your rights, no matter what its costs. It doesn’t matter if you are black or white, if someone steps on your foot, action is taken. Now, here in Brazil, people are starting to do this and I think it’s interesting. It’s a cool thing they [returnees] picked up, if the black feels offended, he sues. If the white feels offended, he sues. If customers receive bad service, they are suing. So, I think it is a positive change [that] these people had there [in the US] and brought here. They learned it [there].

– Ligia, Parda woman, 47 years

Therefore, while the majority of non-migrants perceived that returnees were different post-migration, only a small minority mentioned any changes that were related specifically to race.

119 See Chapter six.
While the first two questions were related specifically to non-migrants’ perceptions of return migrants, the third question focuses on how returnees’ “changes” in the US are brought back to GV and influence life there. Most non-migrants’ (42%) responses to this question indicated that there was no perceptible change in GV race relations and eight non-migrants (33%) did not provide a specific response to the question.

However, six non-migrants (25%) felt that US migration has had a positive “racial” impact on GV. Given such a small number, I am unable to generate themes for non-migrants who cited a positive impact. Nonetheless, three non-migrants specifically mentioned that there was a positive racial impact for returnees in that they go to the US and learn to live with people from all over the world and return with a different frame of mind and more open to different things. Another non-migrant believed race relations in GV are improving as a result of GV-US migration and due to foreigners coming to GV for hang-gliding championships, which contributes to intercultural understanding. Another non-migrant mentioned that this migration brings culture to the city, but did not specifically mention how. Finally, one non-migrant mentioned that migrants who return and who “succeeded” in the US regardless of color are treated well. However, this non-migrant also mentioned that people fear returnees who did not do as well will ask for help of some kind.

---

120 Each year, GV hosts the world-championship competition for hang-gliding, which brings primarily European and Australian competitors to the city.
I think it is changing [race relations] for the better, you know, because from the time that many Brazilians, many foreigners entered the US and vice-versa [Americans coming to Brazil], people are understanding more and [so] there is less racism. I think that people are seeking to understand more, I think it is changing, I believe it is. I think it needs to change [because] as human beings, I think we need to understand everyone.

–Denise, Morena woman, 38 years

He [migrants] has to interact with people from all over the world. In the US, there are people from various parts of the world...So, he [return migrant] has a really different perception...Definitely, they [return migrants] return with a very modified head [way of thinking/ seeing the world]...[migration] definitely changes their vision. They return to Brazil with a totally different mindset because there, they see the black race fighting for their rights. Here, blacks are in the minority and prefer to isolate themselves instead of fighting directly. That’s the reality. From living with different people, ethnicities, countries, their [return migrants] perception is different. They don't have this here, the blacks here. They don't have cultural access in relation to this. And in the US, whether they [migrants] want to or not, interacting with different races and people, they end up having a totally different perception than the people here [non-migrants].

–Mauricio, Moreno man, 24 years

Given how non-migrants responded to my questions, the majority do not feel that US migration has had a perceptible impact on racial dynamics in GV.

Return Migrants

Since I explored how return migrants personally felt their racial perceptions had changed as an influence of US migration in an earlier section, here I will focus specifically on their responses to the third question posed at the beginning of this section. When I spoke with returnees about their perceptions of how US migration has influenced race relations in GV, the majority told me they felt there had been no impact. Very few return migrants thought GV race relations were changing as an influence of migration: only eight of 49 (16%) responded affirmatively or suggested that there was any type of “racial” impact in the city. Of those eight returnees, four felt that migration had a positive impact, one felt there was a negative impact, and three felt there was an impact in GV that I could not categorize as either positive or negative.
With regard to positive effects, four returnees felt that living in the US gave them a more open mind in terms of their interactions with different types of people that they did not have before immigrating. A few return migrants felt that this open-mindedness may be passed along in the city as migrants come back and interact with non-migrants. In terms of the negative impact, one returnee commented that children raised in the US make racist comments, which she felt was not characteristic of Brazilians. The verbal exchange below between Carolina, a returnee with medium brown skin tone and slightly curly shoulder-length black hair, and me demonstrates this perception:

Carolina: I think everything is influenced [in GV from migration]...because parents who have children there or take their children there and grow up there at times come [back] with conceptions from there and bring them here. So, I think in a certain way, there is an impact...

TJ: So, in your opinion, do you have an example of this or how have you observed this in Valadares?

Carolina: Sometimes, I observe their behavior in the mall, they say certain things, their pronunciation...They say racist things.

TJ: What types of racist things?

Carolina: They talk about other people in a racist way. At times when they’re talking, it’s the kind of thing that is not ours [Brazilian]. This transition is not from our culture, it’s brought [by return migrants].

–Carolina, Morena woman, 44 years

The other return migrants whose comments suggested that the impact was neither positive nor negative indicated that migration between GV and the US improves the relationship between both countries since Americans and Valadarenses intermarry and sometimes move to GV. Furthermore, it was believed that some returnees benefited from being around other people in the US and use US racial categories to classify other Brazilians when they come back to GV:

Some people bring [racial ideals from the US] because many people have that obsession of classifying others, “oh, he is this [racially] and calls [another] black, [another] white, [another] Japanese.” There are, some people bring [this], but I think the majority do not.

121 The quote referred to here is used at the beginning of the chapter.
The Brazilian in reality is not racist, the Brazilian has no way to be racist because our race is mixed.

—Felipe, “White, but not 100% white” man, 34 years

[Migrants] get accustomed to saying someone went from [being] moreno to black. You get so used to saying that a person is black if they were yellow or pardo. So, I think that arriving here, in my point of view, no [ideas are brought back] but maybe they [return migrants] look at a morena person and see them as black [here] like there [in the US].

—Vinicius, “Portuguese” man, 31 years

These two quotes specifically indicate a perception that some return migrants are “obsessed” with racial classification. Vinicius’ quote particularly suggests that returnees use the one-drop rule for classifying all nonwhite Brazilians as black, which is characteristic of the US racial system. Felipe and Vinicius’ perceptions regarding returnees’ racial conceptions suggest that some return migrants use a transnational racial optic for classifying Valadarenses with US racial categories and ascribing social importance to these classifications. These respondents believe it is possible for returnees to transmit racial remittances to GV in the form of US racial classification norms and use them in Brazil. While Felipe and Vinicius report observing this behavior among some return migrants, their responses do not demonstrate their personal compliance or participation in this behavior. Felipe’s reference to Brazilians not being racist also implies that returnees’ use of US racial classification in GV is racist and therefore un-Brazilian.

The verbal exchange between Gustavo and me below demonstrates a perception that race relations in GV, if they are changing, are doing so almost imperceptibly.

TJ: In terms of race or the importance of race or skin color here, do you think it [GV] is changing as a result of this immigration between Brazil and the US?
Gustavo: Look, Tiffany, if it is changing, it is barely noticeable.
TJ: Could you tell me more about how it is barely noticeable?
Gustavo: I think that the more the Brazilian has an experience in the US with blacks, working with blacks, he brings this here. But here, he [return migrant] has this way of thinking “oh Brazil is different” [from US]…There in the US, I work with Tiffany because she’s black and here no. Tiffany is over there and I stay over here in my social
class, she stays in hers, you know? So, I think that there in the US is one way and here is another way…

TJ: So, you think that Brazilians have experiences with other groups or nationalities in the US, but that it doesn’t influence their interactions with other people in GV when they return?

Gustavo: I think that if there’s an influence, it is very little.

—Gustavo, white man, 37 years

While a small minority of return migrants felt there was an impact, 41 percent (N=20) felt there was no impact on broader racial dynamics in GV. Another 21 returnees (43%) could not provide a direct answer to this question even though I tried asking it different ways to elicit a response, but to no avail. Therefore, it appears that most returnees feel that there was no perceptible influence of US migration in GV.

Although I only present results regarding returnees’ and non-migrants’ perceptions of how racial dynamics may have shifted in GV, participants’ responses to the influence of US migration on GV’s culture and economy elicited much more descriptive and in-depth answers than my questions about GV race relations. Valadarenses comments about the city’s financial dependence on US dollars, the rise in real estate prices, and the opening of “American” themed stores and businesses demonstrated that GV is a transnational social field where people, goods, and ideals about culture and religion are transmitted between the city and the US on a daily basis.

However, my attempt to learn about perceptible racial remittances from Valadarenses, returnees and non-migrants alike, yielded less conceptually tangible examples of the “racial impact” in GV. Perhaps this was due to respondents’ inability to recognize or unwillingness to disclose perceptions of US racial ideals being present in GV. After all, such ideals are considered racist and/or un-Brazilian. Various quotes in this and previous chapters reveal that Valadarenses vehemently oppose what they consider
overt racist or racially discriminatory behavior. Only a few returnees (16 percent) and non-migrants (8 percent) reported a perception that racial ideas were being remitted to GV and in such cases, respondents did not acknowledge personally transmitting or espousing the US racial ideals they discussed in the interviews.

Furthermore, even if more respondents expressed a perception that US migration was influencing GV racial dynamics, it might have been difficult with my research protocol to disentangle such an influence from pre-existing ideals regarding race and social stratification in GV and Brazil as a whole. There has been extensive migration and return migration between GV and Brazil in the last thirty years, and this project is the first of its kind (to my knowledge) to explore the racial impact of this migration. Thus, it would be difficult to effectively assess any racial impact without an exploration of GV racial dynamics before more extensive US migration began in the 1980s. Therefore, these findings should not be considered all encompassing; further longitudinal ethnographic and survey research on this issue is warranted.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I utilized return migrants’ and non-migrants answers to a combination of qualitative questions to explore their perceptions of racism and how US migration has influenced racial dynamics in GV. Both groups believe racism is prevalent in Brazil and that black Brazilians are the victims of such racism. I also showed that both groups perceive Brazil to be a partial racial democracy, in the sense that Brazilians are a racially mixed people who cannot be separated into distinct racial categories.
With regard to the influence of US migration on racial conceptions, I found that for some returnees, living in the US did facilitate a change in their racial perceptions with regard to the different social positions of black Brazilians vis-à-vis black Americans and heightened their perception of social inequality in Brazil. For these returnees, their responses indicated the use of the transnational racial optic for interpreting racial relations and inequality in GV and Brazil post-migration. However, in my exploration of the racial impact of US migration in GV, the majority of participants did not believe that US migration was influencing GV racial dynamics. Only a very small minority acknowledged that this could be the case. Within this minority, those individuals felt that if there were any changes or shifts, that such changes were subtle and imperceptible. Therefore, despite the prevalence of GV-US-GV migration in the last few decades, findings in this chapter suggest that this movement is not having a noticeable impact on how Valadarenses of different skin tones or racial classifications interact with each other, or that any changes are not perceived or admitted by respondents.
Chapter 8
Conclusion

The findings presented in the previous chapters demonstrate how Brazilian return migrants negotiated race in three contexts: (1) in Brazil before the US migration; (2) while living in the US as racialized immigrants; and (3) in Brazil after the US migration. The objective of this dissertation was to comparatively explore the social constructions of race in Brazil and the US by examining how living in a highly racially polarized country like the US, which has very different racial dynamics than Brazil, influenced these returnees’ racial conceptions in the US and Brazil. Because these migrants immigrated to the US from the city of Governador Valadares, a city that has had an extensive history of migration to and from the US, they had preconceived ideas about life and race in the US before migrating. The unique context of GV as a transnational social field makes that city a place where the transnational flow of people, money, ideas, and culture between GV and the US has a daily impact on the lives of all Valadarenses, returnees and non-migrants alike.

