Working Papers
www.mmg.mpg.de/workingpapers

Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity

Max-Planck-Institut zur Erforschung multireligiöser und multiethnischer Gesellschaften

MMG Working Paper 10-01 • ISSN 2192-2357

EWA MORAWSKA (*University of Essex*)

Glocalization Effects of Immigrants' Activities on the Host Society: An Exploration of a Neglected Theme

Ewa Morawska
Glocalization Effects of Immigrants' Activities on the Host Society: An Exploration of a Neglected Theme

---

MMG Working Paper 10-01

Max-Planck-Institut zur Erforschung multireligiöser und multiethnischer Gesellschaften,
Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity
Göttingen

ISSN 2192-2357 (MMG Working Papers Print)

Download: www.mmg.mpg.de/workingpapers

MPI zur Erforschung multireligiöser und multiethnischer Gesellschaften
MPI for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen
Hermann-Föge-Weg 11, 37073 Göttingen, Germany
Tel.: +49 (551) 4956 - 0
Fax: +49 (551) 4956 - 170

www.mmg.mpg.de

info@mmg.mpg.de

Abstract

International migration seems an ideal field in which to explore the workings of glocalization, understood as the process of simultaneous homogenization and heterogenization of economic, socio-cultural, and political forms (Robertson 1994; Robertson and White 2005), yet curiously, this connection has attracted minimal attention from scholars and exclusively from those not directly affiliated with (im) migration studies (Giulianotti and Robertson 2007, 2004). In this essay, I elaborate the glocalization-(im)migration link, the conceptualization of which by Giulianotti and Robertson (2007) I do not find entirely satisfactory, in order to bring the over-specialized study of (im)migration closer to the ongoing debate in the mainstream social sciences about the global, the glocal, and the local developments in the contemporary world.

The essay consists of three sections. In the first part, I propose a way to position the notions of glocalization and multiscalar spaces of globalization vis-à-vis each other, and I suggest some modifications of the conceptualization of glocalization in relation to (im)migration as formulated by Giulianotti and Robertson. In the remaining two sections, I illustrate my propositions with empirical cases. Although studies of international migration have, by the definition of their subject matter, transgressed national boundaries, these cosmopolitan foundations have not saved the practitioners of this field from a narrow, one-sided perspective in their concerns. The almost exclusive focus of theory and research regarding the effects of the encounters between immigrants and the receiver countries they settle in has been on the modes of adaptation of those newcomers into the host societies and the patterns of accompanying transformation of their home-country identifications, cultural practices, and social and civic commitments. I focus here on a thus far neglected reverse outcome of these encounters, namely, the glocalizing impact of immigrants' activities on the host society.

The empirical part of the essay includes two sets of analyses: I first comparatively consider the effects on the receiver, American society of turn-of-the-last-century vs. contemporary immigrants, and, next, I examine this impact of differently positioned groups among the latter. The information about these groups and their influence on the receiver-country people and institutions comes from my longitudinal historical-sociological study of past and present immigration and ethnicity in the United States.

Author

EWA MORAWSKA is Professor for Sociology and Director of Sociology and European Studies at the University of Essex.

emorawsk@essex.ac.uk

Contents

International migration seems an ideal field in which to explore the workings of glocalization, understood as the process of simultaneous homogenization and heterogenization of economic, socio-cultural, and political forms (Robertson 1994; Robertson and White 2005), yet curiously, this connection has attracted minimal attention of scholars and exclusively those not directly affiliated with (im)migration studies (Giulianotti and Robertson 2007, 2004). In considerable part, this neglect reflects, I believe, a "nichification" of (im)migration studies within its own field-specific agendas, meetings, journals, and research networks— evidence of the very success of this specialization but at a cost of a parochialism of interests and pursuits.[1] If at all echoed in these studies, the concerns of mainstream disciplines represented by (im) migration specialists are those of anthropology as a new and vocal presence in the field since the 1990s. Probably most commonly invoked has been Arjun Appadurai's (1996) concept of "multiscalar scapes", used to denote the simultaneity of the multilevel, here, global and local dimensions of human actors' experience in the contemporary world. Although the premise of the simultaneity of the global and the local is shared by the notion of multiscalar scapes and that of glocalization, no effort has yet been made to try to clarify theoretically or illustrate empirically the relationship of these two ideas.[2]

The purpose of this discussion is threefold: to elucidate the relation between the notions of glocalization and globalization's multiscalar scapes; to elaborate the glocalization-(im)migration link, the conceptualization of which by Giulianotti and Robertson (2007) I do not find entirely satisfactory; and to bring the overspecialized study of (im)migration closer to the ongoing debate in the mainstream social sciences about the global, the glocal, and the local developments in the contemporary world.

The essay consists of three sections. In the first part, I propose a way to position vis-à-vis each other the notions of glocalization and multiscalar spaces of globalization, and I suggest some modifications of the conceptualization of glocalization in

---

1 In the meantime, mainstream social scientists have taken up the issues central to (im)migration research and, based on skewed and truncated readings of the literature in this field, have constructed theories of immigrants' assimilation, transnationalism, and generally, multicultural society. A good example of this development is a recent book by Jeffrey Alexander, *The Civil Sphere* (2006; for a critical review pointing to the author's lack of familiarity with (im)migration/ethnic studies, see Kivisto 2007).

2 A recent interdisciplinary volume, *Deciphering the Global: Its Scales, Spaces, and Subjects* [2007], edited by the sociologist Saskia Sassen, includes several essays by anthropologists who frame their discussions in terms of multiscalar scapes, but does not contain a single mention of glocalization.

relation to (im)migration as formulated by Giulianotti and Robertson. In the remaining two sections, I illustrate my propositions with empirical cases. Although studies of international migration have, by the definition of their subject matter, transgressed national boundaries, these cosmopolitan foundations have not saved the practitioners of this field from a narrow, one-sided perspective in their concerns. The almost exclusive focus of theory and research regarding the effects of the encounters between immigrants and the receiver countries they settle in has been on the modes of adaptation of those newcomers into the host societies and the patterns of accompanying transformation of their home-country identifications, cultural practices, and social and civic commitments. I focus here on a thus far neglected reverse outcome of these encounters, namely, the glocalizing impact of immigrants' activities on the host society.

The empirical part of the essay includes two sets of analyses: I first comparatively consider the effects on the receiver, American society of turn-of-the-last-century vs. contemporary immigrants, and, next, I examine this impact of differently positioned groups among the latter. The information about these groups and their influence on the receiver-country people and institutions comes from my longitudinal historical-sociological study of past and present immigration and ethnicity in the United States.[3]

Exploring Glocalization

The basic affinity between the concepts of globalization's multiscalar scapes and glocalization is the earlier-noted recognition by scholars who use these ideas of the simultaneity of the global and the local dimensions of socio-cultural developments in the contemporary world. It is implied in the very term "glocalization" coined by the sociologists, whereas the anthropologists, whose professional concerns traditionally focus on ground-level socio-cultural phenomena, define globalization as naturally multiscalar in character, so that its processes evolve instantaneously at "subnational" (local in sociologese), national, regional, and global levels. By recognition of the engagement of the local component in societal processes, also those of the global scope, the proponents of both concepts considered here also acknowledge the role of individual and collective social actors in re-constituting the world they live in.

