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A recent online advertisement for Skype read “Miles don’t matter. Friends do.” It is a statement which is both ordinary and extraordinary. It is ordinary because we now take it for granted that we can carry on relationships without being in the presence of each other. But it is also extraordinary because we are living in a time when our most basic concepts of distance and space are being transformed through these new technologies.

From cell phones to emails, Facebook to Skype, these new communication technologies have transformed some of our most basic experiences. For example, just a decade ago, when students moved away to college it meant “cutting the cord, but today, between texting and Skype, the cord has gone cordless, and there's no reason to be out of touch” (Gonzalez 2010). In Japan, anthropologists conducted research on teenagers’ use of cell phones. What they found was that within the “context of such a spatially distributed social reality, there is a need to find new modalities of presence. And this is what cell phone technology, in the hands of the teenagers, is able to do. It makes what is far, near, not by changing physical distances, but by, so to speak, demoting the importance of physical relationships in place of a whole new set of relationships. The children remain far from each other in the physical space in which the commute takes place; but they achieve a closeness, even an intimacy, in a different, virtual space” (Noë 2010).

However, while cell phones and Skype have changed basic experiences among people who are relatively close in space, the revolutionary aspect to these new forms of technology is their global capabilities. They can easily cross international borders and
time zones. For Americans in the Peace Corps, these technologies have changed their experiences. Baddorf (2010) tells of one former Peace Corp volunteer who mentioned that “when he served as a volunteer in the '80s, he lost track of friends and relationships back home. He had no choice but to integrate into the community.” He goes on to say that:

These days, with the advent of the Internet and cell phone service and so forth, I still see volunteers having some of that experience. But again, when they go back to their homes, instead of turning out the kerosene light and going to bed, they can get on Skype and they give a quick call to Mom and Dad back at home. And that part of the experience has changed (Baddorf 2010).

For those Americans in the Peace Corp, technology is allowing them to stay connected to home. However, not everyone in the world is on an equal level when it comes to access to advancements facilitated through increasing globalization, such as transnational communication. In the “space war” of globalization (Ritzer 2008:578), there are winners and losers. According to Zygmunt Bauman, as cited in Ritzer (2008):

[T]he winners of the space war are those who are mobile, able to move freely throughout the globe and in the process to create meaning for themselves. . . . The losers not only lack mobility but are relegated and confined to territories denuded of meaning and even of the ability to offer meaning. . . . The winners can be said to live in time rather than space; they are able to virtually span every space quickly, if not instantaneously. In contrast, the losers can be seen as living in space. That space is beyond their control, heavy, resilient, resistant, untouchable, able to tie time down (P. 578).
In terms of technological inequality, known as the digital divide, there is a “gap between those who do and those who do not have access to computers and the Internet” (van Dijk 2005:1). Those who have access to this technology are usually “the most educated and affluent segment of the population of the most educated and affluent countries, and more often than not in the largest and most sophisticated metropolitan areas” (Castells 1996:360). This inequality manifests itself along racial and class lines, but also, on an international level, between countries. While some people are included in the new global culture, others are excluded. According to Morley (2000), “[f]or Castells, one key dimension is that of access to the information networks which are, as he puts it, the prerequisite of effective participation in the affluent societies of the West” (p. 202). Furthermore, Morley (2000) cites Bauman’s work, further explaining those who are excluded on the global stage; “From Bauman’s perspective, time-space compression emancipates some people from territorial constraints. . . . For others, there is little choice of ever escaping from the locality in which they live” (p. 202). These new communication tools have fundamentally changed the nature of studies on international migration. The introduction of these technologies has meant a huge shift in the way that space and time are perceived and practiced. Furthermore, this has meant a shift in how the identities of strangers and outsiders are constructed, maintained or changed.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND MODEL

What impact does this digital disparity have on individuals outside of their country of birth? If the digital divide scores a line between the digital “haves” and “have-nots,” then what does that mean on an individual level? Does this have an impact on how immigrants function as “strangers?” I will be examining the extent to which globalized
communication technologies have impacted the assimilation process of “strangers” in alien environments. Specifically, I will seek to establish a critique of the concept of the stranger for a globalized world by assessing the accuracy of an assimilation model developed by Alfred Schutz\(^1\) in the 1940s. While globalization is not a new phenomenon and Schutz would have lived in a world which was more globalized than the world in which Georg Simmel originally conceived the stranger, what is unique about this age is the speed and scope of communication facilitated by advances in technology such as the Internet. In order to understand how the specific development and spread of globalized communication impacts the everyday experiences of “strangers,” I conducted a comparative case study of 21 immigrants from South Korea and Nepal. Case studies by their nature are not generalizable outside of the specific research context which they were conducted in. However, they do provide rich, detailed examples for a specific group’s unique experiences.

I define “stranger” as an ethnically and culturally based individual travelling between nation-states – coming from a nation-state, or country of origin, and journeying in another nation-state, or country of reception. I will use a three-part model inspired by Alfred Schutz’s article “The Stranger: An Essay in Social Psychology” (1944). My assumption is that the 1940s world in which Schutz lived and wrote differed greatly from the 2011 world we live in now. Schutz’s world was a less-globalized world. In contrast to our rapidly globalizing world, a less-globalized world was marked by a strong “commitment” and “fixation” to place, in that, one’s identity was strongly based on a physical place which was given an emotional appeal. This is in contrast to a globalized

\(^1\) The original 1944 article spells Shutz’s surname as “Schuetz.” I have chosen to use the more contemporary spelling for this thesis.
world where identity is freed from time and space and is based on ephemeral concepts of the self. My thesis will test Schutz’s model in a globalized world and will examine if it is still valid or if the model should be adapted or completely discarded.

Schutz’s work, like most work related to the stranger, is a dialogue with Georg Simmel, who first articulated the sociological category of the stranger (Wolff 1950). Schutz himself was in a particularly suitable situation to write and reflect on “strangerness” because he was an exile from Nazi Germany (Ålund 1995). As Harman (1987) writes, “Unlike the early American theorists, Schutz took the perspective of the stranger rather than the host. Whereas the Americans viewed newcomers with an attitude which took for granted their desire to assimilate, and consequently viewed marginality as a condition of choice vis-à-vis the ideal of assimilation, Schutz recognized, albeit at a preliminary level, the built-in resistance which any system of membership has to fully accepting ‘outsiders’ and ‘insiders’” (p. 39). This experience allowed Schutz a unique insight into the psychology of the stranger that both complemented and somewhat differed from Simmel’s original article (Ålund 1995).

The stranger, Simmel wrote, is “fixed within a particular spatial group, or with a group whose boundaries are similar to spatial boundaries. But his position in this group is determined, essentially, by the fact that he has not belonged to it from the beginning, that he imports qualities into it, which do not and cannot stem from the group itself” (Wolff 1950:402). Some of these qualities, Schutz would argue, are a differing set of cultural patterns and assumptions. However, as the stranger’s presence imports qualities into the group, so, too, does the group impress new modes of thinking on the stranger. The changes which take place in the psyche of the stranger, and the process which brings
about these changes, is where Schutz’s contribution to the field is most evident. Simmel’s stranger represented the links between “the inner and the outer. . . [p]roximity and distance, connection and separation” whereas Schutz’s stranger “develops a self-effacement in exercising the skills of adjustment towards a total assimilation as the only possible way of saving himself. But between the ‘stranger’ and the ‘group’ he meets, there yawns an insurmountable gulf” (Ålund 1995). Thus, Schutz identifies three stages that the stranger might go through to reach assimilation.

Schutz’s three part model is built on the assumption that each group has a different set of cultural patterns governing “societal life.” The cultural patterns constitute a lived (in contrast to conscious) social realm that is only fully available to members of that group, in that outsiders are not supposed to have the capability to easily penetrate the group’s world and understand it. The conceptions of the world indicative of a certain group represent what Schutz calls a group’s “thinking as usual.” “Thinking as usual,” Schutz (1944) defines as the “of-course assumptions relevant to a particular social group” (p. 502). Put otherwise, “thinking as usual” represents the commonsense knowledge of a group. It is the “unquestioned and unquestionable” knowledge of the group. As the stranger engages the group s/he passes through three stages. First is the stage of a “disinterested observer.” During this stage the stranger is still very much reliant on their home culture’s worldview with no interest in engaging the group. Here, the stranger is satisfied to look upon the group from afar. Furthermore, the stranger’s view of the group of reception is very much influenced by the view s/he had of the group before arrival.