In exploring returnees’ racial conceptions in the US and GV, I demonstrate how a transnational racial optic influenced these racial conceptions at different points of the migration process. Returnees’ recollections of life in the US, as described in Chapters four and five demonstrated how they observed and interpreted the US racial system by revealing constant comparisons between race “here and there.” This allowed returnees to
renegotiate and understand their own racialized and national identities as nonwhite Brazilian immigrants in the US. This was especially important for negotiating their ethno-racial classifications, particularly as related to the Latino/Hispanic categories, two ethno-racial categories which Brazilian immigrants resist and that do not exist in Brazil. Because Brazil was colonized by the Portuguese and not the Spanish, Brazilians are not Hispanic, but are often ascribed membership in the Hispanic category since they are from Latin America and many US citizens are unaware that Brazil is not a Hispanic country.

Likewise, living in the US, also facilitated a nonwhite racial classification for many returnees, especially those who self-classified as white before migration but recalled classifying as Latino/Hispanic in the US. Despite having internalized negative stereotypes about US Latinos, I found that the majority of return migrants I interviewed self-classified as Latino/Hispanic when provided with US ethno-racial categories while living in the US. Such classification indicated an accommodation of US racial classification norms as Roth (2006) suggests. My conversations about racial classification in the US with returnees yielded many comparisons to Brazil where an individual with white phenotype could self-classify and be classified by other Brazilians as white despite having nonwhite ancestry. I found that returnees relied on such norms of Brazilian racial classification to understand and interpret racial classification in the US, which is indicative of the transnational racial optic.

In addition to racial classification, the transnational racial optic was also evident in returnees’ perceptions of US racial relations with regard to the social position of US blacks vis-a-vis Brazilian blacks and the hyper-segregation of US society. As a consequence of racial democracy ideology in Brazil, which facilitated fluid racial
classification and cordial interracial social relations, returnees thought that racial
classification in the US was very influential in shaping social relations such as
friendships and marriages. Returnees’ experiences of blatant racial and anti-immigrant
discrimination also elicited comparisons to Brazil, where they felt that racism was less
overt and that immigrants were well-received. Returnees particularly expressed distaste
for how much US neighborhoods were racially and socially segregated, which when
compared to Brazil, really seemed to be very different. Furthermore, although returnees
were very impressed by the higher socioeconomic mobility and visibility of US blacks,
returnees also felt US blacks were self-segregating and racist compared to Brazilian
blacks, who were perceived to be poorer but more willing to interact with white
Brazilians. Once again, the juxtaposition of returnees’ pre-migration perceptions of
Brazilian racial relations with returnees’ observations of racial relations in the US also
demonstrates the presence of the transnational racial optic, particularly since these
observations of US racial relations vis-à-vis Brazilian racial relations at times surprised
and confused returnees.

Although returnees collectively lived in the US for an average of almost eight
years, the findings in Chapters six and seven indicate that their racial conceptions did not
shift very much after they returned to Brazil. With regard to racial classification, I found
that returnees’ pre-migration and post-migration racial classifications were nearly
identical. This was especially the case for returnees who self-classified as white in Brazil
before migrating. While returnees felt that their racial classifications had not changed due
to living in the US (which is consistent with the findings in Chapter 7), no returnees
recognized or commented on the shift from their pre-migration classifications to the
Latino/Hispanic classification while living in the US. Despite not finding major shifts in returnees’ racial classifications, I did notice that slightly fewer returnees self-classified as white after migration compared to before migration. Furthermore, skin tone classifications among returnees suggested that on average they reported having darker skin tones after migrating compared to before migrating. These two findings suggest that returnees relied on US notions of white racial classification to classify themselves in GV after migration and provide evidence of the transnational racial optic in returnees’ considerations for their post-migration classifications.122

Upon incorporating data from the non-migrant relatives of 24 return migrants, I discovered that there were not many differences between both groups’ racial classifications at the time of the interview. However, more returnees did self-classify in nonwhite racial categories compared to non-migrants. I also found that perceived external racial classification by others had more of an influence on racial classification for returnees than it did for non-migrants. While external racial classification was also important for returnees while they lived in the US, it was less important for them before immigrating. This finding is also indicative of the transnational racial optic since it shows that returnees began to rely more on how others racially perceived them while living in the US and also continued to use external racial classification as a primary factor for racial classification in GV post-migration.

With regard to returnees’ perceptions of Brazilian racial relations after returning to GV, I found that many of them acknowledged that racism did exist in Brazil and Brazilian blacks were the victims of racial discrimination. This was consistent with non-

---

122 See Chapter four.
migrants’ perceptions. Both groups expressed a perception that Brazil was a racial
democracy in the sense that all Brazilians have racially mixed ancestry, but also stated
that racial and social (class) inequality was rampant in Brazil. Despite there being very
few differences in perceptions of Brazilian racial relations among these groups, I found
that returnees did share their perceptions of US racial relations with non-migrants during
and after migration. Non-migrants reported hearing various things about race in the US,
particularly about the elevated social position and presumed racist behavior of US blacks
and the marginalization of Latinos in the US. Therefore, as a transnational social field, it
appears that some perceptions about race in the US were being exchanged among
returnees and non-migrants in GV.

Another objective of this dissertation was to learn if US racial ideals were being
remitted to GV and if so, how racial relations in GV were being influenced by such racial
remittances. While returnees and non-migrants provided specific examples of how this
migration has had an economic, cultural, and social impact on the city, participants had
much less to say about the racial impact. Only a small minority of returnees and non-
migrants felt that GV racial relations were shifting as an influence of US migration with
regard to how Valadarenses want to fight for their rights (like US blacks) and
intercultural understanding is being developed between the US and GV. For returnees,
although they acknowledged that living in the US was a valuable experience that taught
them how to manage their finances more responsibly, live in another country, and
(minimally) interact with different types of people, returnees felt that US migration did
not change their post-migration racial conceptions. If any change did occur, it is likely
that these respondents were not conscious of them or did not voice them in the interviews.

The transnational racial optic, which I conceptualized in Chapter two as a way to demonstrate how transnational migration influences how individuals observe, interpret, and negotiate race in their host and home societies, was not always present in returnees’ observations of race in the US and GV. Based on the findings in this dissertation, I would argue that the transnational racial optic was more evident among returnees during their lives in the US. Although returnees also sometimes discussed their post-migration racial conceptions of Brazil by comparing them to the US, such comparisons were not as detailed or as overtly indicative of race “here and there” particularly when they referred to the city of GV. The results presented in Chapter six revealed more nonwhite racial classifications and darker skin tone classifications among returnees after migration and indicate their use of the transnational racial optic. Returnees’ exposure to the rigid US racial classification system facilitated nonwhite racial classification (for some returnees) in GV. However, because returnees also reported a perception that sun exposure can darken skin tone and racial classifications, it is difficult to determine if returnees reported darker skin tones and nonwhite racial classifications post-migration as an influence of US migration and thus, the transnational racial optic or, due to residing in tropical GV.

Another reason the transnational racial optic is less evident for returnees’ post-migration racial conceptions is due to their intent to return to Brazil and their social interaction with non-Brazilians in the US, which was limited due to their limited English proficiency, documentation status, and low skilled jobs. The lack of socially meaningful and sustained interaction with US citizens may not have facilitated an authentic
identification with and internalization of US racial ideals. In her examination of racial conceptions among Dominican and Puerto Rican immigrants in New York, Roth (2006) argues:

The amount of time migrants have spent in the U.S. does not significantly affect their concept of race largely because the barriers to structural assimilation were highest for the respondents who arrived first. Even after decades in the U.S., they still have not achieved the kind of social mobility that would bring them into meaningful contact with Americans…They interact casually with Americans in stores, restaurants, or on the subway, but these exchanges are not sufficient to change their conception of race. Casual contact exposes them to popular racial classifications but not to a deeper understanding of how Americans define race. And lacking upward class mobility, their views do not change over time.” (pg. 177-178)

Therefore, returnees’ lower social status in the US may have played a role in their ability to truly understand and internalize the US racial system to an extent that small “parts” of it could have been transmitted back to GV. Furthermore, returnees’ racial socialization in Brazil before migrating may have been so influential that although living in the US challenged their pre-migration racial conceptions, the US migration did not yield a major transformation in returnees’ post-migration racial conceptions of Brazilian society.

Furthermore, returnees and non-migrants may not have perceived changes in GV racial relations as an influence of US migration due to a reluctance to acknowledge that US racial ideals might be “present” in GV since racist characteristics of the US racial system are considered to be repugnant and un-Brazilian. If there were shifts or changes, such shifts might have been so subtle that respondents, returnees and non-migrants, alike were not conscious of them.