---

3 See Morawska 2009, 2003 on contemporary immigrants; idem 1996, 1993 on turn-of-the-last century arrivals; and idem 2005, 2001 on a comparison of these two waves.

Although obviously related, the notions of globalization's multiscalar scapes and glocalization have, however, different "interpretative capacities." The former, focused on the multi-level nature of globalization processes, offers a welcome antidote to the fixed (as in enduring) macrostructural emphasis of the classical globalization models by providing a heuristic guidepost for a more complex and flexible conceptualization of the *how* of these developments. In comparison, the notion of glocalization is, I believe, more capacious theoretically, in that it offers both insight into how globalization processes evolve and the proposition of *what*—new forms emerging from the mixing-and-blending of the global and local influences—is the outcome of multiscalarity of these phenomena. In addition, whereas the "object matter" of the notion of globalization's multiscalar scapes are (different-level) localized global phenomena, the concept of glocalization encompasses and, thus, invites empirical examination of, both that and the globalized local.

Having recognized globalization's multiscalar scapes, but finding the notion of glocalization more challenging overall for the study of the effects of international migration, here, on the host society, I would now like to propose three modifications to Giulianotti and Robertson's (2007) conceptualization of this process in relation to (im)migrants' activities in the receiver country. The first one concerns the authors' typology of this phenomenon. Giulianotti and Robertson distinguish four kinds of glocalization projects: *relativization* or the preservation by social actors of their pre-existing ideas and practices, thus contributing to differentiation of the host culture; *accommodation* or the absorption by social actors of the meanings and practices associated with other societies; *hybridization* or the mixing-and-blending by social actors of their own and other socio-cultural representations and habits to produce distinctive new forms; and *transformation* or the abandonment by social actors of their own traditions on behalf of those associated with other socio-cultural systems.

Assuming we agree that theoretical models produced by the sociologists should be anchored in the social reality they aim to account for, here, (im)migrants' experience in the host society, and that the matter of concern is the relation of this experience to glocalization, I would suggest, first, to fuse the first two of Giulianotti and Robertson's types into one—*accommodation*. Whereas the retention by social actors of their group traditions in an ethnically plural society indeed contributes to its differentiation, it does not necessarily imply relativization if—as was the case in turn-of-the-twentieth-century America vis-à-vis new immigrants, to be examined in the next section—such plural cultural patterns exist separately side by side rather than being "open" to reciprocal influences. I propose, therefore, to use the term accommodation

in two meanings corresponding to different situations. One mode of accommodation involves the coexistence of different socio-cultural patterns side by side with each other, which implies hetereogenization, but no homogenization, and, therefore, cannot be treated as glocalization. This type of accommodation well illustrates the multiscalarity of globalization processes in that, by settling in the host society and establishing foreign communities bustling with 'foreign' socio-cultural life and ideas, immigrants globalize the receiver country from below, but they do it on their own, as it were, without the active collaboration of native residents. The other situation and the precondition of interpenetration of coexistent modes of operation of groups or societies resulting in their simultaneous homogenization-and-diversification is the accommodation, likewise involving multiscalar processes, which, however, engages a reciprocal or at least one-directional readiness for such mutual engagement.

Second, I suggest that hybridization *is* transformation, involving the emergence of new forms as the result of mixing-and-blending by immigrants of their home-country traditions and elements of host-country culture—the most common type both of immigrants' accommodation to the host society (for a review of existing studies, see Morawska 2009) and of the receiver-country culture under the impact of immigrants' activities (see the next section). As defined by Giulianotti and Robertson, transformation resembles the classical model of assimilation of Milton Gordon (1964), which posited the linear progressive disappearance of immigrants' cultural traits and social bonds replaced by host-society orientations and practices. It has since been effectively refuted by immigration scholars theoretically and, of concern here, empirically (see, e.g., Foner 2001; Portes and DeWind 2008; Waters and Ueda 2007), although it can be defended as possible under a specific constellation of circumstances (Morawska 1994). But what does this homogenization of socio-cultural patterns through immigrants shedding their differences and assuming the mainstream outlooks have to do with glocalization, defined by Giulianotti and Robertson as simultaneous differentiation and uniformization? The authors' reference to "location in global ecumene," and "critical reflexivity on new mediation" as definitional features of the transformation-as-glocalization-project reflects the agenda of the recent vogue studies of "global cosmopolitanism" (see, e.g., Archibugi 2008; Breckenridge 2002; Fine 2007) rather than the experience of the bulk of transnational travellers examined by students of immigration.[4] As for the reverse effect or trans-

4 Magdalena Nowicka and Maria Rovisco's recently published volume of collected essays, *Cosmopolitanism in Practice* (2009), where "deanchored" identities and commitments of

formation-as-disappearance-of-native-features of the host society under the impact of immigrant activities, such alteration seems inconceivable at present (although one could imagine some such effect in the future in the American Southwest, for example, overcome by the Mexicans and their offspring).

With the focus on the glocalization-(im)migration link, then, the second modification of Giulianotti and Robertson's conceptualization I would like to suggest is that we treat accommodation and transformation not as fixed types but as *phases* of glocalization or the processes of becoming. While recognizing varying durations of the accommodation and transformation processes, in the empirical analyses presented here, I examine glocalization effects within the span of a generation.

The last adjustment of the concept of glocalization necessary, I believe, for it to serve as an effective interpretative tool for the examination of the interaction between (im)migrants and the receiver society, is to make it sensitive to societal contingencies embedded in this relationship. As is, the concept of glocalization is devoid of any notion of potential differences in the operation of the processes of transformation-as-hybridization depending on its structural environment and the characteristics of the participant actors. Sociology offers different ways of accounting for such contingencies. I propose to do it in the mode of a historical-sociological analysis (see Abrams 1982; Hall 1999) whereby, in order to explain *why* things happen, an investigator demonstrates *how* they happen by identifying a constellation of relevant circumstances that have contributed to the specific outcome. In the case of (im)migrants' impact on the host society, this approach calls for incorporating the potentially relevant societal dividers, such as socio-economic position, racial membership, and gender of social actors; their group institutional completeness; and receiver-country legal-institutional system, orientations, and practices regarding (im)migrants, into the cluster of "variables", the effects of which are to be checked on the examined empirical material. This mode of accounting "from below" for the multiple context-dependency of societal processes requires the sustained alertness of a researcher to the potential influence of these circumstances, and yet allows for their absence in concrete situations.

---

different groups of highly skilled globe-trotting migrants are empirically demonstrated, is a welcome exception.