Second, the stranger moves towards the stage of a “would-be member.” This shift is a result of the insufficiencies the stranger experiences in their “thinking as usual.”
Schutz (1944) writes, “The cultural pattern of the approached group, then, is no longer a subject matter of his [the stranger’s] thought but a segment of the world which has to be dominated by actions” (p. 503). In other words, the group of reception existed only theoretically in the stranger’s mind. Now, however, the stranger is experiencing the group as an everyday lived phenomenon. Gradually the stranger comes to discover the inadequacy of the knowledge s/he had about the group from their group’s thinking.

Finally, the stranger moves into the final stage of the transition, what Schutz terms as “a member of the cast.” In this stage the stranger becomes a full member of the group of reception and enters into social relations with other social actors. This psychological transition is, furthermore, marked by a transition in physical space from remoteness to proximity with the group. During this stage the stranger experiences a crisis of sorts. What the stranger is witnessing is, perhaps, at odds with their previous knowledge. Therefore, doubt begins to creep into the mind about all knowledge s/he was confident about in the past. This caution persists and stops the stranger from adopting fully the knowledge of the adopted group. It is in this space that the stranger’s objectivity is formed. The model was formed out of an auto-biographical context in a 1940’s pre-Internet world. I will assess the extent to which advances in technology have affected Schutz’s model, or, indeed, made it irrelevant.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

My research serves two significant purposes. First, it will advance the research on the sociology of the stranger for the globalized world. Historically, “in sociology, society. . . tended to be theorized out of historical time” (Friedland and Boden 1994:5). That is, social theories were often conceptualized without acknowledging how the time
(and place) they were writing in informed their theories. My research, thus, is an attempt to situate the stranger in modern time. Second, my research will bring this discussion down to the level of the everyday and focus on how ordinary people navigate and experience immigration in a globalized context. Much of the research related to the change which these new forms of technology and globalization have brought is done so on a macro-level. The research speaks to these phenomena from a largely structural point of view. My approach is to present the social-psychological situation of the stranger from the stranger’s point of view; a micro-level approach and view how these large structural changes have impacted the biography of individuals.

There are several questions which arise when one attempts to superimpose the “stranger” of the past to the reality of today. Does the easy flow of information across all borders mean that people can no longer be “disinterested observers” of a group? Do strangers come to a group carrying a broader knowledge base of the group of reception than they would have been in the 1940s? Does the psycho-social category of the stranger exist anymore? Is assimilation still expected of strangers or even desired by natives? Or, thanks to new communication technology and pluralism, is there less pressure to adopt a new group’s “thinking as usual?” Have new forms of global information technology allowed strangers to remain disinterested observers for longer periods of time by maintaining long-distance relationships with friends and family in their societies of origin? This research is an attempt to combine the literature of the stranger and apply it to a globalized world marked by great ease scope of communication. This research seeks to advance the literature on the stranger and make it more adequate for a more globalized world.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This research is organized in the following way. Chapter 1 outlines the research question being addressed and presents the model which will serve as the frame for this study. Chapter 2 presents a brief history and review of the literature related to the sociology of the stranger and builds a conceptual frame for analysis through presenting literature on the changing dynamics of space and identity. Chapter 3 discusses the study’s methodology. Chapter 4 discusses the themes which emerged through the interviews with my participants. Chapter 5 puts forth an alternative model and provides a conclusion which summarizes the themes and suggests areas for future research.
CHAPTER 2
THE STRANGER AND GLOBALIZATION

Within sociology, perhaps no other concept evokes as many colorful, exotic mental images as does “the stranger.” This concept, originally articulated by Georg Simmel, “was the foundation stone of what became the sociology of the stranger” (Murphy-Lejeune 2002:11). Like sociology as a discipline, a sociology of the stranger “is a very broad rubric which encompasses phenomena ranging from the initiation of new social relationships to the assimilation of newcomers and from the effects of the stranger on the social structure and culture of the receiving group to the social-psychological processes which characterize the stranger’s role within the group” (McLemore 1970:87). This research continues in this tradition and, indeed, attempts to advance it. Much of the literature associated with the sociological form of the stranger is somewhat dated, specifically the social-psychological position of strangerhood has not been updated for a postmodern (or late modern), globalized condition. This is despite the observation that “the stranger has become the paradigmatic figure for contemporary society, a society that, depending on one’s theoretical and conceptual framework, has increasingly become categories as ‘high modern’, second modernity’ or post-modern’” (Marotta 2010:106). While the works of scholars such as Bauman (1997), Harvey (1989) and Giddens (1990, 1991) have been concerned with the changes and impacts of globalization and postmodernity on society, there has been a lack of research devoted to understanding how globalization has impacted the social-psychology of strangers. There has been little work to assess the extent to which phenomena facilitated by globalization and the postmodern condition, such as global communication technologies, cultural pluralism, cosmopolitanism, and changes in the way distance is felt has changed the position of the
stranger within the society of reception. This research is an attempt to update the
discussion of strangerhood in a globalized world.

Because of its broadness, there has hardly been a consistent definition for the
stranger, which necessitates, then, a clear definition here. The definition used for the
purpose of this study is in keeping with Schutz’s (1944) usage of the stranger which
states, “[T]he term ‘stranger’ shall mean an adult individual of our times and civilization
who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he
approaches. The outstanding example for the social situation under scrutiny is that of the
immigrant, and the following analyses are, as a matter of convenience, worked out with
this instance in view” (p. 499). While he admits that “the applicant for membership in a
closed club, the prospective bridegroom who wants to be admitted to the girl’s family, the
farmer’s son who enters college. . . all are strangers according to the definition just given”
(1944:499), for his purposes, and mine, the stranger will be defined through an ethnic and
cultural lens as a person (migrant) travelling between nation-states; coming from one
nation-state, or country of origin, and is journeying in another nation-state, the country of
reception, for a greater period of time than a visitor or tourist would.

SCHUTZ’S STRANGER

Within the canon of sociological literature concerning the stranger, Alfred Schutz
“has written one of the outstanding essays on the stranger” (McLemore 1970:90). It is
outstanding, particularly for my purposes, because of its focus on the “stranger” as a
newcomer, specifically as an immigrant, and the social psychology associated with
“strangerhood.” It is also outstanding because, according to Bauman, the
conceptualization of Schutz’s stranger as a social position “characterizes the global situation” (Ossewaarde 2007:370).

Schutz’s stranger is a newcomer who is attempting to integrate into a new group. This is in contrast to Simmel’s stranger who has no desire to become a group member. As the stranger attempts to integrate, he/she struggles with not possessing the cultural knowledge, or “cultural patterns of group life,” needed to adapt or be accepted. Yet, as the “stranger” moves closer to the group, he/she begins to know about the new cultural pattern, yet in a hybrid and cosmopolitan manner. There is an attempt at reconciling the two patterns within the stranger, yet the stranger always remains cautious of the new patterns. The cautious attitude comes from how inadequate he/she found their own cultural pattern for their new way of life. Thus, the new pattern not only clashes with what he/she has always known, there is suspicion that this new pattern will offer anything which is also not easily shed in another environment. Schutz’s stranger carries their cultural knowledge with them as they interact with the new group. This “clash” of cultures leads to the stranger being estranged from the group and also becoming “a stranger to the self” (Ossewaarde 2007:370).

Schutz’s “stranger” as a social-psychological concept for understanding the newcomer or the outsider is an important tool because it deals with issues of knowledge and how we come to know about our world, culture and about ourselves. However, this tool is no longer able to adequately perform in the (post)modern social world. What we need is a new model of how the “stranger” as a newcomer knows cultural patterns and how those patterns are navigated. Though this research is an advancement of Schutz’s article, Schutz’s work on the stranger is an advancement of the stranger which was
grounded in the work of Simmel as well as that of other scholars engaged in the sociology of the stranger.