The Brazilian city of Governador Valadares provided a unique context for conducting this research because of its history as Brazil’s largest immigrant-sending city
to the US. For the last thirty years, Valadarenses have been on the move literally (via migration) and figuratively (via transnational communication) to and from the US. While living in the US, returnees in this study maintained connections with family and friends in GV by sending remittances and communicating via phone and internet, which are some of the traditional ways that contemporary migrants establish transnational ties. However, because these returnees intended to return to Brazil (and eventually did), their internal thoughts were constantly on GV as they made temporary lives in the US as racialized immigrants. This intent facilitated constant comparisons between Brazil and the US. My focus on how this sample of Brazilian returnees negotiated the racial systems in Brazil and the US by relying on their internal understandings, negotiations, and comparisons of racial dynamics in each context is a departure from traditional transnational migration studies. Previous studies, for the most part, have explored the transnational reconfiguration of gender, religion, and political involvement among immigrants in the US and other immigrant-receiving societies. Yet, there has been less research on the impact of migration in immigrant-sending communities and even fewer studies on how transnational migration can reconfigure individuals’ understandings of racial classification and relations, as an influence of migration, in sending communities.

My findings regarding the transnational racial optic among Brazilian returnees in GV are not intended to be generalizable to all Brazilian return migrants or Brazilian immigrants, as the returnees in this study had a set of migration experiences that are unique to them and their specific locales in the US and Brazil. However, I do believe my theoretical framework of the transnational racial optic can be applied to migrants on the move in other international contexts. Because migrants are social actors, they are
socialized in and develop an understanding of the social world in their countries of origin before migrating, which affect how they understand social relations in the countries to which they migrate. Race is a social construction that has been particularly influential in shaping social relations in the US and other countries. Thus, the specificities of racial dynamics in migrants’ home societies shape how these individuals negotiate racial dynamics upon their arrival in host societies. The contentious history of US racial classification and relations presents a sharp contrast to other countries which is a challenge for migrants, not only from GV or other parts of Brazil, but also from other countries around the world. How these migrants are “positioned” in the US ethno-racial hierarchy can affect their structural incorporation into US society. For migrants who do return to their home countries, exposure to the US racial system may provide another lens, that they “carry” with them, to help them renegotiate ethno-racial relations in their countries of origin. This lens is the transnational racial optic, which can account for changes, although subtle and subconscious, in these migrants’ racial conceptions.

In concluding this dissertation, I would like to briefly discuss how my experiences conducting this research are somewhat similar to the results I reported regarding return migrants’ perceptions of their post-migration racial conceptions which did not shift drastically as an influence of US migration. While living in GV, I was a temporary migrant who went to Brazil with a US-framework of race, but who had to adapt to and develop an understanding of the Brazilian racial system to conduct this research. My personal experiences with racial classification and observations of Brazilian racial relations (as somewhat different from the US racial system) have had a subtle impact on the way I think about race on a daily basis even though I am now back in the US.
However, my racial classification did not change and I am still very aware of and practice norms for US racial classification. Although I still see myself as black and my black racial identity is intact despite having been told by many Brazilians that I was not black, I have noticed that I sometimes see people in the US, especially US blacks, and think to myself, “she/he would definitely not be black in Brazil.”

Furthermore, during short visits to the US (while conducting fieldwork) and immediately after returning from conducting fieldwork, I noticed that I paid more attention to skin color and other phenotype markers such as hair texture and nose shape. I feel that I became more (skin) color conscious than I was before conducting this research, especially given the legacy of colorism in the African American community. I started noticing variations in skin tone among US blacks and others, but especially among blacks. I believe I began to pay more attention to skin color than racial classification because I had been living in Brazil, talking with Brazilians about these issues, and noticed that skin color was very important there. While I felt that Brazilians did not discuss racial classification like people in the US do (in terms of distinctive racial groups), they definitely talk about skin color and hair in very blatant ways that would be considered politically incorrect in the US.

I certainly feel that this was a subtle shift for me that was indicative of how I believe the transnational racial optic personally influenced my “post-migration” conceptions of race in the US after having lived in Brazil. However, despite developing a more nuanced lens for observing other peoples’ skin tones and races in the US, I do not feel that my temporary migration affected my perception of my own racial classification or of racial stratification in the US as a black woman. I still self-classify as black (despite
being perceived as nonblack in Brazil), other people externally classify me as black, and I still believe racism in the US is subtly and overtly aimed towards people of color. Therefore, I believe there were subtle shifts in the way I think about race after my temporary “migration” to GV that are evidence of the transnational racial optic in my personal life. I also believe this could be the case for return migrants I interviewed in GV as well as for other individuals who have the opportunity to migrate temporarily or permanently to host countries that have racial systems that are different from those in their countries of origin.

My exploration of how the US migration influenced Brazilian return migrants’ racial conceptions in this study is relevant for understanding how immigrants in the US develop an understanding of US racial classification, relations, and inequality, particularly as racial demographics and discourses shift in the US. As stated before, the growth of the Latino population into the largest ethno-racial minority and increased migration from Latin America, Asia, and the Caribbean is influencing how individuals are racially classified and how Americans think about race. Because Brazilian immigrants do not fit easily into existing US racial categories, their increasing numbers could facilitate how they are denoted on official forms in the years to come. Additionally, if the US will undergo a Latin-Americanization of race, racial cues may be taken from Brazil as Latin America’s largest country, which emphasizes the importance of this study in another. By comparing the racial systems in Brazil and the US via returnees’ racial conceptions, I examined how everyday Brazilians on the move negotiate race in multiple contexts, as individuals who are influenced by larger racialized social structures in Brazil and the US. To my knowledge, such a study has not been conducted.
Finally, because this project was the first of its kind to explore some of these issues, these findings are novel. However, additional research needs to be done not only in GV, but in other immigrant-sending communities to the US from Brazil and other parts of Latin America to examine if and how US racial ideals are being exchanged in and transmitted to sending communities. While exploring the racial issue is relevant, it is also important to examine the economic, social, and cultural impact of US migration in sending communities, which is necessary for understanding the factors that facilitate US migration and how race may influence the migration process.
Appendix 1
Demographic Information

The tables on the following pages include demographic information (e.g. pseudonym, age, gender, racial classifications) for each participant in the study. Tables 23 and 24 contain the demographics for the returnee sample. In addition to general demographic information, these tables also include immigration-related information for each returnee, such as year of migration to US, year of return to GV, length of stay in US, and US states of residence. The last columns in tables 23 (cont’d) and 24 (cont’d) include the pseudonym of that returnee’s non-migrant relative who participated in the study. Since I included extensive demographic information for returnees, Tables 23 and 23 (cont’d) include demographic information for the first 24 returnees while Tables 24 and 24 (cont’d) include corresponding information for the remaining 25 returnees. Table 25 contains the demographic information for the 24 non-migrant participants, each of whom was a relative of 24 corresponding returnees. Please see the last column in Table 25 for the returnee relative of each non-migrant.
Table 23: Return Migrants' Demographic Info (Returnees’ 1-24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year of (1st) Arrival in US</th>
<th>Year of (Last) Return to GV</th>
<th>Length of Stay in US (yrs)*</th>
<th>US State(s) of Residence</th>
<th>Open-Ended Race Before Immigrating</th>
<th>Categorical Race Before Immigrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NJ, NY, MA</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jéssica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>mulata</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NY, NJ</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrique</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA, NH</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduard0</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FL, CT</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernanda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiago</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MA, CT</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NY, NJ</td>
<td>light morena</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinicius</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NY, NJ, MA</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natália</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>white/transparent</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MA, CT</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mixed: not black/white</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MA, NY, NJ, PA, FL</td>
<td>neutral: not black/white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest year
Table 23: Return Migrants’ Demographic Info (Returnees 1-24), cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Open-Ended Race in US</th>
<th>Categorical Race in US</th>
<th>Open-Ended Race-Time of Interview</th>
<th>Categorical Race-Time of Interview</th>
<th>Mean Skin Tone over Migration</th>
<th>Pseudonym of Non-migrant Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>black Hispanic</td>
<td>Other: Black and Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jéssica</td>
<td>white, normal</td>
<td>Other: White and Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Irma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana</td>
<td>mulatta</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>mulata</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Franciely: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Other: Morena</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateus</td>
<td>light moreno</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrique</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Jorge: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>white/Brazilian</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Francisco: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernanda</td>
<td>much lighter</td>
<td>Other: White and Latina</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Marcia: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiago</td>
<td>white/Brazilian</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white, but not 100% white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Nicolas: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>not black, white, or American</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>light morena</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>light morena</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>light morena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Denise: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Mauricio: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinicius</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Rosangela: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Brazilian/Latina</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>Foreigner</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Douglas: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela</td>
<td>white, but not as white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Samara: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>mixed person</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>mixed person</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Lara: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>neutral: not black/white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Filipe: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year of (1st) Arrival in US</td>
<td>Year of (Last) Return to GV</td>
<td>Length of Stay in US (yrs)*</td>
<td>US State(s) of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NC, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Washington, DC, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NY, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2008-last visit to US</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>FL, SC, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SC, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NY, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NY, MD, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronaldo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NH, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antônio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*rounded to nearest year
Table 24: Return Migrants’ Demographic Info (Returnees 25-49), cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Open-Ended Race in US</th>
<th>Categorical Race in US</th>
<th>Open-Ended Race-Time of Interview</th>
<th>Categorical Race-Time of Interview</th>
<th>Mean Skin Tone over Migration</th>
<th>Pseudonym of Non-migrant Relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Other: morena</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Ligia: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiz</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Hugo: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Vixiane: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luana</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>yellowish white</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Cecilia: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabio</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>yellowish white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcio</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td>Brazilian/Latina</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa</td>
<td>white or yellow</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Rodolfo: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaella</td>
<td>not black or white</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>yellowish white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Olivia: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephane</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Brazilian/Latino</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Cecicle: sister-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Marcela: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo</td>
<td>not black or white</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Katia: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>Does not classify</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Does not classify</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavio</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Other: Moreno</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronaldo</td>
<td>Does not classify</td>
<td>Other: White and Asian American</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>Other: white and yellow</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Heitor: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciana</td>
<td>parda</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>parda</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa</td>
<td>parda, yellow, white</td>
<td>Other: Hispanic/ Latino and Asian American</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Giovana: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Human Being</td>
<td>Other: Human Race</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Isaac: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antônio</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Open-ended Racial Classification</td>
<td>Categorical Racial Classification</td>
<td>Skin Tone Classification</td>
<td>Pseudonym of Returnee Relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciely</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Juliana: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thiago: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>branco</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eduardo: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>parda</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Fernanda: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rafael: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ana: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>branco</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Henrique: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>branca</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Isabel: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>branco</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Natalia: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>morena</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Camila: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>branco</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marcelo: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>negro</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Luiz: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>parda</td>
<td>Other: black</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Marina: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosângela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>negra</td>
<td>Other: black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Letícia: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>amarela</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Luana: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecília</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>clara</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fabio: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodolfo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>normal:branco</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Larissa: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olívia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>branca</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rafaela: sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecílie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>negra</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sabrina: sister-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>branca</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Paulo: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>mais negra</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sergio: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heitor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>pardo</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ronaldo: brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>morena clara</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luisa: cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>moreno</td>
<td>Pardo</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Lorena: cousin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Coding Schema

The following pages include the primary coding schema for the racial conceptions of returnees and non-migrants in the sample. Each coding schema contains the categories that were used to organize and analyze the interview data in the project based on participants’ responses to interview questions. Each of the categories in the schema have subcategories that were used to further organize the interview data. However, these subcategories are not shown due to space constraints and the complex organization of these subcategories in the NVivo qualitative software used for this project. Participants discussed a number of factors relevant to race in the US and Brazil, migration in Governador Valadares, and broader social inequality in Brazil. Thus, I developed additional coding schema in NVivo to analyze participants’ responses on these themes. However, the coding schemas on the following pages primarily focus on race and do not include non-racial commentary from the interview data.