The Accommodation Phase of the Glocalization Process: A Comparison of the Situations of Turn-of-the-Twentieth-Century and Contemporary Immigrants in America

As proposed, accommodation may involve a coexistence of different socio-cultural patterns side by side with each other or—the precondition of interpenetration of coexistent modes of operation of groups or societies resulting in their simultaneous homogenization-and-diversification—a reciprocal readiness for such mutual engagement. Available studies of past and present immigrants' experience in the United States suggest three conditions are necessary (although not always sufficient) for the latter situation to emerge: (i) the host-society's civic culture and practice of openness/inclusion vis-à-vis "others," and, in particular, acceptance of immigrants by the host-society's native residents and institutions or, at a minimum, their pragmatically motivated interest in immigrant cultures; (ii) the existence of social spaces of contact between host-society native residents and institutions; and (iii) a relatively low level of normatively (religiously, ideologically) prescribed socio-cultural enclosure of the immigrant groups themselves. The temporal dimension of these circumstances creates further contingencies in the adaptation phase in the glocalization process: receiver-society's and immigrants' openness vis-à-vis each other in attitudes and everyday practices must constitute the enduring (rather than situational—now present, now gone, depending on current domestic or world developments) conditions; and contacts between native residents and institutions and immigrants must be regular (rather than sporadic).

I argue that the accommodation by the host, American society of turn-of-the-last-century immigrants, most of them peasants from South and East Europe, represented a side-by-side-coexistence type of adjustment, and even that problematic for native residents, rather than a preparatory stage for the absorption of the newcomers' "profiles of cultural orientation" (Kluckhohn 1950).[5] During the early decades of the twentieth century, public opinion of native-born Americans saw new immigrants as culturally inferior, uninteresting, and potentially dangerous, and there were neither

5 Although it lies beyond the scope of this paper, it is interesting to note that while their transformative impact on the receiver, American society, was non-existent or minimal, turn-of-the-last century South and East European immigrants exerted a considerable influence, noted by historians, on their home-country local cultures and, especially, on the rise of a modern national consciousness, which began to replace local, village-scope identities, and on the formation of labour unions and agricultural cooperatives (see Greene 1975; Nelli 1979; Morawska 2001).

laws nor civil organizations to protect immigrants' rights as foreign-born residents. Widely recognized "scholarly" racist theories represented South and East European groups, today defined as white, as racially differentiated by physical features, skin "hues", and genetically determined mental capacities. The "Nordic race" was considered superior to all others. In this scheme, South and East Europeans—immigrants and their American-born children—were perceived as racially (and not just nationally or ethnically) distinct and inferior to the dominant Anglo-Saxon and other Northwestern European groups. They are made of "germ plasm," "the Slavs are immune to certain kinds of dirt. They can stand what would kill a white man," Italians' "dark complexion... resembles African more than Caucasian hues," "Jews or furtive Yacoobs...snarl in weird Yiddish"—examples of such racist pronouncements about those "suspicious aliens of inferior species" by respectable public personae in respectable American institutions, such as Congress, Harvard University, the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the American Federation of Labor (AFL), and the like, were common.[6]

The exclusion of South and East Europeans from closer social relations with the natives, open discrimination against them at work, and their prolonged non-admission to the labour unions resulted in part from these accepted perceptions and in part from the hierarchical and ethnic-divisive operation of industrial capitalism and, specifically, the employment of large numbers of foreign-origin workers assembled in nationality gangs in the mills and factories, whose contacts with native superiors were mediated through "gang leaders" or their fellow nationals with a longer duration of stay in the country. Immigrants' half-imposed/half-voluntary concentration in so-called "foreign colonies", isolated from native neighbourhoods, their unfamiliarity with English; and the sojourner, home-country-focused mentality of the majority, which endured for several decades after their arrival in America, further diminished their opportunities to influence the receiver society.

As a result, "old" immigrants were closet ethnics who had lived their differences within their own communities. Turn-of-the-last-century American neighbourhoods, churches, schools, and workplaces were definitely multicultural—multiscalar globalization as diversification from below of the American society was certainly taking place as immigrants established their communities and celebrated their traditions in

6 On the American public opinion's and institutions' perceptions of South and East European immigrants and their offspring in racial terms, see Higham 1972; Roediger 1991; Kraut 1994; Jacobson 1998; Gutterl 2000; Foner and Fredrickson 2004; Gugliemo and Salerno 2003.

the localities they settled in, but it was segmented multiculturalism composed of ethnic niches. Hybridization processes did evolve at a slow pace as within those niches immigrants gradually incorporated the American ways into their everyday lives, but it was a one-way glocalization, not accompanied by a parallel transformation of the receiver society.

The situation today is different on several accounts. Prejudice and discrimination against newcomers by mainstream American society and its institutions have undoubtedly been enduring features of immigrants' experience then and now. But publicly sanctioned and openly proclaimed racist perceptions directed at the turn of the twentieth century against basically defenceless South and East Europeans were an effective factor responsible for their exclusion from closer social relations with the natives and for manifest discrimination against them at work and in public places. In comparison, the contemporary racism of Americans has been significantly tempered or potentially tempered by the shift in the American civic-political ideology accompanied by the institutionalization of practical measures to achieve it, including weapons to fight racial discrimination. The official recognition of pluralism as the principle of American society and its trickle-down effect on its residents through the system of laws, education at schools and in the workplaces, and the media, have created a protective shield against discrimination for its potential victims and have given the immigrants a sense of civic entitlement, including the encouragement to pursue their ethnic activities and make claims in the public sphere of mainstream society. In addition, and important for the here examined matter, these developments have opened the mindset of a large segment of the native-born American population by making them view multiculturalism as a natural and welcome feature of society.

The restructuring of the American economy since the 1970s has produced a bifurcated labour market with a hardened barrier between the highly-skilled, well-paid workforce very much in demand and the underclass composed of low-educated, low-skilled residents, often of foreign birth, who, like their predecessors a century ago, live isolated from mainstream society. At the same time, however, the small-scale, informal and decentralized mode of operation of post-industrial capitalism allows for much more contact among employees, especially higher-skilled ones in primary and secondary sectors of the labour market.

Next and related has been the diversification of contemporary immigrants' human capital and their increased occupational and residential dispersion throughout the dominant society. Whereas the overwhelming majority of turn-of-the-century immigrants were unskilled manual labourers, today's arrivals match the native-born Ameri-

can population in the overall proportion of college and higher educated persons (24%), while the share of persons employed in professional and managerial positions (25%) is only slightly lower than that among native-born employed residents (30%).[7] More than two-thirds of better educated immigrants employed in highly-skilled occupations live in residential dispersion among native-born Americans (see Massey 2008; Myles and Hou 2004; Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2002).[8]

In the above context, inter-ethnic friendships and intermarriage as an important pre-condition for multicultural exchange from below have also significantly increased (although by no means became predominant, especially across racial lines). At the closing of the twentieth century, the rate of the latter was between 20-40%, depending on particular groups, as compared with 2-3% for South and East Europeans combined in 1920.[9]

Last and important, the "spirit" of contemporary consumer capitalism relies on the constant updating and diversification of the supply of merchandise and services and, on the receiver side of the game, customers' needs and lifestyles. Interest in "other" people and their cultures by increasing numbers of native residents, especially in younger and better-educated groups, represents a form of this consumer culture. As we shall see in the next section, this attraction to the "other" in contemporary mainstream American culture is capable of transgressing structural barriers of socio-economic divisions.