SIMMEL AND A TRADITION OF THE STRANGER

Since its intellectual inception in the exceptional mind of Georg Simmel, *der fremde* ("the stranger") has weaved its way through modern sociological discourse. Within one short essay, Simmel managed to delineate a concept of more intellectual merit than many other works of much greater length. Indeed, few can speak of the stranger without speaking of Simmel, just like one can hardly speak of anomie without mentioning Durkheim (Levine 1979). Since Simmel’s original essay, there have been several definitions and typologies developed which are associated with “strangerness,” including the marginal man (Park 1928; Stonequist 1935), the sojourner (Siu 1952), middleman minorities (Bonacich 1973), the newcomer (Greifer 1945) and the homecomer (Schutz 1945). Furthermore, the social position of the “stranger” has been stretched to include social positions from members of out-groups (Schutz 1944) to students on the first day of sociology class (Dorn 1987). While it could be argued that many “have strayed far from Simmel’s original ideas” (Driedger and Peters 1977:168), all of these articles engage in a dialogue with Simmel on the nature of the stranger. Driedger and Peters (1977) continue, explaining “Simmel’s concept ‘The Stranger’ is a fruitful one which led many early American sociologists, who had studied under him and read his works, to pursue the dimensions of nearness and farness, identity and distance” (p. 168). Furthermore, Simmel’s “short excursus. . . has been widely acknowledged as a stimulus to two prominent research traditions: the social psychology of the stranger and
the measurement of social distance” (Levine, Carter and Gorman 1976:829). Both of these traditions will be present themselves throughout this study.

Simmel, a German Jew, was himself an outsider and stranger in his time, though “He was well known in German academic circles and even had an international following, especially in the United States” (Ritzer 2008:160). However, in Germany, in addition to facing anti-Semitic discrimination, “Simmel served as an unpaid lecturer whose livelihood was dependent on student fees” (Ritzer 2008:160) which further marginalized him in the university. Despite his outsider role in the university, he was a very popular and well-attended lecturer, even drawing in members of the cultured community of Berlin (Ritzer 2008). However, the popularity of his lectures did not translate into a secure academic position. Thus, Simmel’s biography created a perfect environment for him to develop his theory on the stranger.

Simmel defines the stranger as “the potential wanderer: although he has not moved on, he has not quite overcome the freedom of coming and going. He is fixed within a particular spatial group, or within a group whose boundaries are similar to spatial boundaries. But his position to this group is determined, essentially, by the fact that he has not belonged to it from the beginning, that he imports qualities into it, which do not and cannot stem from the group itself” (Wolff 1950:402). Implicit in Simmel’s original essay is the theme of distance: physical and psychological. Simmel writes:

The unity of nearness and remoteness involved in every human relation is organized, in the phenomenon of the stranger, in a way which may be most briefly formulated by saying that in the relationship to him, distance means that he, who is close by, is far, and strangeness means that he, who also is far, is actually near.
For, to be a stranger is naturally a very positive relation; it is a specific form of interaction. The inhabitants of Sirius are not really strangers to us, at least not in any sociologically relevant sense: they do not exist for us at all; they are beyond far and near. The stranger, like the poor and like sundry “inner enemies,” is an element of the group itself. His position as a full-fledged member involved both being outside it and confronting it (Wolff 1950:402).

Simmel’s love of paradoxes is clearly shown in this passage (McLemore 1970). Furthermore, what Simmel accomplished “was to make vividly clear just how problematic is the whole question of being a member of a group” (Levine et al. 1976:829). “[A] person may be a member of a group in a spatial sense but still not be a member of the group in a social sense” (Mclemore 1970:86, emphasis original). Simmel’s original conception was dealing with the paradox of social distance; outsiders are linked to the group but did not come from the group. Simmel’s stranger is located in several experiential paradoxes, among which the stranger must cope with his/her “position in space and in time, social and symbolic position, as well as identity issues” (Murphy-Lejeune 2002:12). Murphy-Lejeune (2002) continues, explaining that “spatially, strangers represent the unity between wandering and fixation. . . . In time, the stranger is defined as ‘the person who comes today and stays tomorrow’. . . . Socially, as an intruder challenging established relations. . . . Finally, the spatial, temporal, social and symbolic disorientation experienced by strangers in their new environment may cause a personal crises during which identity borders are disturbed and must be renegotiated” (p. 12-13).

Simmel’s stranger exemplified the paradoxes of social distance and space. Later researchers expanded and adapted the definition of the “stranger” after Simmel. In many
cases, they used Simmel’s concept to launch different typologies of strangerness. Indeed, there have been at least two major theoretical traditions born out of the stranger. “The first tradition involves research based on Simmel’s original conceptualization of the term, or research on people living in a foreign environment but not desiring membership in the host group. The second line of research is concerned with strangers that [Mary Margaret] Wood calls ‘newcomers,’ people in a foreign environment who desire membership in the host group” (Gudykunst 1983:403). As McLemore (1970) explains, “Simmel’s principal interest clearly is not in the newcomer as such. His main interest is in a particular configuration of social attributes which may characterize a group member who has come from somewhere else. For Simmel, the word ‘stranger’ refers not just to the newcomer but to one who having come from some other place assumes, or is assigned, a particular position in the social structure” (p. 88-89). So very early on, there was a split in the designation of what the stranger personified.

Although Mary Margaret Wood (1934), who has contributed to the debate, is often overlooked in the literature of the stranger, when she is cited, there is “the tendency. . . to miss or understate the crucial distinction between the stranger as a newcomer and the ‘stranger’ of Simmel’s. . . analysis” (McLemore 1970:88). Even one of the most commonly used phrased to describe the stranger, as someone who is “in the group but not of the group” is actually first used in Wood’s research (McLemore 1970). In her study, Wood uses second-hand data from ethnographic studies on immigrant and isolated communities to draw out concepts on the arrival and personal attributes of the “stranger” (McLemore 1970). Yet, she was one of the earliest to provide “a broad,
meaningful definition of the field and [organize] an extensive literature [on the subject]” (McLemore 1970:88).

Addressing the stranger as a “newcomer” set in motion the creation of several different typologies, mentioned earlier, which have been formed out of a theoretical interest in the stranger, particularly in early American sociology. Indeed, perhaps the sociological interest of the ”stranger” specifically, and the prominent position paid to Simmel early on in American sociology more generally, can largely be attributed to Robert Park and the Chicago School of Sociology.

PARK AND THE CHICAGO SCHOOL LEGACY

Robert Park, who was a student of Simmel’s (Mullins 1973:42), was also an esteemed faculty member of the famous Chicago School of Sociology. He was also “a man who did so much to make Simmel’s work known in American sociology in the 1920s and who produced the first English translation of Der Fremde” (Levine 1979:22).

Park, like many other early American sociologists, was interested in concepts of race and immigration. This was particularly true in Chicago, where these ideas were palpable in early industrialized America. Park saw in the early studies of race and migration in the city, an opportunity to apply Simmel’s stranger.

In his essay on the “marginal man,” Park begins by discussing the stranger as a concept, but then proceeds to “delineate a concept of the marginal man as its equivalent” (Levine et al 1976:829). Levine (1976) continues, “It should be clear, however, that in the borrowing Park altered the shape of the concept: his ‘marginal man’ represents a configuration notably different from Simmel’s ‘stranger.’ Thinking of the experience of ethnic minorities in zones of culture contact in American cities, Park conceived the
marginal man as a racial or cultural hybrid; ‘one who lives in two worlds, in both of which he is more or less a stranger’. . . Simmel’s stranger, by contrast, does not aspire to be assimilated’’ (p. 830).