The first coding schema shown in Figure 6 was used to organize and analyze participants’ racial conceptions in Brazilian society. Thus, the categories shown refer to interview data from returnee and non-migrant data that demonstrates how these individuals negotiated, interpreted, and understood various aspects of the Brazilian racial system. Some of the thematic categories are very specific to Brazilian society, particularly discussion of the racial democracy, importance of social class, importance of
appearance, and the perception that the sun or climate can change an individual’s race. Some of these categories coincide with findings discussed in chapters six and seven.

I will now briefly describe and explain each thematic category starting from the left of the tree diagram and moving to the right. (The order of the categories and length of lines in the diagram are arbitrary.) Keep in mind that each of the categories in the schema includes all words, phrases, and/or sentences from transcripts that directly refer and allude to the title of that category. Each thematic category was developed after I listened to the actual interview and revised each corresponding interview transcript two times to develop an idea of what themes were emerging in the interview data.

“Blacks as Poor”: includes participants’ perceptions of Brazilian blacks as poor, disenfranchised, and marginalized in Brazilian society; for returnees—also includes their comparisons of poor Brazilian blacks to more upwardly mobile US blacks

“Defining Race”: includes participants’ perceptions of how they personally define racial classification in Brazil. Since most literature argues that racial classification is associated with actual skin tone, I included interview questions to confirm or negate this perception with participants. Subcategories included: skin color, nationality, species (i.e. human race), and miscellaneous.
Figure 6: Coding Schema for Returnees' and Non-Migrants' Brazilian Racial Conceptions
“Diversity: Lot/Lack of”: includes participants’ perceptions of Brazil as a racially/ethnically diverse country. Returnees’ perceived that Brazil was less diverse than the US due to their migration experiences when compared to non-migrants.

“Importance: Appearance/Beauty”: includes participants’ perceptions that physical appearance with regard to lighter skin tone, straight hair, and nice clothes are very important in Brazilian society for being treated respectfully and positively regarded. This theme was very pronounced for returnees who made comparisons to US where they felt individuals were more judged by character rather than appearance.

“Importance: Race”: includes participants’ perceptions regarding the importance of race as a social structuring factor in Brazil.

“Importance: Skin Color”: includes participants’ perceptions regarding the importance of skin color as a social structuring factor in Brazil.

“Importance: Social Class”: includes participants’ perceptions regarding the importance of social class in Brazil.
“Racial Classification”: includes participants’ perceptions regarding their own racial classifications and racial classification broadly in Brazil. Subcategories include: categorical racial classification using Brazilian census categories, open-ended racial classifications with no prompt, factors considered in racial classification, perception of how others racially classify respondent using Census categories, less defined (more fluid), and relationship to skin tone.

“Racial Democracy”: includes participants’ perceptions of whether or not Brazil is a racial democracy as defined in existing studies of race in Brazil (see Chapters two and seven).

“Racial Quotas”: includes participants’ perceptions related to racial quotas or affirmative action in Brazilian universities and institutions.

“Racism in Brazil”: describes participants’ perceptions of whether and to what extent racism in exists in Brazil. Subcategories include: regional variations (north versus south) and participants’ declarations of not being racist.

“Sun/Climate Can Change Race/Skin Color”: includes participants’ (mostly returnees’) perceptions that sun exposure can facilitate a change in skin tone and thus racial classification.
“Social Class Trumps Race”: includes participants’ perceptions regarding belief that social class is more important than race in Brazil and that racism exists because of social class, not race.

“US as More/Less Racist Than Brazil”: includes participants’ opinions of whether the US or Brazil is more racist.

“Miscellaneous”: includes race-related comments participants made that could not be coded under other thematic categories.

The second coding schema in Figure 7 was used to organize and analyze return migrants’ retrospective perceptions of race in the US while they resided there as immigrants. Once again, the descriptions of each of thematic category are explained below, starting from the left of the diagram and moving to the right.

“Brazil/US Comparisons”: includes returnees’ perceptions in which aspects of the US and Brazilian racial systems were compared.

“Discrimination”: describes returnees’ perceptions of their observations and experiences of discrimination in the US. Subcategories include: anti-immigrant, class, gender, racism, miscellaneous, and responses to discrimination.
“Importance: Other Identities”: includes returnees’ perceptions regarding the importance of other identities/classifications in the US.

“Race More Important in US”: includes returnees’ perceptions that race and racial classification are more important in US.

“Importance: Race”: includes returnees’ perceptions regarding the importance of race in the US, particularly in influencing social interactions and outcomes.

“US vs. Brazilian Blacks”: includes returnees’ comparative perceptions of US and Brazilian blacks. Subcategories include: appearance, behavior-attitude, misconceptions, political, socioeconomic status.

“Race Relations”: includes any observations returnees made about US race relations while living in the US.

“Racial Classification”: includes any observations returnees made about racial classification while living in the US. Subcategories include: census-forms (filling out), Latino/Hispanic category, normal, not white in US, open-ended, rigid/well-defined, self versus external, skin tone classification.
Figure 7: Coding Schema of Returnees’ US Racial Conceptions
“What Returnees Heard Regarding Race in US Pre-Migration”: includes anything returnees heard or knew about race in the US before immigrating. Subcategories include: discrimination, media, race relations, racial classification.

“US as More Racist than Brazil”: includes returnees’ perceptions that US is more racist than Brazil.

“Miscellaneous”: includes race-related comments participants made that could not be coded under the other thematic categories.
Appendix 3
Interview Protocol for Return Migrants-English Version

I. INFORMATION ABOUT IMMIGRATION TO THE USA
This part of the survey contains questions about your immigration experience in the US. I would like to know basic information about your time there.

1. Why did you decide to immigrate to the US? What was the primary factor in your decision to immigrate?

2. What was the main reason you immigrated?
   1. ( ) To work
   2. ( ) Family Living in US
   3. ( ) Other: _____________

3. How many times did you immigrate to the US? What year did you immigrate? What year did you return? What city did you go to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times did you immigrate?</th>
<th>Year of Arrival in US</th>
<th>Year of Return to Brazil</th>
<th>Length of US Stay (in months)</th>
<th>US City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did you have relative or friend in the US when you immigrated? How did that relationship help you while you were immigrating?

5. Were there other reasons you immigrated to the US?
6. If you immigrated more than once, what was the main reason you immigrated again?
   1. ( ) To work
   2. ( ) Family Living in US
   3. ( ) Other: _____________

7. Did you obtain a tourist or work visa before immigrating?
   1. ( ) Yes
   2. ( ) No

8. Did you obtain a ‘green card,’ US citizenship, or work authorization during your time there?
   1. ( ) Yes
   2. ( ) No

9. Did you intend to return to Brazil when you immigrated to the US (the first time)?
   1. ( ) Yes
   2. ( ) No

10. What was your job before you immigrated to the US? Your estimated monthly salary (in Brazilian Reais)? What was your job in the US? Your estimated monthly salary (in US Dollars)? What is your current job and estimated monthly salary (in Brazilian Reais)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Immigrating</th>
<th>In the US</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>Monthly Salary (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How did you find work in the US?

12. Did you send remittances to GV during your time in the US?
   1. ( ) Yes (continue to number 13)
   2. ( ) No

13. How much on average did you send each month? To whom? For what purpose?

14. Can you describe the city or region where you lived? Were there other Brazilians? Did you socialize with them? And the Americans? Can you describe your relationship with them (social, work, in whatever circumstance)? Were they native born Americans, immigrants, or of other nationalities?

15. How often did you speak by phone with your Brazilian relatives or friends? How did you feel about living and being in the US? How was your life there?

16. Do you speak English?
   1. ( ) Very well
   2. ( ) Good
   3. ( ) A little bit
   4. ( ) None

II. RACE AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION BEFORE IMMIGRATING

This part of the survey contains questions about your experiences with race, skin tone, and racial classification before immigrating to the US.

17. Before immigrating, did you hear anything about race or color in the US? Where did you hear these things? Please tell me about that.

18. Before immigrating, with regard to race, how did you see yourself?

________________________________________________________________________
19. When you classified that way (your response in number 18), which of the following, in the list below, did you take into consideration in first place? In second place?

   a. In first place? ______________
   b. In second place? ______________
   c. Anything else? ______________

   1. Skin Tone
   2. Your hair
   3. Other physical features (eye color, nose, lips, etc.)
   4. Your family (parents, grandparents)
   5. The way other people classify you
   6. Nothing
   7. Other: ______________

20. Using the options in the list, how did you racially classify before immigrating (Brazilian Census Categories)?

   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

21. Before immigrating, how important was this classification for you?

   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All

22. Using the options in the list, how do you think other people racially classified you?

   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________
23. Before immigrating, on a scale of 1 to 10, how did you classify your skin tone?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Before immigrating, how important was this classification for you?