The Transformation Phase of the Glocalization Process: Contemporary Immigrants' Impact on the Host Society

The features of the contemporary immigrants and the receiver society identified in the previous section jointly contribute to the emergence of multiculturalism as mixing-

7 Information about educational achievement and occupational position of the foreign-born population comes from the 2000 U.S. Population Census; these proportions differ significantly, however, among particular immigrant groups, ranging from 70% of college educated and 66% in professional and managerial occupations for Asian Indians to 5 and 8%, respectively, for Mexicans.

8 As in the case of immigrants' socio-economic positions, group differences in rates of residential concentration are considerable, depending on the size and levels of institutional completeness of particular ethnic populations.

9 Information about intermarriage between foreign- and native-born Americans then and now has been compiled from Perlmann and Waters 2004, 2007.

and-borrowing rather than simply existing next to each other at a considerably quicker pace: within the newcomers' lifetime rather than over several generational cohorts, as was the case with the impact of "old" immigrants.[10] We examine here the glocalization—transformation-as-hybridization—effects of present-day immigrants' presence in the United States in two areas: their impact on civic-political and social-cultural life of the host society. It is, of course, impossible to account for this influence by all immigrant groups numbering, with documented and undocumented residents combined, 30-odd million people settled in different locations across the country. The few cases reported here demonstrating the transformative impact of immigrants on host-society civic-political affairs and cultural orientations and practices have been selected not to make my account representative of this multiplicity, but to illustrate the diversity of glocalization effects contingent on the class, race/ethnicity, and gender position of those newcomers and the features of the locations where they settle.

Host-Society's Civic-Political Affairs

We begin with the mainstream civic-political arena where two transformative developments can be noted. One of them has been the increase of anti-immigrant sentiments among native-born residents in response to the quickly growing numbers of (im)migrants. Interestingly, the mechanisms and transformative effects of the impact of this resentment on the lives of the native-born population have been different for middle-class white and lower-class black Americans. Los Angeles, which has attracted the largest numbers of immigrants during recent decades, well illustrates these processes.

"Unlike New York, Los Angeles is new to its present role as an immigrant mecca"—with this statement Roger Waldinger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr (1996: 9) open their reconstruction of the uneasy transformation of the city into a multicultural metropolis. Mostly still native-born (Anglo) white and parochial ("Iowa-on the Pacific") in the early 1960s, within a few decades Los Angeles had surpassed New York in its number of foreign-born residents. From a mere 10-odd % in 1960, the share of the foreign-born among Los Angelenos had quadrupled by 2000 and members

10 It was only in the third+ generation of the descendants of turn-of-the-twentieth-century immigrants that the absorption of their ethnic cultures into mainstream society became visible, such as, for example, the incorporation of Yiddish words into the New York English, or of Italian food into mainstream American supermarkets in the form of all-American pizzas and Italian-American tortellini.

of non-white ethnic minority groups (primarily Hispanics, and also Asians) have become, numerically, the majority population. The sudden change of the makeup of city neighbourhoods and workplaces caused by the rapidly growing numbers of foreigners, including an army of undocumented migrants from across the Mexican border, has generated increasing resentment among native-born residents, both white and black.[11]

The impact of the rapidly expanding presence of immigrants in the city, and in California in general, and of the shared sense of threat it poses to native-born middle-class white Americans has been threefold. First, the increase of anti-immigrant sentiments in this population does not appear to have eradicated their general acceptance of multiculturalism, but has "hybridized" this attitude by introducing an element of ambivalence: immigrants are basically good for America and it is nice to have a multi-ethnic society, but there are too many of them right where we live. The primary reaction of native-born white residents to this cognitive dissonance has been the flight further and further away from areas where Hispanic residents concentrate. It has been accompanied by political mobilization of generally laid-back middle-class Californians, with white Los Angelenos at the helm of the lobbying, directed mainly at the local (state) authorities, for more restrictive action regarding social services to immigrants, especially undocumented ones.[12]

The main transformative effect of Hispanic and Asian immigrants' expanding presence in Los Angeles on the lives of its lower-class (the majority) African-American residents has been different. Directly confronted with these newcomers in the neighbourhoods and at work, lower-class African Americans have lacked the resources available to middle-class whites to escape their situation in the form of either financial means to change their residence, sufficient training to obtain better employment, or the political know-how and influence to try to curtail the "foreign surge." Instead,

---

11 Information about the numerical growth of immigrants in Los Angeles and the resentful reaction of native-born residents from Chang and Leong 1994; Bozorgmehr, Sabagh and Light 1996; Waldinger and Bozorgmehr 1996; Mollenkopf 1999; Mollenkopf, Olson, and Ross 2002; Johnson, Farrell, and Guinn 2001; U.S. Census Bureau *Current Population Survey* 2006.

12 A successful state-wide action in 1994 for the passage of Proposition 187 to add a constitutional amendment denying all but emergency aid to illegal immigrants and placing an obligation on public employers to report the suspects has been the most prominent instance of these activities, but more numerous have been local (state)-level initiatives aimed at curbing immigration. Information compiled from Gutierrez and Zavella 2009; Hanson 2003; Zuniga and Hernandez-Leon 2005; Reitz 2003.

they have experienced a sense of collective disenfranchisement and grievance regarding their group position vis-à-vis those immigrants and aversive attitudes toward them, perceiving them as competitors for and/or encroachers upon the claimed resources. The shared feeling among Los Angeles blacks that, just when the Civil Rights movement removed the formal institutions of racial segregation in the 1960s and opportunities appeared for the black minority, the massive arrival of immigrants set city development on a different track, stalling African-American progress, has made the sense of anger and disempowerment even more acute. This group aggravation has repeatedly led to open confrontations with immigrants since the 1990s. The most notorious among them have been black-Korean and black-Mexican conflicts — each of them, for that matter, generated by (inter)group-specific mechanisms.[13]

An unusually large proportion, about 40%, among the employed Korean immigrants in Los Angeles, most of whom arrived in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s, are self-employed in small businesses. The owners of these small establishments have their homes either in Koreatown west of downtown Los Angeles or in neighbourhoods outside of the city centre. But Korean businesses are disproportionately located in poor minority neighbourhoods: 60% of the total, almost equally distributed between African-American and Latino sections of South Central Los Angeles. Their residents—here, African-Americans—dissatisfied with what they perceived as discourteous service, non-employment of blacks in Korean businesses, and the lack of capital and social investment by Koreans in the African-American community, the exploitation of which "they get rich on," have frequently verbally abused and occasionally looted Korean stores. Koreans responded with racial slurs calling blacks "lazy," drug addicts, and no-goods in general. Originally instigated by the anger of African-Americans against a five-year probation (much too lenient in their view) given in the fall of 1991 to a Korean grocery owner who shot to death an African-American girl while struggling with her over an unpaid bottle of orange juice, in the spring of 1992 anti-Korean hostility erupted into mass violence after a jury pronounced white police officers innocent of beating black motorist Rodney King. During the burning and looting, one Korean was killed and 46 were injured, and more than 2,000 Korean stores, altogether worth more than $350 million, were destroyed,

13 This and the following information about African Americans' competition with immigrants in Los Angeles and its effect on the former has been compiled from Bozorgmehr, Sabath, and Light 1996; Min 2008; Logan and Alba 1999; Sonenshein 1996; Chang and Leong 1994; Waldinger and Bozorgmehr 1996; Mollenkopf, Olson, and Ross 2002; Morawska 2001.

primarily in black neighbourhoods in the South Central section of the city but also in Koreatown four miles away. Although the conflict was eventually extinguished, "eruptive tension" between Korean shopkeepers and their black customers has persisted into the twenty-first century, making this discomfort—one extra unpleasantness that was not there in the hopeful decades of the 1960s and 1970s—the enduring element of African-Americans' everyday lives.