Everett Stonequist, Park’s student (Levine 1979), contributed to the “marginal man” theory in 1935 in a journal article entitled “The Problem of the Marginal Man” and further elaborated on the theory with his book The Marginal Man (1937). In his essay, Stonequist (1935) elaborates on the definition of the marginal man, writing, “is it not clear that the immigrant who has left his home culture and is not yet assimilated into the new situation may, if he encounter an unfriendly attitude, become a marginal man?” (p. 7). So we see an expansion from a marginal man being a hybrid to becoming an ostracized person who failed to assimilate. Furthermore, Stonequist (1935) adds that marginal men can also “emerge among a people who have not themselves emigrated but instead have been subject to invasion from without” (p. 9). He also adds the life-cycle of the marginal man in his essay, complete with three stages. First is “a stage of preparation when the individual is being introduced into the two cultures,” however, “at this period he is not conscious of a personality problem” (Stonequist 1935:10). Second is the “crisis” stage where “the individual through one or more defining experiences, becomes aware of the cultural conflict which involves his own career” (Stonequist 1935:10). During this stage, the marginal man internalizes the two, often conflicting, views of himself from the two groups and becomes divided. His third stage involves the individual’s response to the crisis in stage two. Like both Simmel and Park, Stonequist views this social position as beneficiary, not only for the individual but for society as well. Stonequist (1935) says on
this that “the marginal man is likely to have an important part. He is the key-personality in this type of cultural change” (p.12).

Paul Siu in 1952 contributed another form of the “stranger” to the field through his work on the “sojourner.” Originally a study on marginals in Chicago, Siu was soon disappointed that none of his subjects could be considered a “marginal man” (Levine et al 1976). The sojourner is another personality type of the stranger, like the marginal man, the difference between the marginal man and the sojourner is, as Siu (1952) writes, “the sojourner. . . clings to the culture of his own ethnic group as in contrast to the bicultural complex of the marginal man. Psychologically he is unwilling to organize himself as permanent resident in the country of his sojourn. When he does, he becomes a marginal man” (p. 34). So the sojourner is a marginal man who has not accepted his new culture as permanent; he is “a stranger who spends many years of his lifetime in a foreign country without being assimilated by it” (Siu 1952:34). Even more, not only does the sojourner not assimilate, it is actually nearly impossible for him to do so. The reason for this, Siu (1952) explains, is that “the essence of assimilation, according to Park and Burgess, is ‘a process of interpenetration and fusion in which person and group acquire the memories, sentiments and attitudes of other persons or groups, and by sharing their experience and history, are incorporated with them in common cultural life.’ It seems that the sojourner, on the contrary, tends to be isolated instead” (p. 35). Sojourners set up “colonies,” such as Little Tokyo or Chinatown. The functions of these colonies are “to establish or to re-establish some sort of primary-group relationships in the matrix of homeland culture – an effort to create a home away from home. Whatever activities the sojourner may participate in, in the community at large, in private life he tends to live apart from the
natives and to share with his countrymen in striving to maintain homeland culture” (Siu 1952:37).

In order to illustrate his point, Siu (1952) uses the examples of a Chinese laundry-man in America and an American missionary in China. For both of these examples, “the intrinsic purpose of the sojourn is to do a job and do it in the shortest possible time” (p. 35). But not all sojourners are equal. Siu (1952) points out in his comparison of the Chinese laundry-man and the American missionary, that it is far easier for the American missionary to isolate him or herself than it is for the Chinese laundry-man to do the same. This is because the American missionary can send his children to American schools and also live in “segregated” (p. 38) areas reserved especially for missionaries. This is in contrast to the Chinese laundry-man who “cannot isolate his children so successfully” because “the Chinese immigrant has to send his children to American schools. The Chinese child, therefore, is more likely to become a marginal man” (Siu 1952:38). A point of difference between the sojourner and the marginal man is the aspect of mobility. Central to the idea of the sojourner is that they maintain their “homeland ties” (Siu 1952:39). In fact, the reason he embarked on the sojourn is to complete the job quickly, “the job itself is essentially a means to an end” (Siu 1952:35). But instead of seeking success during his sojourn, his sojourn is to seek success for praise back in his homeland. Returning back home is vital to this because “the trip shows that he is a person to be admired, to be appreciated, to be proud of, and to be envied” by the people back home whose “sentiments and attitudes make his trip meaningful” (Siu 1952:39).

Edna Bonacich (1973) in “A Theory of Middleman Minorities,” discussed how the sojourner status affects occupational choices. Furthermore, Bonacich also identifies
sojourner communities, which will be discussed in the next section. Bonacich’s article extends the concept of middleman minorities developed by Blalock (1967). Middleman minorities are those groups comprised mostly of ethnic minorities that “occupy an intermediate rather than low-status position” and “tend to concentrate in certain occupations” (Bonacich 1973:583). Bonacich (1973) explains that all minority groups who occupy ‘middleman’ positions began as sojourners, however, “sojourning is not a sufficient condition of the middleman form in that there are sojourners who do not become middlemen” (1973:585). According to Bonacich (1973), the nature of sojourners’ short-term orientation gives them an advantage in these middleman positions. Thrift, “willingness to suffer short-term deprivation to hasten the long-term objective of returning to the homeland” (p. 585), and “future time orientation” are both characteristics of sojourners that also give them advantages in business. Additionally, sojourners are apt to choose occupations which “do not tie him to the territory for long periods” (Bonacich 1973:585), which is advantageous considering the returnee mentality characteristic of sojourners.

However, not all sojourners return to their home countries. According to Bonacich (1973), the sojourners who do not return comprise “lasting middleman minorities” (p. 592). Bonacich (1973) cites two reasons why sojourners would not want to return to their homelands. The first involves deteriorating political conditions that make return unfavorable. Second is that many middleman minority sojourners are successful in their businesses and “that very success makes returning difficult” (p. 592). Furthermore, Bonacich (1973) gives two forms in which sojourners stay in the country where they are sojourning. First is relinquishing the dream to return home. In this
scenario, the sojourner starts to view their host country as their home and become integrated socially and economically, which “would entail engaging in more non-economic activities, joining non-ethnic organizations, intermarrying with neighbors, employing and being employed by persons of different ethnicity, and the like” (p. 593). The reverse of the former is the perpetual dream of return. In this scenario, the sojourner may not have any actual plans or intention of returning; however it is a self-orientation that keeps the sojourner from integrating. In the first scenario, the person is likely to become marginalized whereas in the second scenario the person remains a stranger.

Expanding on the idea of sojourners who prolong their sojourn, Natan Uriely (1994) proposed his type of the sojourner called the “permanent sojourner.” Studying Israeli immigrants in Chicago, Uriely (1994) notes:

The explanatory power of the ‘sojourner’ concept rests on its definition as a type of orientation expressed by immigrants. When such an orientation characterizes groups of immigrants upon arrival, it is possible to view it as a product of social conditions in the country of origin. However, the sojourner orientation might also be perceived as a determinant of the immigrant’s career in the receiving country (P. 527).

Uriely makes the distinction here that it is up to the immigrant, as an individual or as a community, to determine whether they are sojourners or settlers. Furthermore, some immigrants come with a sojourner orientation already in mind, while others are conditioned economically to employ the sojourner orientation. For Uriely (1994), “the notion of the sojourn experience [is] a process” (p. 528). For sojourners who remain in their host country, but still maintain the sojourner orientation, Uriely refers to them as
permanent sojourners. Permanent sojourners represent a meeting point between sojourners and settlers. Sojourners have an interest as well as concrete plans of returning to their country of origin. Settlers have neither an interest or plans of returning. The permanent sojourner however has the intention to return but possess no plans to return.

Uriely studied lower-status and higher-status Israeli immigrants and found that economic factors contribute to the type or orientation they possess. The lower-status immigrants were likely to be settlers because they have no connections in their home country. The upper-level immigrants, however, came to the United States with a sojourner mindset and ended up staying, placing them as permanent sojourners. Their time as a sojourner was often limited by the time they were going to be in university or the time they were going to be here for work. But after their sojourn expires, they stay. But they do not adopt the settler mindset. This point is very important regarding sojourners in relation to other types of strangers, specifically Park’s marginal man. In his research he found that while the immigrants maintained a sojourner mindset, they were “free from aspects of discomfort” (Uriely 1994:534). He continues, “They do not wish to be accepted as members of the host society, they are not yet stigmatized in their homeland. . . and they do not show signs of restlessness or intensified self-consciousness. Moreover, the findings suggest that Israeli ‘sojourners’ perceive their stay in the United States as a gratifying experience, and believe that being abroad for a while adds a cosmopolitan flavor to their image at home” (Uriely 1994:534).