1. ( ) Very Important  
2. ( ) Somewhat Important  
3. ( ) Not Important  
4. ( ) Not Important At All

25. Before immigrating, which classification did you consider most important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other

26. Before immigrating, which classification was the 2nd most important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other

27. Before immigration, which classification was least important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other
III. RACE AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION IN THE US

This part of the survey contains questions about your experiences with race and racial and skin tone classification during your time in the US.

28. In the US, with regard to race, how did you see yourself?

________________________________________________________________________

29. When you classified that way (your response in number 28), which of the following, in the list below, did you take into consideration in first place? In second place?

a. In first place? ______________
b. In second place? ______________
c. Anything else? ______________

1. Skin Tone
2. Your hair
3. Other physical features (eye color, nose, lips, etc.)
4. Your family (parents, grandparents)
5. The way other people classify you
6. Nothing
7. Other: ______________

30. Using the options in the list, how did you racially classify in the US (US Census Categories)?

1. ( ) White
2. ( ) Black
3. ( ) Hispanic/Latino
4. ( ) Asian/Pacific Islander
5. ( ) Native American
6. ( ) Other: ______________

31. In the US, how important was this classification for you?

1. ( ) Very Important
2. ( ) Somewhat Important
3. ( ) Not Important
4. ( ) Not Important At All
32. Did you ever fill out a Census or other form in the US? Did these forms ask for your racial classification? How did you racially classify yourself? What influenced your decision to classify this way?

33. Using the options in the list, how do you think other people racially classified you in the US?
   1. (  ) White
   2. (  ) Black
   3. (  ) Hispanic/Latino
   4. (  ) Asian/Pacific Islander
   5. (  ) Native American
   6. (  ) Other: ______________

34. Did you think race was important in your interactions with others? How important? How did you feel about this?

35. Did others try to racially classify you in any way? What terminology did they use? How did you feel about this?

36. Did you hear or are you familiar with the Latino/Hispanic category in the US? Would you self-classify in this category? Did others use this category to classify you? How did you feel about this?

37. Do you remember your first experience or have a strong memory of race in the US? If so, can you tell me about this?

38. In the US, on a scale of 1 to 10, how did you classify your skin tone?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Lighter               Darker
39. In the US, how important was this classification for you?

1. (    ) Very Important
2. (    ) Somewhat Important
3. (    ) Not Important
4. (    ) Not Important At All

40. In the US, which classification did you consider most important?

1. (    ) Being Brazilian
2. (    ) Man or Woman
3. (    ) Social Class
4. (    ) Race/Color
5. (    ) Nothing
6. (    ) Other

41. In the US, which classification was the 2nd most important?

1. (    ) Being Brazilian
2. (    ) Man or Woman
3. (    ) Social Class
4. (    ) Race/Color
5. (    ) Nothing
6. (    ) Other

42. In the US, which classification was least important?

1. (    ) Being Brazilian
2. (    ) Man or Woman
3. (    ) Social Class
4. (    ) Race/Color
5. (    ) Nothing
6. (    ) Other

43. Did you ever experience what you consider to be racism in the US? Can you describe what happened? Would this be considered racism in Brazil?

44. Do you think there is a difference between race in Brazil and in the US? If so, can you explain this?

45. Do you think race had more importance for you in the US compared to Brazil? If so, why?
46. Did you feel that belonged to or identified with a particular racial group in the US (for example: blacks, white, Latinos/Hispanics, Asians, others)? Why did you feel a connection with that group?

IV. RACE AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION IMMEDIATELY AFTER RETURNING TO BRAZIL

This part of the survey contains questions about your experiences with race and racial and skin tone classification immediately after returning to Brazil.

47. What reasons influenced your decision to return?

48. Immediately after returning to Brazil, with regard to race, how did you classify?

49. When you classified that way (your response in number 48), which of the following, in the list below, did you take into consideration in first place? In second place?

   a. In first place? _____________
   b. In second place? _____________
   c. Anything else? _______________

   1. Skin Tone
   2. Your hair
   3. Other physical features (eye color, nose, lips, etc.)
   4. Your family (parents, grandparents)
   5. The way other people classify you
   6. Nothing
   7. Other: _____________________
50. Using the options in the list, how did you racially classify immediately after returning to Brazil (Brazilian Census Categories)?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Yellow/Amarelo/Asian
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

51. Immediately after returning to Brazil, how important was this classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All

52. Using the options in the list, how do you think other people racially classified you immediately after returning to Brazil?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Yellow/Amarelo/Asian
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

53. Immediately after returning to Brazil, on a scale of 1 to 10, how did you classify your skin tone?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Lighter  Darker

54. Immediately after returning to Brazil, how important was this classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All
55. Immediately after returning to Brazil, which classification did you consider most important?
1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other  

56. Immediately after returning to Brazil, which classification was the 2nd most important?
1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other  

57. Immediately after returning to Brazil, which classification was least important?
1. ( ) Being Brazilian  
2. ( ) Man or Woman  
3. ( ) Social Class  
4. ( ) Race/Color  
5. ( ) Nothing  
6. ( ) Other  

V. RACE AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION AT TIME OF INTERVIEW  

This part of the survey contains questions about your current experiences with race and racial and skin tone classification.  

58. Currently, with regard to race, how did you classify yourself?  
_____________________________________________________________
59. When you classified that way (your response in number 58), which of the following, in the list below, did you take into consideration in first place? In second place?

a. In first place? ______________
b. In second place? ______________
c. Anything else? ______________
   1. Skin Tone
   2. Your hair
   3. Other physical features (eye color, nose, lips, etc.)
   4. Your family (parents, grandparents)
   5. The way other people classify you
   6. Nothing
   7. Other: ______________

60. Using the options in the list, how do you currently racially classify (Brazilian Census Categories)?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

61. Are there particular reasons you classify this way?

62. Currently, how important is this classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All
63. Using the options in this list, how do you think other people racially classify you currently?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ____________________

64. Why do you think other people classify you this way?

65. Do you think your racial classification changed after living in the US? How?

66. Currently, on a scale of 1 to 10, how do you classify your skin tone?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Lighter  Darker

67. Are there particular reasons you classify your skin tone this way? Do you think this classification changed after living in the US? How?

68. After living in the US, would you say that your opinion or the way you think about race or skin color has changed in any way? If so, how?

69. Do you still feel that you identify with any US racial group?

70. Currently, how important is your skin tone classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All
71. Currently, which classification do you consider most important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian
2. ( ) Man or Woman
3. ( ) Social Class
4. ( ) Race/Color
5. ( ) Nothing
6. ( ) Other: ________________

72. Currently, which classification is the 2\textsuperscript{nd} most important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian
2. ( ) Man or Woman
3. ( ) Social Class
4. ( ) Race/Color
5. ( ) Nothing
6. ( ) Other: ________________

73. Currently, which classification is least important?

1. ( ) Being Brazilian
2. ( ) Man or Woman
3. ( ) Social Class
4. ( ) Race/Color
5. ( ) Nothing
6. ( ) Other: ________________

74. Do you think race and skin color are the same?

1. ( ) Yes
2. ( ) No

75. For what reasons do you think this?

76. At any time in your social relations have you felt discriminated against in Brazil or the US? If so, how?

77. Do you think you were discriminated against because of your skin color or race? How did you feel about this?
78. After living in the US, do you think your perception about the skin color of people here in Brazil:
   1. (  ) Changed (go to number 79)
   2. (  ) Did Not Change

79. How did you perception change?

80. How have you dealt with these differences?

81. Have you discussed these new perceptions of race with other Brazilians/Valadarenses? What do they think about this?

82. How would you say that Brazil-US migration has affected life in Governador Valadares? Socially, economically, culturally? And race relations? The importance of race or skin color for Valadarenses?

83. Would you say your perception of racism in Brazil changed after living in the US? How? Which activities or ideas would you consider to be racist?

84. Do you think racism exists in Brazil?
   1. (  ) Yes, Why? __________________________________________________________
   2. (  ) No, Why? __________________________________________________________

85. How does racism exist here in Brazil? And in Governador Valadares? Can you speak about your perceptions of race and color here in GV? Racism? Discrimination?

86. In what ways do you think Brazil and the US are similar or different in terms of race?

87. Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience with race and skin color in Brazil, GV, or in the US? Anything in general?
VI. PERSONAL INFORMATION

88. What is your sex?
   1. ( ): Female
   2. ( ): Male

89. What is your date of birth (day/month/year)? _______________________

90. What is your birthplace? ________________________________________

91. What is your situation before immigrating and currently in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before Immigrating to the US</th>
<th>Currently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (when you 1st immigrated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Residential Neighborhood in GV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. Did you attend school in the past?
   1. ( ) Yes (continue to question 93)
   2. ( ) No (continue to question 94)
93. What was the highest level you completed?  
   1. ( ) Primary or Elementary  
   2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)*  
   3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)*  
   4. ( ) Middle School  
   5. ( ) High School  
   6. ( ) College  
   7. ( ) Master’s or Doctorate  
   8. ( ) Literacy Class for Adults  
   9. ( ) Day Care  
  10. ( ) Preschool

94. In what course are you currently enrolled?  
   1. ( ) Primary or Elementary  
   2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)*  
   3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)*  
   4. ( ) Middle School  
   5. ( ) High School  
   6. ( ) College  
   7. ( ) Master’s or Doctorate  
   8. ( ) Literacy Class for Adults  
   9. ( ) Day Care  
  10. ( ) Preschool

95. Where did you complete your studies?
   1. ( ) Brazil  
   2. ( ) US

96. While living in the US, did you take any courses?
   1. ( ) No  
   2. ( ) Yes? What Type? ________________________________________________  
      Which school/college/university? ________________________________

97. Are you currently employed?

---

123 Some of these educational categories(*) do not have an equivalent in the US educational system. I have left those categories in Portuguese.
124 Some of these educational categories (*) do not have an equivalent in the US educational system. I have left those categories in Portuguese.
1. ( ) Yes
2. ( ) No

98. What do you think of an American conducting research in GV?

99. How do you racially classify me? ________________________________

100. Using the options below, how do you racially classify me? (Brazilian Census)
1. ( ) White
2. ( ) Black
3. ( ) Brown
4. ( ) Yellow
5. ( ) Indigenous
6. ( ) Other: ______________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:
__________________________
_______________________________________________

QUESTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEWER

1. Using the options in the list, how do you (the interviewer) classify the participant? (Brazilian Census Categories)
1. ( ) White
2. ( ) Black
3. ( ) Brown
4. ( ) Yellow
5. ( ) Indigenous
6. ( ) Other: ______________

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, how do you (interviewer) classify the participant’s skin color:

1    2    3    4    5    6    7    8    9    10
Very Light                     Very Dark

3. Other observations:
Appendix 4
Interview Protocol for Non-Migrants-English Version

I. INFORMATION ABOUT IMMIGRATION

This part of the survey has questions about your experiences with immigration here in Governador Valadares.