The local context of native-born black/Latino tensions in Los Angeles has been different from that fuelling African-American/Korean hostilities. The massive entry of cheap Latino, mainly Mexican, labour into the Los Angeles economy between the 1970s and the 1990s has largely displaced black workers from several job concentrations, for example, certain manufacturing sectors, construction, services to dwellings, low-skill restaurant and hotel jobs (men), and textile production and domestic household service (women). In other fields, such as metal industries, furniture and fixtures, transportation, and higher-level manual jobs in hotel and restaurant services, the growing presence of immigrants and, in particular, the expansion of immigrant occupational niches based on in-group network recruitment, has made it increasingly difficult for African-Americans to compete successfully for jobs. In addition to the sheer mass of cheap and willing immigrants and a high-level ethnic nichefication of the economy that has effectively excluded outsiders, the savage-capitalist open-shop labour market combined with native white and immigrant (Asian) employers' preference for Mexican (docile) over African-American (finicky and too ambitious) workers, even for jobs outside of ethnic occupational niches, makes job competition particularly tough for blacks.

African-Americans' only occupational niche in the city has been in public-sector employment. As in the private sector, the competition between them and Hispanics/Mexicans, whose "fair share" demands for public jobs and political influence have intensified since the 1990s, has continued to generate mutual resentment and negative stereotyping. Mexicans see blacks as having been in power too long and not wanting to recognize the fact that they are no longer the majority. African-Americans respond to these charges by pointing out that blacks struggled for years to win power in the civil service, while immigrants just arrived and expect to have everything. The Mexicans' upper hand in this conflict concerns the future. "Tom Bradley was not only L.A.'s first black mayor," as an observer of the Los Angeles political scene said half in jest, he was also probably its last [African-American mayor]. "Power has shifted for good here, even though most people don't realize it yet" (after Rieff 2002: 149). Among African Americans, who feel they are still a long way from equity

in mainstream American society, toward which they began a difficult march in the 1960s, the disappointing realization that this may indeed be so cannot but add an angry blemish to their everyday lives.

The second transformative effect on the receiver society's civic-political affairs of immigrants' presence and, in this case, their engagement in public matters, has been the multiculturalization of concerns and issues informing civic-political processes in the cities/regions where immigrants live or their multiscalar transformation through the incorporation of the global into the local. This is illustrated by the impact of Cubans on Miami's politics. I have selected this case to demonstrate the important role in facilitating glocalization of two circumstances: a high degree of institutional completeness of the immigrant/ethnic community including, in particular, the presence of the economically powerful elite, active in the local public forum and supported by group members; and the receiver society's political interests in the country/region of origin of the immigrants, which coincide with the latter's orientations.

The glocalizing influence of Cuban refugees on Miami's civic-political life represents an unusual—unique, really—case of "hybridization" of local public affairs, whereby the ethnic component prevails over the mainstream or native-born American one. Since the 1970s, the intense "Cubanization" of Miami's politics has transformed the composition of political offices, imbued the local establishment with a staunchly conservative political orientation, and sustained its active preoccupation with the Cold War and Soviet influence in South America and, especially, efforts to undermine the Castro regime in Cuba.

A constellation of several conducive circumstances has made possible Miami Cuban immigrants' rise to such unprecedented prominence. Most of the 135,000-member first wave of Cuban refugees were well-established businessmen and managers and their families who came to Miami between January 1959 and mid-1961. Most of them either already had invested in the United States or had managed to transplant their financial resources to the United States as they fled the communist revolution which, combined with their entrepreneurial acumen, made it possible for this group to quickly re-establish their businesses in Miami and to gain positions of leadership in the growing Cuban community. Subsequent waves of lower-class Cuban immigrants into the Miami area—about 100,000 refugees followed first-wave families between 1962 and 1964 and another 250,000 had come by 1974—supplied the same-language, same-culture work force with the diverse skills needed for the formation of an extensive, residentially concentrated, thriving ethnic enclave as the mode of incorporation into the local economy. The generous support for Cuban refugees by

the United States government dictated by the priorities and preferences of its foreign policy in the Cold War era, in the form of the Cuban Refugee Program and other federal initiatives, including direct loans, housing subsidies and guaranteed health care, significantly helped the immigrants adapt to the new environment.[14]

The solid presence of the powerful first-wave Cuban refugee businessmen and managers at the helm of the large Cuban economic enclave gave this group power to be reckoned with. In the secondary and informal sectors of the city's economy, in particular apparel manufacturing, construction, and hotel and restaurant services, Cuban immigrant businessmen have held the uncontested dominant position since the 1980s. The large size and good organization of the Cuban population and its elite's economic influence in Miami enabled its leaders to also gain central power in city politics. The appropriation by Cubans of the city political establishment was a prolonged process, as it met with strong resistance—eventually ending in a concession—from the native white establishment, which saw itself increasingly set aside by the Cubans, who relied on their own ethnic organizations rather than, as native-born American leaders expected, integrating into the existing political system.

By the late 1980s, the city of Miami and the surrounding townships all had Cuban-born mayors and foreign-born Cubans controlled the City Commission and made up a majority of the county delegation to the state legislature. "Nowhere else in America, not even in American history"—Guillermo Grenier and Lisandro Perez comment on the long list of Cuban city and state officials in Miami—"have first-generation immigrants so quickly and so thoroughly appropriated political power" (Grenier and Perez 2003: 368).[15] Characteristically, the agents of the Cubanization of Miami's political life have exclusively been men. Although more than one-third of the adult women refugees in the first-wave group of immigrants came to Miami with professional or managerial skills, and an equal proportion had training in sales and

---

14 This and the following information about Cuban refugees' position in Miami has been compiled from Mohl 1989; Smith and Feagin 1995; Grenier and Castro 1998; Portes and Stepick 1993; Grenier and Perez 2003; DeSipio 1998; Bowie and Stepick 1998; Becker and Dluhy 1998.

15 It has been, we should add, political power of a distinctly exclusionary bent, reluctant to accommodate other resident groups' aspirations for a share in it, which, combined with the Cuban establishment's conservative persuasion, have understandably aggravated the city's ethnic minorities, primarily African-Americans. The enduring discontent among Miami's blacks caused by the pervasive barriers to competition and advancement opportunities for racial/ethnic outsiders posed by Cuban dominance is yet another instance of a transformative impact of immigrants on the quality of native-born, here, minority, Americans' everyday lives.

administrative jobs, after a brief period of outside employment when their families were putting down roots in the new environment, they withdrew into the homes as middle-class wives and mothers.