Uriely (1994) contrast this psychological state to that of the permanent sojourner. “Moreover, Israeli permanent sojourners” experience embarrassment, guilt feelings, and anxiety as a result of the dissonance between their expressed plans of returning and their
continuing stay in the host country” (p. 535). The disconnect between the life they are living and their psychological orientation causes discomfort and stress. The sojourner here is Simmel’s stranger, while the permanent sojourner fits the marginal man description.

Furthermore, Uriely (1994) says that permanent sojourners express “a unique form of ethnicity” which he terms as “rhetorical ethnicity” (p. 525). Rhetorical ethnicity is a symbolic ethnicity which manifests itself psychologically and does not manifest itself in more public displays of ethnicity, such as membership in ethnic organizations. For the Israelis that Uriely (1994) studied, rhetorical ethnicity manifested itself in “being exposed to and aware of news from Israel, discussing the political situation in Israel at home and with friends, expressing the longing to return to Israel, sending the children to an Israeli Sunday school” (p. 537). Even some Israelis who had taken American citizenship and held American passports did not feel they were American, or were even betraying their Israel identity. Instead, they viewed it as a decision made out of convenience. They also denied association with Israeli-American identity.

Although the literature related to the stranger is very broad and encompasses several different forms and typologies of outsiders, there has been a feeling that “there exists a well-articulated, unified, and generally accepted literature and ‘theory’ of the stranger’ (McLemore 1970:88). While I do not believe in a unified theory of the stranger, together each typology offers an insight into each unique social position. However, each unique social position and each typology was created in a specific time. As time and space have changed, the validity of each typology needs to be questioned and addressed.
While each typology could be updated for a globalized age, it is beyond the scope of this research. I will be focusing solely on the “stranger” as delineated by Schutz.

My research will deal with both traditions of the stranger - the social-psychological newcomer and the spatial-temporal stranger. I am focusing on both because I am particularly interested in the way these immigrants come to know and feel their experience that experience is shaped by bigger forces. And what we are seeing is a sea change in the ways time and space are being perceived which differs from the past. This is having a fundamental impact in every facet of daily life for everyone, but particularly for immigrants. No longer does migration require a sharp break from home, but rather now it is a soft bending or stretching of home.

In the past the newcomers came to know the new cultural patterns of a group through uncomfortable clashes of direct interactions where the assumptions of the stranger were assaulted by the new and unfamiliar. In Schutz’s model, assimilation was ultimately a means for survival. However, now, can we still consider this to be the only way the newcomer comes to know his/her new group? Does the newcomer come to the group with a degree of cultural knowledge obtained from outside the group, like from the Internet or satellite TV? Does this aid his/her transition? Does it make assimilation more necessary, desired, easier or quicker? Or, conversely, does the global reach of TV and the Internet allow for immigrants to remain connected to their home cultures and be able to remain in their lifeworld and continue functioning without their cultural assumptions being challenged?

SPACE, PLACE AND TIME

Discussions on “strangers” ultimately deal with who are considered social insiders
and outsiders. Examined further, insider/outsider debates hinge largely on concepts of space, place and time and how they are used to manufacture community identities. Social spaces, and thus identities, are lenses through which we experience society. They are also very dynamic and fluid. Concepts of time and space/place have often been neglected as centrally important within sociological theory (Urry 1996). This could well be due to their abstract nature. As David Harvey (1989) writes, “Space and time are basic categories of human existence. Yet we rarely debate their meanings; we tend to take them for granted, and give them common-sense or self-evident attributions” (p. 201). It could also be due to “the search for universals in an objective social world [which] drove social theorists to situate themselves and their object out of space and time, divorced from the particularities of place and period” (Friedland and Boden 1994:4).

Concepts of time and place/space are often confusing and discussed tautologically. However, their importance in sociological discourse is reemerging. And, indeed, these concepts are of great importance to sociology, especially as these concepts are changing. To this study, they are also centrally important. As space and time are being compressed and changed through technology, sociological theory and discourse can no longer accept these concepts as stable or taken-for-granted. Indeed, we need to take a close look at how spatial and temporal change are effecting basic social institutions.

Space and place, often used synonymously, should, in actuality, be understood as separate concepts. “‘Place’ is best conceptualised by means of the idea of locale, which refers to the physical settings of social activity as situated geographically” (Giddens 1990:18). Gieryn (2000) describes place has having three features. First, at its most basic, place “is a unique spot in the universe. Place is the distinction between here and there,
and it is what allows people to appreciate near and far. Places have finitude” (p. 464). In this feature, in other words, place could be anything from a certain chair to a certain city. Gieryn’s second feature of place is that “place has physicality. Whether built or just come upon, artificial or natural, streets and doors or rocks and tress, place is stuff” (Gieryn 2000:465). It is in this physicality that “social processes. . . happen” (Gieryn 2000:465). Third, “without naming, identification, or representation by ordinary people, a place is not a place. Places are doubly constructed: most are built or in some way physically carved out. They are also interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and imagined” (Gieryn 2000:465). Place is not, Gieryn warns, the same as space.

In Gieryn’s (2000) explanation, space is “more properly conceived as abstract geometries detached from material form and cultural interpretation. Space is what place becomes when the unique gathering of things, meanings, and values are sucked out” (p. 465). Castells (1996) writes that “in physics, [space] cannot be defined outside the dynamics of matter. In social theory it cannot be defined without reference to social practice” (p. 411). Moreover, “space is a material product, in relationship to other material products – including people – who engage in [historically] determined social relationships that provide space with a form, a function, and a social meaning” (Castells 1996:411). “Space is the expression of society,” Castells (1996) writes, “not a reflection. . . its expression. . . Space. . . is society” (p. 410). “A place,” on the other hand, “is a locale whose form, function and meaning are self-contained within the boundaries of physical contiguity” (Castells 1996:423). So for Castells, place is a physical locale and space is where society exists. But both, David Harvey (1989) argues,
“cannot be understood independently of social action” (p. 223) because it is people that give meaning to both space and place.

Ideas of space were dealt with by the classic sociological works of Marx, Durkheim and Weber, although in “rather cryptic and undeveloped ways” (Urry 1996:373). Without question, Simmel was the most important classic theorist to concern himself with thoughts of space (Urry 1996:374). Urry (1996) writes:

[Simmel] analyzed five basic qualities of spatial forms that are found in those social interactions which turn an empty space into something meaningful. These qualities are the exclusive or unique character of a space; the ways in which a space may be divided into pieces and activities spatially “framed;” the degree to which social interactions may be localized in space, the degree of proximity/distance especially in the city and the role of the sense of sight; and the possibility of changing locations and the consequences especially of the arrive of the “stranger. (P. 374)

Very early on Simmel was establishing the foundations for a sociology that is spatially aware, especially in relation to distance, which helps to understand Simmel’s original conception of the stranger as a stranger based on space. “Distance, for Simmel, is a primal feature of the continuous movement that characterizes all aspects of human existence” (Cooper 2010:69). It is, then, no surprise that the brand of sociology that developed at the University of Chicago (where many faculty trained under Simmel) established urban sociology, “the academic specialty that arose to investigate such metropolises” (Urry 1996:275).
Sociological concepts of time have been sparse and have historically failed to establish strong research traditions. However, it is a concept the earliest sociological thinkers, specifically Durkheim and Marx, were familiar with. Durkheim argued, for example, that time was social (Urry 1996). “[Durkheim] argued in *Elementary Forms* . . . that only humans have a concept of time and that time in human societies is abstract and impersonal and not simply individual. Moreover, this impersonality is socially organized; it is what Durkheim refers to as ‘social time.’ Hence, time is a ‘social institution’ and the category of time is not natural but social” (Urry 1996:370). As a social institution, therefore, time varies across societies. Furthermore, time not only varies across societies (space), but time varies across time.