1. Have you ever tried to immigrate to the US?
   1. (    ) Yes
   2. (    ) No

2. Do you currently have any relatives in the US?
   1. (    ) Yes, How many? __________
   2. (    ) No

3. Do you speak with telephone or communicate with your relatives there? What do you talk about in those conversations? Can you tell me about that?

4. Will you try to immigrate to the US in the future?
   1. (    ) Yes
   2. (    ) No

II. INFORMATION ABOUT RACE AND RACIAL CLASSIFICATION

This part of the survey contains questions about your experiences with race and racial and skin tone classifications.

5. Currently, with regard to race, how do you see yourself?

________________________________________________________________________________________
6. When you classified that way (your response in number 5), which of the following, in the list below, did you take into consideration in first place? In second place?
   a. In first place? __________________
   b. In second place? ______________
   c. Anything else? _________________
   1. Skin Tone
   2. Your hair
   3. Other physical features (eye color, nose, lips, etc.)
   4. Your family (parents, grandparents)
   5. The way other people classify you
   6. Nothing
   7. Other: __________________

7. Using the options in the list, how do you currently racially classify (Brazilian Census Categories)?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

8. Why do you classify this way? What factors influenced your classification?

9. Currently, how important is this classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All
10. Using the options in the list, how do you think other people racially classify you currently?
   1. ( ) White
   2. ( ) Black
   3. ( ) Mixed/Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Asian/Amarelo(a)=Yellow
   5. ( ) Indigenous
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

11. Why do you think other people classify you in this way? What factors do you think influenced their classification of you?

12. Currently, on a scale of 1 to 10, how do you classify your skin tone?
   1           2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9       10
   Lighter                                      Darker

13. Why do you classify your skin tone in this way?

14. Currently, how important is this classification for you?
   1. ( ) Very Important
   2. ( ) Somewhat Important
   3. ( ) Not Important
   4. ( ) Not Important At All

15. Currently, which classification do you consider most important?
   1. ( ) Being Brazilian
   2. ( ) Man or Woman
   3. ( ) Social Class
   4. ( ) Race/Color
   5. ( ) Nothing
   6. ( ) Other: ______________
16. Currently, which classification is the 2nd most important?

1. (  ) Being Brazilian
2. (  ) Man or Woman
3. (  ) Social Class
4. (  ) Race/Color
5. (  ) Nothing
6. (  ) Other: __________

17. Currently, which classification is least important?

1. (  ) Being Brazilian
2. (  ) Man or Woman
3. (  ) Social Class
4. (  ) Race/Color
5. (  ) Nothing
6. (  ) Other: __________

18. Do you think race and skin color are the same?

1. (  ) Yes
2. (  ) No

19. For what reasons do you think this?

20. At any time in your social relations, have you felt discriminated against in Brazil? If yes, where and how?

21. Do you believe you were discriminated against due to skin color or race? How did you feel about this?

22. Do you believe racism exists in Brazil?

1. (  ) Yes, Why? ______________________________
2. (  ) No, Why? ______________________________


24. Do you have much contact with Brazilian immigrants in the US or with immigrants who have returned to Governador Valadares? How do you communicate with them? How often?
25. In those conversations or interactions, did you discuss racial issues or skin color? How did those conversations occur?

26. Have you heard anything about race or skin color in the US? Tell me about this.

27. How would you say Brazil-US migration has affected life in Governador Valadares? Socially, economically, culturally? Race relations? The importance of race or skin color for Valadarenses?

28. Do you think these immigrants return “Americanized”? How so?

29. Has this created tension between non-migrants and return migrants?

30. Do you have other comments about your perceptions of race and skin color in GV or Brazil? Any other comments?

III. PERSONAL INFORMATION

31. What is your sex?
   1. ( ): Female
   2. ( ): Male

32. What is your date of birth (day/month/year)? ____________________________

33. What is your birthplace? _____________________________________________
34. What is your current situation in relation to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Monthly Salary (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Did you attend school in the past?

1. ( ) Yes  
2. ( ) No

36. What was the highest level you completed? 125

1. ( ) Primary or Elementary  
2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)*  
3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)*  
4. ( ) Middle School  
5. ( ) High School  
6. ( ) College  
7. ( ) Master’s or Doctorate  
8. ( ) Literacy Class for Adults  
9. ( ) Day Care  
10. ( ) Preschool

125 Some of these educational categories(*) do not have an equivalent in the US educational system. I have left those categories in Portuguese.
37. In what course are you currently enrolled?  
   1. ( ) Primary or Elementary  
   2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)*  
   3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)*  
   4. ( ) Middle School  
   5. ( ) High School  
   6. ( ) College  
   7. ( ) Master’s or Doctorate  
   8. ( ) Literacy Class for Adults  
   9. ( ) Day Care  
   10. ( ) Preschool

38. Are you currently employed?  
   1. ( ) Yes  
   2. ( ) No

39. What do you think of an American conducting research in GV?

40. How do you racially classify me? ________________________________

41. Using the options below, how do you racially classify me? (Brazilian Census)  
   1. ( ) White  
   2. ( ) Black  
   3. ( ) Brown  
   4. ( ) Yellow  
   5. ( ) Indigenous  
   6. ( ) Other: ______________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:  
_______________________________________________________________________

---

126 Some of these educational categories (*) do not have an equivalent in the US educational system. I have left those categories in Portuguese.
QUESTIONS FOR THE INTERVIEWER

1. Using the options in the list, how do you (the interviewer) classify the participant? (Brazilian Census Categories)
   1. (   ) White
   2. (   ) Black
   3. (   ) Brown
   4. (   ) Yellow
   5. (   ) Indigenous
   6. (   ) Other: ______________

2. On a scale of 1 to 10, how do you (interviewer) classify the participant’s skin color:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Very Light     Very Dark

3. Other observations:
Appendix 5
Interview Protocol for Return Migrants-Portuguese Version

ENTREVISTA PARA IMIGRANTES RETORNOS

I. DADOS SOBRE A IMIGRAÇÃO PARA OS EUA
Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre sua experiência de imigração para os EUA. Eu gostaria de saber algumas informações básicas sobre sua experiência lá.

1. Porque você resolveu imigrar? Qual foi o factor determinante na decisão de imigrar?

2. Qual foi a principal razão para imigrar?
   1. ( ) Para Trabalhar
   2. ( ) Tem ou tinha família lá
   3. ( ) Outro: _____________

3. Quantas vezes você imigrou para os EUA? Qual foi o ano de chegada nos EUA? Qual foi o ano de retorno para o Brasil? Qual tipo do trabalho você exercia nos EUA? E para qual cidade que você permanecer por mais tempo?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantas vezes emigrou?</th>
<th>Ano de chegada</th>
<th>Ano de Retorno</th>
<th>Tempo (em meses)</th>
<th>Cidade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ª vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ª vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ª vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ª vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Você tinha um parente ou amigo lá quando imigrou? Como este relacionamento ajudou você durante o processo de imigração?
5. Havia outras razões para imigrar para os EUA?

6. Se você imigrou mais de uma vez, qual foi a principal razão para imigrar de novo?
   1. (   ) Para Trabalhar
   2. (   ) Tem ou tinha família lá
   3. (   ) Outro: _____________

7. Você conseguiu um visto de turista ou de trabalho antes de imigrar?
   1. (   ) Sim
   2. (   ) Não

8. Você conseguiu um ‘green card’, cidadania americana, ou visto de trabalho durante seu tempo lá?
   1. (   ) Sim
   2. (   ) Não

9. Você pretendia voltar pro Brasil quando imigrou (da primeira vez)?
   1. (   ) Sim
   2. (   ) Não
10. Qual era seu trabalho no Brasil antes de imigrar aos EUA? Era sua renda mensal estimada antes de imigrar (Reais Brasileiros)? Qual era seu trabalho nos EUA? Sua renda mensal estimada (Doláres Americanos)? Qual é seu trabalho e sua renda mensal atualmente?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antes de Imigrar</th>
<th>Nos EUA</th>
<th>Atualmente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tipo de Trabalho</td>
<td>Renda Mensal (R)</td>
<td>Tipo de Trabalho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ª Vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ª Vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ª Vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ª Vez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Como você conseguiu o trabalho nos EUA?

12. Você enviou remessas para GV durante seu tempo nos EUA?
   1. ( ) Sim (siga para número 13)
   2. ( ) Não


15. Quantas vezes você falava por telefone com os familiares ou amigos brasileiros?
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Sobre que você falava nestas conversas? Como você sentia sobre morar e estar nos EUA? Como era sua vida lá?

16. Você fala inglês?
   1. (     ) Fala muito bem
   2. (     ) Fala bem
   3. (     ) Fala um pouquinho
   4. (     ) Não fala

VI. A RAÇA E A CLASSIFICAÇÃO RACIONAL ANTES DE IMIGRAR

Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com raça e a classificação racial e de cor da pele antes de imigrar para os EUA.