Host-Society's Cultural Orientations and Practices

Another area of the operation of the receiver, American society, upon which immigrants coming from other parts of the world exert a notable transformative impact is that of cultural orientations and practices. Two examples, one from the top and another from the bottom of the receiver country's socio-economic structure, illustrate context-, here, class-specific nature of the glocalization effects: the impact of Hong Kong global businessmen in the Los Angeles area on the local mainstream managerial culture, and that of undocumented Polish (im)migrants in Philadelphia on the practices of native-born Americans who employ them.

About 7% of the 80,000 Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong who reside in Los Angeles, most of whom arrived in America starting in the 1980s, are high-level employees of transnational companies and in global, mainly Asia-oriented businesses. They reside—when they are in the country, that is—in the suburban areas west of Los Angeles County called "Asian Beverly Hills", created by a Chinese real estate developer who launched the development of this residential area far away from the centres of Hispanic and African-American concentration. Although as a (small) group they live there in residential dispersion among affluent native-born white Los Angelenos, individual families frequently buy homes in relative proximity to each other. [16]

It has been primarily as powerful global traders and financiers with connections to Asia, sought after by American business and political leaders, that Hong Kong businessmen have integrated into Los Angeles society. Their entry into the United States has been facilitated from the start by a new "investor category" created in the receiver-country immigration system that guarantees permanent residence to 10,000 immigrants annually in exchange for a US $1 million investment by these newcomers that results in the creation of at least 10 jobs in the United States. Native-born American leaders of the area's capitalism, American politicians, and the media all see this group as "bridge-builders" between the United States and South Asia,

16 This and the following information about Hong Kong global businessmen in Los Angeles has been compiled from Skeldon 1994; Dirlik 1996; Waldinger and Bozorghmer 1996; Wong 1998; Hamilton 1999; Koehn and Yin 2002; Ma and Cartier 2003; Saxenian 2006; Saxenian and Li 2003; Holdaway 2007; Yin 2007.

instrumental in the creation of the Pacific century in the global economy. As studies indicate, Hong Kong immigrants' self-perceptions contain this image as well. Their sustained contributions to the internationalization of the Los Angeles economy integrate them into the very core of mainstream American capitalism in the global era.

Hong Kong transnational businessmen's powerful economic position and their importance in expanding financial and trade connections between the United States and Southeast Asia—nearly half of American joint ventures and investments in that region in 2000 were sponsored either by Chinese immigrants alone or in partnership with all-American companies—also makes them important agents in the glocalization-as-hybridization of cultural habits among native-born (white) American leaders of transnational trade and finance in the Los Angeles area. The latter have been reported to learn and put into practice Chinese ways of conducting transnational business, such as an emphasis on a collective style of management and the protocol for interpersonal relations. As they do so, these modes of behaviour from a faraway part of the world are integrated into an important segment of the American mainstream economic cultural system.

Like male Cuban refugees in the transformation of Miami, the agents of glocalization of the managerial culture in Los Angeles have been Hong Kong transnational business*men.* A small number of women – known in the Chinese community as "strong women" – has independently engaged in transnational entrepreneurship as managers of global hotel chains, high-tech investment companies, and export/import firms and, like their husbands or fathers, have travelled back and forth between the United States and Hong Kong. But these women have been an exception. The vast majority of the wives of the wealthy global businessmen and financiers have been housewives, taking care of the homes and children. As we shall see in the next case, however, such strictly gendered hybridization of host-country practices through the involvement of immigrants has by no means been the rule.

This illustration comes from the opposite end of the receiver society's socio-economic spectrum and concerns the incorporation of what I call beat-the-system/bend-the law coping strategies used by low-skilled, especially undocumented immigrants, men and women alike, in locating and changing work into the practices of native-born American operators of the mainstream small-scale production and service sectors which employ such people. To the extent that such transformation of the pursuits of native-born Americans involves evading/corrupting the law, this particular instance of glocalization can be classified not only as cultural but also as a civic-political transformative effect of the engagement by immigrants of host-country residents.

Empirical evidence for this case is provided by my ethnographic study of Polish *Arbeitstouristen* or (im)migrants on tourist visas who extend their stay in the host country and undertake undocumented employment in Philadelphia (Morawska 2004; also in Berlin—idem 2003) and by recurrent media reports about native-born Americans seeking—and finding—labourers for home construction and repairs, house cleaning and baby-sitting through informal connections in immigrant colonies.

Breaking the law as "an American way of life" (Bell 1953) has been an enduring tradition in the United States. The novelty here is the way it happens. Rather than by individual or organized transgressions as described by Daniel Bell more than a half century ago, the opportunistic-*debrouillard* strategies of evading the existing laws and regulations employed by contemporary immigrants who come from un(der) developed countries with ineffective and often corrupt civic-legal systems and who find themselves in economically or politically disadvantaged situations in the host country imperceptibly penetrate its structures through informal everyday interactions with the natives. A bottle of Polish vodka offered by émigré men or an amber brooch produced by tourist-worker women in exchange for a "connection" to the employer—"as a token of my appreciation for your kindness, it is customarily done in my culture"—is accepted without the recipient's awareness of being subtly drawn into a nepotistic *potlatch* chain of exchanges of services. In a few instances when I asked native-born Philadelphians whether they were aware of what was happening when they were offered and accepted such "small gifts" (a bottle of home-made schnapps and an amber brooch) by Polish tourist workers in exchange for assistance with finding better-paying employment, the replies were puzzled looks. A similar implantation of beat-the-system/bend-the-law coping strategies used by immigrants into the practices of their native-born American employers has also been reported on the West Coast, where Mexicans in situations similar to those of Philadelphia Poles look for and find jobs outside of their ethnic niche (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1997; Hanson 2003; Gutierrez and Zavella 2009).

In this case, two major circumstances have created the space for this effect to emerge. Post-industrial restructuring of the host-country economy has created a large informal sector specializing in small-scale manufacturing, construction, and service industries, offering low-paid and expendable jobs detached from the "official" legal-institutional infrastructure. And the receiver-country restrictive immigration policies, including, especially, regulations of the duration of sojourn and permission to work, have created an army of undocumented (im)migrants whose structural—here, civic-political—position channels them into the informal sectors of the receiver-country

labour market, where they are eagerly awaited by native employers seeking to lower the cost of their operations.

While polymorphization of the host-society's economic culture, as in the case of the impact of Hong Kong global businessmen or Polish tourist-workers, requires a considerable accommodation period—the involved actors must collaborate with each other for a certain amount of time in order for the glocalization to occur—the permutation of present-day mainstream consumer culture occurs at a much quicker pace. In addition to a greater openness of the contemporary receiver society, guaranteed by the system of laws and sustained by the public discourse, another important circumstance responsible for this acceleration has been the cultural logic of consumer capitalism (Jameson 1991) and, especially, its high-speed principle. The same principle may well contribute—the matter awaits empirical investigation—to a shallow reach and the short-span endurance of the incorporated fragments of outside consumer cultures, which come and go with the whims of fashion.