Perceptions and expressions of time have changed over time as culture and technology have impacted the social institution of time. Giddens (1990) argues, “All premodern cultures possessed modes of the calculation of time. . . . But the time reckoning which formed the basis of day-to-day life, certainly for the majority of the population, always linked time with place – and was usually imprecise and variable. No one could tell the time of day without reference to other socio-spatial markers; ‘when’ was almost universally either connected with ‘where’ or identified by regular natural occurrences” (p. 17, emphasis mine). All of this changed with the invention of modern mechanical clocks. Previously, Giddens (1990) argues, “Time was still connected with space (and place) until the uniformity of time measurement by the mechanical clock” (p. 17-18). Urry (1996) continues, “modern societies are generally viewed as being more based on clock-time than are premodern societies. Time in modern societies is not structured principally in terms of social activities. Clock-time is central to the organization of modern societies.
and of their constitutive social activities. . . . It is clear that the first characteristic of modern machine civilization was temporal regularity organized via the clock. . . . People were viewed as having shifted from having an orientation to task to an orientation to time” (p. 371).

The time period many call postmodern, or late modern, has again changed the organization of society and brought forth a new spatial-temporal mode. We have witnessed a “compression” of time and space as David Harvey asserts (1989). As the invention of the mechanical clock displaced time from space as Giddens argues, then under a postmodern condition, through globalizing technology, we have witnessed “the annihilation of space through time” (Harvey 1989:293). But if space is society, as Castells (1996) argues, then what impact do changes to space have for social relationships?

COMMUNITY AND THE DETACHMENT OF SPACE

Spaces and places “bring people together,” but, as Gieryn (2000) asks “then what?” (p. 476). “Put crudely, the possibilities are two: engagement or estrangement” (Gieryn 2000:476). This research will not go into estrangement; I will stick with the engagement option, specifically the engagement of community. Simmel was writing on changing social interactions as space was transformed in modernity and the city. From this framework, one issue which can be extrapolated from his theory is the impact this change was having on community. However, as commonplace as the idea and verbiage of community is in our modern day discourse, it remains difficult to conceptualize. In fact, Driskell and Lyon (2002) explain that, in the mid 1950s, Hillery “found no fewer than 94
different community definitions. . . and observed that no complete agreement exists as to
the nature of community” (p. 375).

Community can be roughly defined as “those things which people have in
common, which bind them together, and give them a sense of belonging with one another”
(Day 2006:1). Urry (1996) cites the work of Bell and Newby and their three
distinguishing features of community:

First, there is its use in a simply topographical sense, such as to refer to the
boundaries of a particular settlement; second, there is the sense of community as a
local social system implying a degree of social interconnection of local people
and institutions; and third, there is “communion,” a particular kind of human
association implying personal ties, belongingness, and warmth. . . . It should also
be noted that community can also be understood in a fourth sense, as ideology,
where efforts are made to attach conceptions of communion to buildings, areas,
estates, cities, and so on, in ways which conceal and help to perpetuate the non-
communion relations actually to be found (P. 376).

The idea of community can be found in a physical sense, a psychological sense, or an
emotive sense. In the case of classic ethnic enclaves, all three are true. Community
represents “those things which people have in common, which bind them together, and
give them a sense of belonging with one another” (Day 2006:1). When applied to
marginalized people, this fact becomes all the more evident. John Bruhn (2005) writes
that ethnic communities “provide. . . a social support system that includes housing, a
sense of community, and jobs” (p. 54). Bruhn (2005) continues, saying that “immigrant
adaptation [is] a process of community-making that first involves developing a
meaningful social identity and second, establishing ties and social networks that will lead to a sense of belonging” (p. 56).

In the classic sense of thinking of ethnic enclaves, as physically-bound, often spatially separated from other neighborhoods, the physical sense of a community displays the rationalization of space under modernity. David Inglis (2005) writes, “the spaces in which we carry out our daily lives – workplaces, schools, shopping centres, leisure stadia and other places – all embody in certain ways aspects of modern rationalized culture” (p. 48). To illustrate his point, Inglis uses soccer as an example. “[B]efore the later nineteenth century ball-games had often occupied, integrated and discovered the whole space and landscape between two (or more) villages or [urban] quarters. In other words, the spaces where soccer and other games like it were played in the past were generally rather loose and unfixed. . . . The game would move wherever the ball and the players happened to go; there were no rules and regulations as to where the players could and could not go” (Inglis 2005:49). However, under rational modernity the “sports space has shrunk towards a standardized. . . field serving the production of ‘goal results’ and the time orientation that modernity calls ‘tension’” (Inglis 2005:49). In order to modernize soccer, Inglis (2005) explains that three processes took place. “First, sports were taken out of the streets and put into special locales dedicated to them. . . . Second, these spaces were designed and laid out in ways which emphasized that players had to follow certain rules. . . . Third, the spatial contours of the pitches were standardized” (p. 49).

This is a useful metaphor for thinking about the rationalization of ethnic neighborhood’s space under modernity. Ethnic neighborhoods were created out of the larger society’s rejection of immigrants as strangers. Immigrants were placed in special
locales dedicated to them; spaces not just for immigrants in general, but specific separate ethnicities “based on a previous place of residence” (Hiller and Franz 2004:735), such as Chinatown or Little Italy. Furthermore, they were designed and laid out in ways that emphasized rules. Gieryn (2000) writes that the design of cities “restrict the range and diversity of people with whom one is likely to interact on daily rounds. The borders among ethnic (or class) enclaves in the urban mosaic often become impassable” (p. 478). The neighborhoods that immigrants occupied, which gave rise to the ethnic enclave, were clearly and rationally segregated and spatially separated on the basis of the immigrant’s strangerhood. Thus, the enclaves that developed in cities around the country developed a specific place-based culture to the extent that it developed the feel of being in “Little Italy.” Thus the ethnic enclave existed physically and well as psychologically in the minds of its residents.

In the past it was taken for granted that space, place and community would all be found in a geographically situated area. This is no longer the case. Now we talk about community as an association of like-peoples who may or may not be situated in the same space or place. Immigration has changed what it means to be part of a community. Often this requires a difficulty of fitting in and a difficulty of overcoming distance. In his classic work on Italian immigrants in Harlem, Robert Orsi (2002) discusses at great length the theme of distance in the lives of the immigrants. Orsi, a historian by training, looked at Italian immigrant experiences up to the 1950s; still in a pre-Internet world. The pain that the immigrants experienced upon leaving their homes is palpable in Orsi’s work. However, more to the point of this study is the way the Italian immigrants dealt with the distance from their families when they arrived in Harlem. Orsi explains that one major
strategy for overcoming the pain of distance was religious devotion to the Madonna of Mount Carmel on 115th Street. Orsi (2002) writes, “Distance is a reality in the hearts of the immigrants: the place of their birth is far behind, they have come a long way. This theme of the faraway helped shape the meaning. . . and the intensity of the people’s [religious] participation” (p. 166). For the Italian immigrants in Orsi’s work, religious devotion to the supernatural offered the only way to overcome and transcend distance. Orsi (2002) continues, “Through their devotion to the Madonna, [the immigrants] could stay in touch with distant loved ones with whom they had no other means of communication. The sense evoked throughout is that the Madonna could overcome these various distances. For many Italians, participation in the devotion on 115th Street meant entering into a realm where distance vanished in the shared worship of the Madonna” (p. 167).

As technology has developed, the ways in which community is maintained across space has also changed. Using a form of technology that is seen as quite common now - the telephone - Meryowitz (1985) explains this spatial/relational detachment, writing, “the telephone tends to bring two people closer to each other, in some respects, than they are to other people in their physical environments” (p. 38). Technology has dramatically changed the psychological feeling of closeness or distance. Now, we can be emotionally close to someone without being sharing spatial proximity. Indeed, the degree to which we are connected lead Giddens to “argue that so mutually constituted are near and far relations that any conceptualization of place or locale as ‘in here’ happenings and space as ‘out there’ happenings is no longer tenable” (Amin 2001:385).
While he most likely could not have envisioned the huge technological advances that have occurred in society, Simmel saw “space as becoming less important as social organization is detached from space” (Urry 1996:374). This begs the question: is space becoming less important as the organization of community is becoming detached from space? Or is community even becoming detached from space? If community is being detached from space, then where is it located now? There is another option for exploring communities in placelessness – cyberspace. But are communities in an online realm “real” communities? Perhaps another way of wording it would be: Can communities actually exist without a shared place?