18. Antes de imigrar, como você se via em relação a raça?

____________________________________________________________

19. O que da lista abaixo você levou em consideração quando se classificou assim (a resposta em número 18)? Em primeiro lugar? E em segundo lugar?

   a. Em primeiro lugar? ______________
   b. Em segundo lugar? ______________
   c. Alguma outra? ______________

1. A cor da sua pele
2. Seu cabelo
3. Outras características físicas (cor dos olhos, nariz, boca, etc.)
4. Sua família (pais, avós)
5. A forma como as pessoas o vêem
6. Nenhuma
7. Outra: _________________________
20. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você se classificava racialmente antes de imigrar?
   1. (    ) Branco(a)
   2. (    ) Preto(a)
   3. (    ) Pardo(a)
   4. (    ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (    ) Indígena
   6. (    ) Outra: ______________

21. Antes de imigrar, esta classificação era importante para você?
   1. (    ) Muito Importante
   2. (    ) Pouco Importante
   3. (    ) Não Importante
   4. (    ) Nada Importante

22. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você acha que as outras pessoas lhe classificavam antes de imigrar?
   1. (    ) Branco(a)
   2. (    ) Preto(a)
   3. (    ) Pardo(a)
   4. (    ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (    ) Indígena
   6. (    ) Outra: ______________

23. Antes de imigrar, em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você classificava sua cor de pele:
   1            2            3            4            5            6            7            8            9            10
   Muito Clara                          Muito Escura

24. Antes de imigrar, esta classificação era importante para você?
   1. (    ) Muito Importante
   2. (    ) Pouco Importante
   3. (    ) Não Importante
   4. (    ) Nada Importante
25. Antes de imigrar, o que você considerava mais importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra

26. Antes de imigrar, qual classificação era a segunda mais importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra

27. Antes de imigrar, qual classificação era menos importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra

VII. A RAÇA E A CLASSIFICAÇÃO RACIAL NOS EUA

Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com raça e a classificação racial e de cor da pele durante seu tempo nos EUA.

28. Nos EUA, como você se via em relação a raça?  

_____________________________________________________________
29. O que da lista abaixo você levou em consideração quando se classificou assim (a resposta em número 28)? Em primeiro lugar? E em segundo lugar?
   a. Em primeiro lugar? ______________
   b. Em segundo lugar? ______________
   c. Alguma outra? ______________

   1. A cor da sua pele
   2. Seu cabelo
   3. Outras características físicas (cor dos olhos, nariz, boca, etc.)
   4. Sua família (pais avós)
   5. A forma como as pessoas o vêem
   6. Nenhuma
   7. Outra: ______________

30. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você se classificava racialmente nos EUA (na primeira vez se você imigrou mais de uma vez)?

   1. ( ) Branco(a)
   2. ( ) Preto(a)
   3. ( ) Hispanic/Latino(a)
   4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
   5. ( ) Indígena
   6. ( ) Outra: ______________

31. Nos EUA, esta classificação era importante para você?

   1. ( ) Muito Importante
   2. ( ) Pouco Importante
   3. ( ) Não Importante
   4. ( ) Nada Importante

32. Você preencheu os formulários do Censo ou outros formulários nos EUA? Estes formulários pediram a sua classificação racial? Como você se classificou racialmente? O que influenciou sua decisão para se classificar deste jeito?

33. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você acha que as outras pessoas lhe classificavam nos EUA?

   1. ( ) Branco(a)
   2. ( ) Preto(a)
   3. ( ) Hispanic/Latino(a)
   4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
   5. ( ) Indígena
6. (   ) Outra: ________________

34. No seu convívio com outros, era importante a questão da raça? Quanto importante? Como você se sentiu?

35. Outros tentaram classificar você racialmente de alguma maneira? Que terminologia eles usavam? Como você se sentiu?


37. Você se lembra da primeira experiência com raça nos EUA? Se afirmativa, você pode me contar sobre isso?

38. Nos EUA, em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você classificava sua cor de pele:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Escura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Nos EUA, esta classificação era importante para você?

1. (   ) Muito Importante
2. (   ) Pouco Importante
3. (   ) Não Importante
4. (   ) Nada Importante

40. Nos EUA, o que você considerava mais importante?

1. (   ) Ser Brasileiro
2. (   ) Homen ou Mulher
3. (   ) Classe Social
4. (   ) Raça/Cor
5. (   ) Nenhuma
6. (   ) Outra
41. Nos EUA, qual classificação era a segunda mais importante?

1. (    ) Ser Brasileiro
2. (    ) Homen ou Mulher
3. (    ) Classe Social
4. (    ) Raça/Cor
5. (    ) Nenhuma
6. (    ) Outra

42. Nos EUA, qual classificação era menos importante?

1. (    ) Ser Brasileiro
2. (    ) Homen ou Mulher
3. (    ) Classe Social
4. (    ) Raça/Cor
5. (    ) Nenhuma
6. (    ) Outra

43. Você alguma vez experimentou o que podemos considerar racismo nos EUA? Você pode descrever isto para mim? Isto seria considerado racismo no Brasil?

44. Você acha que há diferença entre a raça no Brasil e nos EUA?

45. A raça tinha mais importância para você nos EUA do que no Brasil? Se afirmativa, porque?

46. Você se considerava pertencente ou se identificava com algum grupo racial nos EUA (por exemplo: negro, branco, latino/hispanico, asiático, outro)? Por que você sentia uma conexão com esses grupos?
VIII. A RAÇA E A CLASSIFICAÇÃO RACIAL LOGO DEPOIS DE VOLTAR PARA GOVERNADOR VALADARES

Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com raça e a classificação racial e de cor de pele logo depois de voltar ao Governador Valadares.

47. Quais razões influenciaram sua decisão de voltar?

48. Logo depois de voltar, como você se via em relação a raça?

49. O que da lista abaixo você levou em consideração quando se classificou assim (a resposta em número 48)? Em primeiro lugar? E em segundo lugar?
   a. Em primeiro lugar? ______________
   b. Em segundo lugar? ______________
   c. Alguma outra? ______________

   1. A cor da sua pele
   2. Seu cabelo
   3. Outras características físicas (cor dos olhos, nariz, boca, etc.)
   4. Sua família (pais avós)
   5. A forma como as pessoas o vêem
   6. Nenhuma
   7. Outra: __________________

50. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você se classificava racialmente logo depois de voltar?

   1. ( ) Branco(a)
   2. ( ) Preto(a)
   3. ( ) Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
   5. ( ) Indígena
   6. ( ) Outra: ______________
51. Logo depois de voltar, esta classificação era importante para você?

1. ( ) Muito Importante
2. ( ) Pouco Importante
3. ( ) Não Importante
4. ( ) Nada Importante

52. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você acha que as outras pessoas lhe classificavam logo depois de voltar?

1. ( ) Branco(a)
2. ( ) Preto(a)
3. ( ) Pardo(a)
4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
5. ( ) Indígena
6. ( ) Outra: __________________

53. Logo depois de voltar, em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você classificava sua cor da pele:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Muito Clara  Muito Escura

54. Logo depois de voltar, esta classificação era importante para você?

1. ( ) Muito Importante
2. ( ) Pouco Importante
3. ( ) Não Importante
4. ( ) Nada Importante

55. Logo depois de voltar, o que você considerava mais importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra
56. Logo depois de voltar, qual classificação era segunda mais importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra

57. Logo depois de voltar, qual classificação era menos importante?

1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
3. ( ) Classe Social
4. ( ) Raça/Cor
5. ( ) Nenhuma
6. ( ) Outra

V. A RAÇA E A CLASSIFICAÇÃO RACIAL AGORA (HOJE)

Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com raça e a classificação racial e de cor da pele atualmente.

58. Atualmente, como você se vê em relação a raça?

_____________________________________________________________

59. O que da lista abaixo você levou em consideração quando se classificou assim (a resposta em número 58)? Em primeiro lugar? Em segundo lugar?

a. Em primeiro lugar? ____________

b. Em segundo lugar? ____________

c. Alguma outra? ________________

1. A cor da sua pele
2. Seu cabelo
3. Outras características físicas (cor dos olhos, nariz, boca, etc.)
4. Sua família (pais avós)
5. A forma como as pessoas o vêem
6. Nenhuma
7. Outra:_______________________
60. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você se classifica racialmente atualmente?
   1. (   ) Branco(a)
   2. (   ) Preto(a)
   3. (   ) Pardo(a)
   4. (   ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (   ) Indígena
   6. (   ) Outra: ______________

61. Porque você se classifica assim?

62. Atualmente, esta classificação é importante para você?
   1. (   ) Muito Importante
   2. (   ) Pouco Importante
   3. (   ) Não Importante
   4. (   ) Nada Importante

63. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você acha que as outras pessoas lhe classificam atualmente?
   1. (   ) Branco(a)
   2. (   ) Preto(a)
   3. (   ) Pardo(a)
   4. (   ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (   ) Indígena
   6. (   ) Outra: ______________

64. Porque você acha que outras pessoas lhe classificam assim?

65. Você acha que sua classificação racial mudou como resultado de imigrar para os EUA? Como?

66. Atualmente, em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você classifica sua cor da pele:
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Muito Clara                        Muito Escura
67. Porque você se classifica assim? Acha que esta classificação mudou como resultado de imigrar para os EUA? Como?

68. Depois de morar nos EUA, você diria que de algum modo sua opinião sobre raça ou cor mudou? Se afirmativa, como?

69. Você ainda pensa que pode se identificar com algum grupo racial americano?

70. Atualmente, esta classificação é importante para você?
   1. (   ) Muito Importante
   2. (   ) Pouco Importante
   3. (   ) Não Importante
   4. (   ) Nada Importante

71. Atualmente, o que você considera mais importante?
   1. (   ) Ser Brasileiro
   2. (   ) Homen ou Mulher
   3. (   ) Classe Social
   4. (   ) Raça/Cor
   5. (   ) Nenhuma
   6. (   ) Outra: _____________

72. Atualmente, qual classificação é a segunda mais importante?
   1. (   ) Ser Brasileiro
   2. (   ) Homen ou Mulher
   3. (   ) Classe Social
   4. (   ) Raça/Cor
   5. (   ) Nenhuma
   6. (   ) Outra: _______________

73. Atualmente, qual classificação é menos importante?
   1. (   ) Ser Brasileiro
   2. (   ) Homen ou Mulher
   3. (   ) Classe Social
   4. (   ) Raça/Cor
   5. (   ) Nenhuma
   6. (   ) Outra: _______________

74. Você acha que a raça e a cor da pele são iguais?
1. ( ) Sim
2. ( ) Não

75. Por quais razões você acha isto?

76. Alguma vez, nas suas relações sociais, você se sentiu discriminado no Brasil ou nos EUA? Se afirmativo, onde e como?

77. Você acredita que foi discriminado por causa da cor da sua pele ou raça? Como você se sentiu sobre isso?

78. Após sua estadia nos EUA sua idéia (percepção) sobre a cor das pessoas aqui no Brasil:
   1. ( ) Mudou (siga para número 79)
   2. ( ) Não mudou

79. Como mudou sua idéia?

80. Como você lida com essas diferenças?

81. Você discute suas novas percepções de raça com outros brasileiros/valadarenses? E o que eles pensam?

82. Como você diria que a imigração Brasil-EUA tem afetado a vida em Governador Valadares? Socialmente, economicamente, culturalmente? E as relações raciais? A questão ou a importância de raça ou a cor da pele dos Valadarenses?