The last illustration of the glocalization of receiver-country cultural preferences and practices is the incorporation into mainstream American consumer culture—or cultures, more accurately, as these effects vary from city/region to city/region—of ethnic elements: Mexican, Jamaican, Korean, Chinese, and Indian food, music, dress, articles of clothing and jewellery, and different forms of entertainment such as films and street festivals. Some of these implantations into the host-society's consumer culture have been the outcome of the activities of immigrant men and women alike, while the agents of others are gender-specific. For example, maid services commonly performed by documented and undocumented lower-class (im)migrant women in middle-class native-American homes have been reported to involve the transfer of the maids' home-country dishes into these habitats, which the employers, usually women, learn to prepare and their family members begin to enjoy as part of their regular diet. Available studies on the contributions of immigrants' presence in the receiver society to new developments therein also report the increase of interest in, often followed up by intensified international tourism to, faraway regions of the world—most commonly noted among middle-class native-born Americans have been South and East Asian destinations. [17]

One more interesting phenomenon should be noted in this context. Paradoxically, the implantation of elements of Mexican traditions such as food, music, and public

17 Information about glocalization of American consumer culture under the impact of immigrants has been compiled from Hondagneu-Sotelo 2003; Hu-DeHart 1999; Peterson 2007; Parrenas 2008; see also Reitz 2003; Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003.

festivals into mainstream American culture in the Southwest seems to have occurred more quickly and to a considerably greater extent than the incorporation of Mexican immigrants themselves into the local American society. It is apparently easier, especially in the era of global consumer capitalism, to accommodate another culture and thus transform one's own than to accept and integrate its human carriers, especially when they are perceived as racially other and positioned at the bottom of the host society's socio-economic structure.

Conclusion

I hope my elaboration of Giulianotti and Robertson's (2007) conceptualization of the link between glocalization and (im)migration has been convincing and the empirical illustrations thereof persuasive, and, if the readers did not find it satisfactory, that the discussion would at least invite further rethinking of this relationship. The parallel purpose of this essay has been to use the notion of glocalization for the examination of immigrants' activities as a way of remedying what I perceive as an unfortunate parochialization of international migration studies or their growing enclosure within a narrow field-specific conceptual apparatus and research agendas. I do not believe one article can accomplish this task, but perhaps it can serve as a reminder that the explicit linking of these sub-disciplinary concerns with those currently debated in the mainstream social sciences is not only possible but also intellectually stimulating.

I have focused here on a dimension thus far neglected in (im)migration studies of the encounters between the newcomers and the country they settle in, namely, the glocalizing impact of (im)migrants on the host society. The traditional foci of research in this field, the modes of adaptation of immigrants into the receiver societies, and the patterns of the accompanying transformation of their home-country identifications, cultural practices, and social and civic commitments, can also, should anybody be interested, be conceptualized in terms of glocalization-as-hybridization (or polymorphization) processes.

My underlying hope, again, is that this brief analysis could serve as an invitation to launch a new direction of research in the field of (im)migration studies. It could, of course, move in different empirical directions conceptualized in different theoretical frameworks. Conceptualized within the fashion proposed here, the most immediate task for empirical research should be, as I see it, to identify the patterns in the

contexts—or the constellations of macro-, mezzo, and local-level circumstances—that contribute to the specific outcomes (composition, endurance) of the transformation. Particularly promising for probing different mechanisms and forms of the relationship between glocalization and (im)migrants' activities are comparative studies across time and/or space of the same groups in different locations or different groups residing in the same city or country.

References Cited

Abrams, Philip (1982). *Historical Sociology.* Near Shepton Mallet: Open Books.

Alexander, Jeffrey (2006). *The Civil Sphere*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Archibugi, Daniele (2008). *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Becker, Fred and Milan Dluhy (1998). "Fragmentation and the Erosion of Municipal Planning in Miami", *Research in Urban Policy*, 7: 101-20.

Bell, Daniel (1953). "Crime as an American Way of Life", *The Antioch Review*, Vol. 12, Summer, 131-54.

Bowie, Stan and Alex Stepick (1998). "Diversity and Division: Ethnicity and the History of Miami", *Research in Urban Policy*, 7: 19-32.

Bozorgmehr, Mehdi, George Sabagh, and Ivan Light (1996). "Los Angeles: Explosive Diversity" in Silvia Pedraza and Ruben Rumbaut (eds.) *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America*. Elmont, CA: Wadsworth, 346-59.

Breckenridge, Carol, ed. (2002). *Cosmopolitanism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Chang, Edward and Russell Leong, eds. (1994). *Los Angeles: Struggles Toward Multiethnic Community*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

DeSipio, Louis (1998). "Building a New Foreign Policy among Friends: National Efforts to Construct Long-term Relationships with Latin American Émigrés in the United States." Unpublished paper.

Dirlik, Arif (1996). "Asians on the Rim: Transnational Capital and Local Community in the Making of Contemporary Asian America", *Amerasia Journal* 22: 1-24.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild (2003). *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.

Fine, Robert (2007). *Cosmopolitanism.* London: Routledge.

Foner, Nancy, ed. (2001). *Islands in the City. West Indian Migration to New York*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Foner, Nancy and George Fredrickson, eds. (2004). *Not Just Black and White. Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Giulianotti, Richard and Roland Robertson (2007). "Forms of Glocalization: Globalization and the Migration Strategies of Scottish Football Fans in North America", *Sociology* 41(1): 133-52.

—— (2004). "The Globalization of Football: A Study in the Glocalization of the 'Serious Life'", *British Journal of Sociology* 55(4): 545-68.

Gordon, Milton (1964). *Assimilation in American Life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Greene, Victor (1975). *For God and Country: The Rise of Polish and Lithuanian Ethnic Consciousness in America, 1860-1910.* Madison, WI: State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

Grenier, Guillermo and Lisandro Perez (2003). *The Legacy of Exile: Cubans in the United States.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Grenier, Guillermo and Max Castro (1998). "The Emergence of an Adversarial Relation: Black-Cuban Relations in Miami, 1959-1998", *Research in Urban Policy*, 7: 33-56.

Guglielmo, Jennifer and Salvatore Salerono, eds. (2003). *Are Italians White? How Race is Made in America*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gutierrez, Ramon and Patricia Zevella, eds. (2009). *Mexicans in California: Transformations and Challenges.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gutterl, Matthew Pratt (2000). *The Color of Race in America, 1900-1940*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hall, John R. (1999). *Cultures of Inquiry. From Epistemology to Discourse in Sociohistorical Research*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, Gary, ed. (1999). *Cosmopolitan Capitalists: Hong Kong and the Chinese Diaspora at the End of the Twentieth Century*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Hanson, Victor Davis (2003). *Mexifornia: A State of Becoming.* San Francisco, CA: Encounter Books.

Higham, John (1972). *Strangers in the Land. Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925.* New York, NY: Atheneum.

Holdaway, Jennifer (2007). "China: Outside the People's Republic of China" in Mary Waters and Reed Ueda (eds.) *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration since 1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 355-70.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierette, ed. (2003). *Gender and U.S. Immigration: Contemporary Trends.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

—— (1997). *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hu-Dehart, Evelyn, ed. (1999). *Across the Pacific. Asian Americans and Globalization*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Iceland, John, Daniel Weinberg, and Erika Steinmetz (2002). "Racial and Ethnic Segregation in The United States: 1980-2000." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Atlanta, Georgia, May 9-11.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye (1998). *Whiteness of a Different Color. European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jameson, Fredric (1991). *Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Johnson, James, Walter Farrell, and Chandra Guinn (2001). "Immigration Reform and the Browning of America: Tensions, Conflicts, and Community Instability in Metropolitan Los Angeles", *International Migration Review,* 31(4): 1055-95.

Kluckhohn, Florence (1950). "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientations: Their Significance for the Analysis of Social Stratification", *Social Forces* 28(2): 376-93.

Kivisto, Peter (2007). "Comment on Jeffrey C.Alexander, *The Civil Sphere*", *Perspectives. Newsletter of the ASA Theory Section* 30 (1): 5-7.

Koehn, Peter and Xiao-huang Yin, eds. (2002). *The Expanding Roles of Chinese Americans in U.S.-China Relations: Transnational Networks and Trans-Pacific Interactions.* New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Kraut, Alan (1994). *Silent Travellers: Germs, Genes, and the "Immigrant Menace"*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Logan, John and Richard Alba (1999). "Minority Niches and Immigrant Enclaves in New York and Los Angeles: Trends and Impacts" in Frank Bean and Stephanie Bell-Rose (eds.) *Immigration and Opportunity. Race, Ethnicity, and Employment in the United States.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 172-93.

Ma, Lawrence and Carolyn Cartier, eds. (2003). *The Chinese Diaspora: Space, Place, Mobility, and Identity.* New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield.

Massey, Douglas, ed. (2008). *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Min, Pyong Gap (2008). *Ethnic Solidarity for Economic Survival.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mohl, Raymond (1989). "On the Edge: Blacks and Hispanics in Metropolitan Miami since 1959", *Florida Historical Quarterly*, July: 37-56.

Mollenkopf, John (1999). "Urban Political Conflicts and Alliances: New York and Los Angeles Compared" in Charles Hirschman, Philip Kasinitz, and Josh De Wind (eds.) *The Handbook of International Migration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 412-22.

Mollenkopf, John, David Olson, and Timothy Ross (2002). "Immigrant Political Participation in New York and Los Angeles" in Michael Jones-Correa (ed.) *Governing American Cities: Interethnic Coalitions, Competitions, and Conflict.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 17-70.

Morawska, Ewa (2009). *A Sociology of Immigration. (Re)Making Multifaceted America.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

—— (2005). "Sociology and History of (Im)Migration: Reflections of a

Practitioner" in Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska (eds.) *International Migration Research: Constructions, Omissions, and Promises of Interdisciplinarity.* Aldershot: Ashgate Press, 203-42.

—— (2004). "Exploring Diversity in Immigrant Assimilation and Transnationalism: The Case of Poles and Russian Jews in Philadelphia", *International Migration Review* 38(4): 232-64.

—— (2003a). "National Identities of Polish (Im)Migrants in Berlin, Germany: Four Varieties, Their Correlates, and Implications" in Willfried Spohn and Anna Triandafyllidou (eds.) *Europeanisation, National Identities and Migration: Changes in Boundary Constructions Between Western and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge, 173-92.

—— (2003b). "Immigrant Transnationalism and Assimilation: A Variety of Combinations and a Theoretical Model They Suggest" in Christian Joppke and Ewa Morawska (eds.) *Integrating Immigrants in Liberal States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 133-77.

—— (2001). "Immigrants, Transnationalism, and Ethnicization: A Comparison of this Great Wave and the Last" in Gary Gerstle and John Mollenkopf (eds.) *E Pluribus Unum? Contemporary and Historical Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 175-212.

—— (1996). "The Immigrants Pictured and Unpictured in the Pittsburgh Survey", chapter in Maureen Greenwald (ed.) *The Pittsburgh Survey Revisited.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 221-41.

—— (1994). "In Defense of the Assimilation Model", *Journal of American Ethnic History*, Winter 1994, 76-87.

—— (1993). "From Myth To Reality: America in the Eyes of East European Peasant Migrant Laborers", in Dirk Hoerder and Horst Rossler (eds.) *Distant Magnets: Expectations and Realities in the Immigrant Experience, 1840-1930.* New York, NY: Holmes & Meier, 241-63.

Myles, John and Feng Hou (2004). "Changing Colours: Spatial Assimilation and New Racial Minority Immigrants", *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 29(1): 29-50.

Nelli, Humbert (1979). *Italians in Chicago.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar (2008). *The Force of Domesticity. Filipina Migrants and Globalization*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Perlmann, Joel and Mary Waters (2007). "Intermarriage and Multiple Identities" in Mary Waters and Reed Ueda (eds.) *The New Americans. A Guide to Immigration Since 1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 110-23.

—— (2004). "Intermarriage Then and Now: Race, Generation, and the Changing Meaning of Marriage" in Nancy Foner and George Fredrickson (eds.) *Not Just Black and White: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Immigration*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 262-77.

Peterson, Marina (2007). "Chinese Modern Dance at Downtown Los Angeles Public Concerts" in Saskia Sassen (ed.) *Deciphering the Global. Its Scales, Spaces, and Subjects*. New York, NY: Routledge, 41-58.

Portes, Alejandro and John DeWind, eds. (2008). *Rethinking Migration. New Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*. New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Portes, Alejandro and Alex Stepick (1993). *City on the Edge. The Transformation of Miami*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Reitz, Jeffrey, ed. (2003). *Host Societies and the Reception of Immigrants.* La Jolla, CA: Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California-San Diego.

Rieff, David (2002). *Los Angeles Capital of the Third World*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Robertson, Roland (1994). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Robertson, Roland and K.E. White (2005). "Globalization: Sociology and Cross-Disciplinarity", in Craig Calhoun and Brian Turner (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Sociology*. London: Sage, 345-66.

Roediger, David (1991). *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of American Working Class*. London: Verso.

Sassen, Saskia, ed. (2007). *Deciphering the Global. Its Scales, Spaces, and Subjects.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Saxenian, AnnaLee (2006). *The New Argonauts. Regional Advantage in a Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Saxenian, AnnaLee and Chuen-Yueh Li (2003). "Bay-to-Bay Strategic Alliances: Network Linkages between Taiwan and U.S. Venture Capital Industries", *International Journal of Technology Management* 25 (91 and 2), entire issues.

Skeldon, Ronald, ed. (1994). *Reluctant Exiles? Migration from Hong Kong and the New Overseas Chinese*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Smith, Michael and Joe Feagin, eds. (1995). *The Bubbling Cauldron: Race, Ethnicity, and the Urban Crisis.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sonenshein, Raphael (1996). *Politics in Black and White. Race and Power in Los Angeles*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

U.S. Census Bureau (2006). *Current Population Survey*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Waldinger, Roger and Mehdi Bozorgmehr, eds. (1996). *Ethnic Los Angeles*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Waters, Mary and Reed Ueda, eds. (2007). *The New Americans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wong, Bernard (1998). *Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship. The New Chinese Immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Yin, Xiao-huang (2007). "Outside the People's Republic of China" in Mary Waters and Reed Ueda (eds.) *The New Americans. A Guide to Immigration Since 1965*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 340-54.

Zúñiga, Victor and Ruben Hernández-Leon, eds. (2005). *New Destinations. Mexican Immigration in the United States.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.