83. Você diria que a sua idéia (percepção) sobre o racismo no Brasil mudou depois de morar nos EUA? Como? Quais atividades ou ideias você consideraria racistas?

84. Você acha que existe racismo no Brasil?
   1. ( ) Sim, Porque? ______________________________________________________
   2. ( ) Não, Porque? ______________________________________________________

86. Em que maneira você acha que o Brasil e os EUA são similares ou diferentes na questão racial?

87. Tem outros comentários sobre sua experiência com a raça e a cor da pele no Brasil, em GV, ou nos EUA?

VI. DADOS PESSOAIS

88. Qual é seu sexo?
   1. ( ): Feminino
   2. ( ): Masculino

89. Qual é sua data de Nascimento (dia/mes/ano): ______________________

90. Qual é sua naturalidade: _____________________________________________

91. Qual é sua situação antes de imigrar e atualmente em relação a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antes de imigrar para os EUA (1ª vez)</th>
<th>Atualmente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estado Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idade (quando imigrou pela primeira vez)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Bairro de Residencia na Cidade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. Você frequentou escola?
   1. ( ) Sim (siga para questão 93)
   2. ( ) Não

93. Até que série?
1. ( ) Elementar (primário)
2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)
3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)
4. ( ) Ensino fundamental ou 1º grau
5. ( ) Ensino médio ou 2º grau
6. ( ) Superior
7. ( ) Mestrado ou Doutorado
8. ( ) Alfabetização de adultos
9. ( ) Não frequentou

94. Qual curso frequenta atualmente?
   1. ( ) Elementar (primário)
   2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)
   3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)
   4. ( ) Ensino fundamental ou 1º grau
   5. ( ) Ensino médio ou 2º grau
   6. ( ) Superior
   7. ( ) Mestrado ou Doutorado
   8. ( ) Alfabetização de adultos

95. Onde você concluiu seus estudos?
   1. ( ) Brasil
   2. ( ) EUA

96. Nos EUA, você fez algum curso?
   1. ( ) Não
   2. ( ) Sim? Qual? ____________________________________________
       Em qual escola ou universidade americana? _______________

97. Você tem um emprego atualmente?
   1. ( ) Sim
   2. ( ) Não

98. O que você acha sobre uma americana fazendo estas pesquisas em GV?

99. Como você me classifica racialmente? ______________________________
100. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você me classifica?

1. ( ) Branco(a)
2. ( ) Preto(a)
3. ( ) Pardo(a)
4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
5. ( ) Indígena
6. ( ) Outra: ______________

COMENTÁRIOS ADICIONAIS:

________________________________________________________________________

PERGUNTAS PARA A ENTREVISTADORA

1. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você (ENTREVISTADORA) classifica O PARTICIPANTE?

   1. ( ) Branco(a)
   2. ( ) Preto(a)
   3. ( ) Pardo(a)
   4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
   5. ( ) Indígena
   6. ( ) Outra: ______________

2. Em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você (ENTREVISTADORA) classifica a cor de pele DO PARTICIPANTE:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Muito Clara   Muito Escura

3. Outras observações:
Appendix 6
Interview Protocol for Non-Migrants- Portuguese Version

ENTREVISTA PARA QUEM NUNCA IMIGROU

I. DADOS SOBRE A IMIGRAÇÃO

Esta parte de questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com a imigração aqui em Governador Valadares.

1. Você alguma vez tentou imigrar para os EUA?
   1. ( ) Sim
   2. ( ) Não

2. Você tem atualmente algum parente nos EUA?
   1. ( ) Sim, Quantos? ______________________
   2. ( ) Não

4. Você pretende imigrar no futuro?
   1. ( ) Sim
   2. ( ) Não
II. DADOS SOBRE A RAÇA E A CLASSIFICAÇÃO RACIAL

Esta parte do questionário tem perguntas sobre suas experiências com raça e a classificação racial de cor da pele.

5. Como você se vê em relação a raça?

_____________________________________________________________

6. O que da lista abaixo você levou em consideração quando você se classificou assim (a resposta em número 5)? Em primeiro lugar? E em segundo lugar?

a. Em primeiro lugar? ______________

b. Em segundo lugar? ______________

c. Alguma outra? __________________

1. A cor da sua pele
2. Seu cabelo
3. Outras características físicas (cor dos olhos, nariz, boca, etc.)
4. Sua família (pais avós)
5. A forma como as pessoas o vêem
6. Nenhuma
7. Outra: _________________________

7. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você se classifica racialmente?

1. ( ) Branco(a)
2. ( ) Preto(a)
3. ( ) Pardo(a)
4. ( ) Amarelo(a)
5. ( ) Indígena
6. ( ) Outra: __________________

8. Porque você se classifica assim? Quais fatores influenciaram sua classificação?

9. Esta classificação é importante para você?

1. ( ) Muito Importante
2. ( ) Pouco Importante
3. ( ) Não Importante
4. ( ) Nada Importante
10. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você acha que as outras pessoas lhe classificam?

1. (   ) Branco(a)
2. (   ) Preto(a)
3. (   ) Pardo(a)
4. (   ) Amarelo(a)
5. (   ) Indígena
6. (   ) Outra: ______________

11. Porque você acha que outras pessoas lhe classificam assim? Quais fatores influenciaram sua classificação?

12. Em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você classifica sua cor de pele:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Escura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Porque você se classifica assim?

14. Esta classificação é importante para você?

1. (   ) Muito Importante
2. (   ) Pouco Importante
3. (   ) Não Importante
4. (   ) Nada Importante

15. O que você considera mais importante?

1. (   ) Ser Brasileiro
2. (   ) Homen ou Mulher
3. (   ) Classe Social
4. (   ) Raça/Cor
5. (   ) Nenhuma
6. (   ) Outra: ______________
16. Qual classificação é a segunda mais importante?
   1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
   2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
   3. ( ) Classe Social
   4. ( ) Raça/Cor
   5. ( ) Nenhuma
   6. ( ) Outra: ___________________

17. Qual classificação é menos importante?
   1. ( ) Ser Brasileiro
   2. ( ) Homen ou Mulher
   3. ( ) Classe Social
   4. ( ) Raça/Cor
   5. ( ) Nenhuma
   6. ( ) Outra: ___________________

18. Você acha que a raça e a cor da pele são iguais?
   1. ( ) Sim
   2. ( ) Não

19. Por quais razões você acha isto?

20. Alguma vez, nas suas relações sociais, você se sentiu discriminado no Brasil? Se afirmativo, onde e como?

21. Você acredita que foi discriminado por causa da cor da sua pele ou raça? Como você se sentiu sobre isso?

22. Você acha que existe racismo no Brasil?
   1. ( ) Sim, Porque? ________________________________________________
   2. ( ) Não, Porque? ________________________________________________

24. Você tem muito contato com os imigrantes brasileiros nos EUA ou com os imigrantes que voltaram para Governador Valadares? Como você se comunica com eles? Com que frequência?

25. Nessas conversas ou interações, vocês mencionam questões raciais ou de cor de pele? Como elas acontecem?


27. Como você diria que a imigração Brasil-EUA tem afetado a vida em Governador Valadares? Socialmente, economicamente, culturalmente? E as relações raciais? A questão ou a importância de raça ou a cor da pele dos Valadarenses?

28. Você acha que esses imigrantes voltam “americanizados”? De que jeito?

29. Isto tem criado tensão entre as pessoas que não imigraram e os imigrantes que voltaram?

30. Tem outros comentários sobre sua experiência com a raça e a cor da pele aqui em GV ou Brasil?

III. DADOS PESSOAIS

31. Qual é seu sexo?
   1. ( ): Feminino
   2. ( ): Masculino

32. O que é sua data de nascimento (dia/mes/ano): ____________________________

33. Qual é sua naturalidade: ________________________________
34. Qual é sua situação atualmente em relação a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Atualmente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estado Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipo de Trabalho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renda Mensal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimada (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Bairro de Residência na Cidade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Você frequentou escola?
   1. ( ) Sim (siga para questão 36)
   2. ( ) Não

36. Até que série?
   1. ( ) Elementar (primário)
   2. ( ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)
   3. ( ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)
   4. ( ) Ensino fundamental ou 1º grau
   5. ( ) Ensino médio ou 2º grau
   6. ( ) Superior
   7. ( ) Mestrado ou Doutorado
   8. ( ) Alfabetização de adultos
   9. ( ) Não frequentou
37. Qual curso frequenta atualmente?
   1. (    ) Elementar (primário)
   2. (    ) Médio 1º ciclo (ginasial, etc.)
   3. (    ) Médio 2º ciclo (científico, clássico, etc.)
   4. (    ) Ensino fundamental ou 1º grau
   5. (    ) Ensino médio ou 2º grau
   6. (    ) Superior
   7. (    ) Mestrado ou Doutorado
   8. (    ) Alfabetização de adultos

38. Você tem um emprego atualmente?
   1. (    ) Sim
   2. (    ) Não

39. O que você acha sobre uma americana fazendo estas pesquisas em GV?

40. Como você me classifica racialmente? ________________________________

41. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você me classifica?
   1. (    ) Branco(a)
   2. (    ) Preto(a)
   3. (    ) Pardo(a)
   4. (    ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (    ) Indígena
   6. (    ) Outra: ______________

COMENTÁRIOS ADICIONAIS:

_______________________________________________________________________

PERGUNTAS PARA A ENTREVISTADORA

1. Usando as opções nesta lista, como você (ENTREVISTADORA) classifica O PARTICIPANTE?
   1. (    ) Branco(a)
   2. (    ) Preto(a)
   3. (    ) Pardo(a)
   4. (    ) Amarelo(a)
   5. (    ) Indígena
   6. (    ) Outra: ______________
2. Em uma escala de 1 a 10, como você (ENTREVISTADORA) classifica a cor de pele DO PARTICIPANTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muito Escura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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