According to Park’s traditional definition of community, two of its “essential characteristics” are “a population territorially organized” and “more or less completely rooted in the soil it occupies” (Driskell and Lyon 2002:375). While many recognize that what it means to be a member of a community has drastically changed, even in recent times from a *gemeinschaft* to a *gesellschaft*, the traditional ideal of a place-based community remains (Driskell and Lyon 2002). Like so many modern institutions, the idea of a community “where residents identify with the local place, where common ties bind them together, and where all interactions are completely holistic *has never existed*” (Driskell and Lyon 2002:378, emphasis mine). While it is true that people had a relatively stronger identification to place in the past, now, “confining community to solely spatial conditions clearly neglects the relational elements. . . necessary for community. . . . [J]ust because people are neighbors, does not necessarily mean they are friends (Driskell and Lyon 2002:378). Morely (2000), discussing the “politics of optimism” delineated by Robins, suggests that “the naïve optimism of the advocates of the communication
revolution is ultimately a nostalgic and backward-looking perspective, premised on the belief that new technologies will somehow restore us to the world of friction-free Gemeinschaft we suppose ourselves to have lost” (p. 188).

Therefore, there has been a move away from thinking of community as based around “local space” to “shared space,” not necessarily a move away from shared space. And, in fact, we already think of communities without local place. Few would dispute that members of a church, school or workplace might think of themselves in terms of forming a community (Driskell and Lyon 2002). However, some argue that this is a form of false community, because it is not forced upon someone; it is voluntary. The same arguments for “shared space” can be extended to “cyberspace.” Many argue that “people effectively use the technology of the Internet to create networks and sustain community ties in cyberspace, thus forming relationships that are both meaningful and supportive” (Driskell and Lyon 2002:380). However, there is a body of research which disputes these claims, stating that virtual communities are “narrowly focused on specific topics and specialized. . . [lack] a significant level of trust and intimacy,” and even lack diversity (Driskell and Lyon 2002:381). As Morley (2000) cautions, online communications can only do so much to bring people together: “It may well be that for those who can afford to use them, new communications technologies better enable people to ‘reach out to others’, thus transcending the barriers of distance in a ‘post-geographical’ world. However, as it is not only distance that divides us, its transcendence can hardly be expected to necessarily unite those who are divided by more than geographical distance” (p. 188). It appears that, instead of promoting healthy relationships formed online,
cyberspace relationships are best at enhancing community based in a local or shared space where people interact face-to-face (Driskell and Lyon 2002).

While, in some ways, with the increase in electronic communication, both space and place are losing their importance, we are still not seeing the “death of distance,” but instead its transformation. Castells (1996) argues that “society is constructed around flows,” (p. 412) for example the flow of capital or the flow of labor, and in a network society there is a new space: the “space of flows” which is “the material organization of time-sharing social practices that work through flows” (p. 412). “It is made of electronic circuits and information systems, but it is also made of territories, physical places, whose functional or symbolic meaning depends on their connection to a network, rather than on its specific characteristics as localities” (Castells 2000:696). This has had enormous impacts of perceptions of time and space. Until recently (the 1980s) space and time and the “space of time-sharing [were] assumed to be a place because time and space were taken to be coextensive” (Stalder 2006:144). It is this new space, where time and space are not coextensive, that Castells calls the space of flows. This space “does not replace the geographical space; rather, by selectively connecting places to one another, it changes their functional logic and social dynamics” (Stalder 2006:147). “Castells stresses, ‘the space of flows is not placeless, although its structural logic is.’ The ability of a node to contribute to the program of a network is often directly related to its location” (Stadler 2006:153).

The space of flows happens through nodes in cyberspace, which is placeless; however, the space of flows is not placeless as people still physically have to live in places and associate with places everyday. But how is place connected to the growing
placelessness of place? Hiller and Franz (2004) provide an excellent example of this phenomenon using the concepts of immigration and people in diaspora.

Hiller and Franz (2004) explored the role that cyberspace and computer-mediated communication (CMC) played in the lives on internal migrants in Canada. They looked at Canadians from Newfoundland who moved to western provinces and how technology was utilized in diaspora. CMC can play two roles Hiller and Franz (2004) argue: first, “CMC can support the development of social capital or social connectedness in physically-based communities” (p. 732). People living in a place-based community can use Internet communication to organize and further their developments. In this scenario, face-to-face contacts are subsidized through online contact. Second, “CMC can [also] build bridges between people who were previously unknown to each other and separated in time and space, and can sustain those relationships even without physical contact” (Hiller and Franz 2004:732). Here, individuals who have never had any face-to-face contact, nor do they share the same physical space, develop relationships and sustain them totally online. However, Hiller and Franz (2004) warn that this dichotomy may not be “as clear as expected” because “people who have common interests may have those interests because of living in a common territory or having some prior place-based identity” (p. 733). In other words, there may be an overarching place-based identity that informs people’s interests that then draw people who are dispersed into online relationships.

Both of these factors are found in Hiller and Franz’s study on internal migrants. Hiller and Franz (2004) recognize the transformative power CMC has had on the migrant experience, stating that “formerly, migration meant a radical break from place of origin to
destination,” (p. 734), but “more recently, the idea of a transnational community has supplant[ed] that old idea” (p. 735). Hiller and Franz (2004) continue: “Migrants are now much more likely to continue to retain strong ties to their region of origin, and complex transnational relationships are developed, with homelands serving as important symbolic anchors for diasporic peoples” (p. 735). The strong retention of the migrant’s homeland ties can perhaps partially be explained by the rise in multiculturalism overcoming the ideology of assimilation. However, advances in technology also play a great role in this. The computer has allowed “boundaries [to be] perceived [as] more permeable, at the same time [eroding]. . . territory as the pre-eminent marker of community” (Hiller and Franz 2004:735). Under modernity, place and community were linked, but after the postmodern turn, this can no longer be said to be true. The role of the place-based ethnic community is transforming and being replaced by transnational community.

Compared to the old ethnic enclaves, now “it is also possible [for the migrant] to maintain continuous contact with home by virtual visits. . . [making] homelands. . . no longer just a memory supported by occasional contact, but. . . an intimate aspect of daily living” (Hiller and Franz 2004:735). In the past, the enclave served as a “gathering point for migrants. . . a short-term mechanism of adjustment in the new location,” (Hiller and Franz 2004:735) as well as a network of employment opportunities. The ethnic community was a way for the immigrant to maintain his/her ties to his/her home community. The community as a way to maintain ties to his home is still the case, but increasingly the computer is now what is facilitating the immigrant’s backward gaze (Hiller and Franz 2004:740). The backward gaze can manifest itself in community organizations. Mizukami (2007) studied the sojourner community of Japanese in
Australia, describing the different roles the sojourner community plays for the immigrants. One role is that of maintaining the sojourner community. The organizations are vital in keeping the sojourners, who are still homeland-minded, up to date with news and media from home. However, the need for a place-based community organization is changing as the location of community changes. The organization can be based entirely online and be national, perhaps even transnational. Additionally, an online organization, similar to a physically-placed organization, brings together individuals who, apart from coming from a specific place (a country, village or community), have nothing previously in common and have never met.

However, while the community organization no longer needs to be place-based, as Hiller and Franz (2004) explained, the common interests of its members are still based on place. As Day (2006) writes, “[we should not] assume that global forces are necessarily fatal to place-based relationships. Giddens notes how sometimes social bonds can be re-embedded, tied back to local conditions of time and place; for instance, the maintenance of trust among individuals who otherwise are strangers. . . in a depersonalized world of movement, direct contact with others may acquire an added value” (p. 191-192). These unique communities that form among strangers, in states of diaspora or while sojourning, unite people who, back in their country of origin, might have little in common. These communities then might perpetuate the culture of their home country, but the state of being in a host country changes their culture and creates a kind of ‘super-culture’ based around their sojourn or diasporic state.

GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY

“How does the question of ‘who are you?’ become inextricable from that of...
‘where are you from?’” (Lie 2004:233). Or as Sundstrom (2003) states, “[s]pace is an integral aspect of the production of human categories and identities” (p. 83). Sundstrom (2003) continues that “if we survey the social and physical landscape we will find that there is a relationship between every social identity and place” (p. 87). However, as space is being transformed, is that still the case? When discussing the changing dynamics of how we experience space, perhaps no other example is as clear as globalization.

Globalization has not only facilitated and advanced new technologies which have made the world smaller and more connected, it has had tremendous impact on identity. Today “it is also possible to identify with group membership that is not directly linked to a geographical locale. . . ’a stranger’s cultural identity becomes increasingly flexible – no longer rigidly bound by membership to the original culture, or to the host culture – and begins to take on a more fluid intercultural identity’” (De Korne 2007:300).

In the globalizing age, we have seen a rise in the importance of multiculturalism, biculturalism, and cosmopolitanism. In fact, the two cannot be thought of as mutually exclusive, as Ulrich Beck describes cosmopolitanism as “*internal* globalization, globalization from *within* national societies” (Roudometof 2005:116). The two are so connected that De Korne (2007) argues that “[G]lobalisation intensifies the need for cosmopolitanism, or an awareness of being citizens of the world”’ (p. 292). “Where pluralism has existed throughout most of human history, it has tended to operate within the framework of a strong dominant culture” (Hunter 2009:1310). However, these days we see pluralism extended to everyone. “In today’s expanding ‘cultural supermarket’, individual and national cultural identities are contested, and can no longer be viewed as the permanent, structured foundation of the self” (De Korne 2007:292). De Korne (2007)
explains, “[u]nderstanding biculturalism is important in the current context of globalization; the degree of contact between cultures continues to increase, and thus, more people are likely to experience personal connections to multiple cultures, or ‘transnational identities’” (p. 292). However, these “connections to multiple cultures” are not always celebrated, especially by those invested in the nation-state model. Recently, some European leaders have declared that multiculturalism has failed. German Chancellor Angela Merkel recently declared that Germany’s “attempts to create a multicultural society have "utterly failed" (Westervelt 2010). Additionally, UK Prime Minister David Cameron echoed Merkel’s sentiment, saying, “multiculturalism. . . encouraged “segregated communities” (Burns 2011). These expressions, I believe, are evidence of the struggles that major modern institutions, like nation-states, are dealing with as society is globalizing. It is a unique and contradictory set of challenges. “While technology, media, and capital are globalized and cross geographical boundaries of nation-states with ease, national governments everywhere appear to be tightening and guarding their physical borders more vigilantly than ever by enacting and enforcing narrowly defined and sometimes highly intolerant immigration laws and by militarizing their border spaces” (Naficy 1999:3). As Morley (2000) explains, Bauman “argues that globalization and (re)territorialisation are in fact mutually complementary processes, so that there is a ‘mutual conditioning and reciprocal reinforcement between the ‘globalisation’ of all aspects of the economy and the renewed emphasis on the ‘territorial principle’” (p. 226).

Globalization is not a new phenomenon – people have travelled and shared culture for thousands of years – however, the media and technological environment
which characterizes our society now has assaulted the ordinary person with globalization, making it very evident in everyday life. “Anthony Giddens recently identified the communications media as ‘the leading influence in the globalization of society over the past 20 or 30 years’” (Coucher 2004:14). Giddens (1991) further states that “Modernity is inseparable from its ‘own’ media: the printed text and subsequently, the electronic signal” (p. 24). We could extend this statement to say that post-modernity is inseparable from its ‘own’ media: the Internet. David Morley (2000) explains that “electronic media of various kinds allow the radical intrusion of distant events into the space of domesticity” (p. 9). Morley (2000) continues, “broadcasting [enables] its consumers. . . to ‘visit’ faraway locations (via sound and image) without leaving the comfort and security of their homes. They are thus enabled to simultaneously stay home and ‘go places’” (p. 9). Additionally, Morley (2000) tells of Sandra Wallman’s argument which asserts that “‘even homogeneous populations now come up against otherness as soon as they have access to modern media of communication’” (p. 9). Morley (2000) continues, “In the traditional vision of things, cultures were understood as being rooted both in time and space, embodying genealogies of ‘blood, property and frontiers’ and thus cultures ‘rooted societies and their members: organisations which developed, lived and died in particular places’. By contrast, the contemporary world is a world of movement and that mobility (both physical and imaginative) is central to our conceptualization of modernity and its various ‘posts’” (p. 9). Electronic media, specifically the Internet (but also satellite television and others) is a primary force which is decoupling culture from time and space and allowing it to exist solely in time.
While this technology is decoupling culture from specific time and space, it is also decoupling people from the same boundaries. Globalization, specifically the globalization of communication technology, is having an impact on the concept of the life-world fashioned by Schutz and other phenomenological sociologists such as Berger and Luckmann (Zhao 2006). However, this concept has been further developed by Habermas in more recent years. “The lifeworld is the social world as it is constructed and maintained through the taken-for-granted social skills and stocks of knowledge of its members. The lifeworld is therefore maintained through ordinary people communicating with each other, and thereby establishing a shared understanding of the world as a meaningful place. . . . The lifeworld carries the traditions of the community and is the source of individual socialisation” (Edgar 2006:xvi).

For Habermas, the concept of the lifeworld is strongly tied to communication. According to Ritzer (2008), “[e]ngaging in communicative action and achieving understanding. . . lead to the reproduction of the life-world through the reinforcement of culture, the integration of society, and the formation of personality (p. 539). “The lifeworld,” Habermas (1987) writes, “is, so to speak, the transcendental site where speaker and hearer meet, where they can reciprocally raise claims that their utterances fit the world (objective, social, or subjective), and where they can criticize and confirm those validity claims, settle their disagreements, and arrive at agreements. In a sentence: participants cannot assume in actu the same distance in relation to language and culture as in relation to the totality of facts, norms, or experiences concerning which mutual understanding is possible” (p. 126). Communicative action is, according to Habermas, what it means to be human, and anything which disrupts the free flow of constructive
communication threatens the lifeworld. For many people, the new communication
technologies are seen as expanding the flow of communication and being a democratizing
force in the world. It is, to use Habermasian phrasing, a force which resists the
“colonization” of the lifeworld by empowering people instead of the system. However,
one could argue that as long as governments control the flow of the Internet, then it is
being already colonized.

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to dwell on the political nature of the
lifeworld, as global communication has become widespread around the world, there is a
need to rethink and reconceptualize the idea of the lifeworld. Zhao (2006) explains, “The
advent of the Internet and the ensuing social transformation has thus reconfigured the
lifeworld we live in, specifically, the ways in which we connect with others. In this new
environment, face-to-face interaction is only one of the many contact options individuals
can choose from for ‘social relating’” (p. 471). According to Berger and Luckman, the
lifeword consists of several different realities, of which the reality of “everyday life” is
the most important (Zhao 2006:459). Everyday life, they continue, is experienced
spatially and temporally; extending spatially from “here” to “there” and temporally from
“now” to “then” (Zhao 2006:460). In the past, the only combinations which could be
experienced were the “here and now” and the “there and then.” However, Zhao (2006)
argues, the Internet and global media has created the combination of the “there and now”
(p. 460). Zhao (2006) continues, “The emergence of this ‘there and now’ zone has altered
the spatiotemporal structure of the reality of everyday life. Instead of centering on the
‘here’ of my body and ‘now’ of my present,’ the reality of everyday life is now organized
around both the ‘here’ of my body and ‘there’ of my mediated reach” (p. 460).
When forming his concept of the lifeworld, Schutz divided the lifeworld into two realms – the realm of consociates and the realm of contemporaries - based on the “spatial-temporal arrangement of human contact” (Zhao 2004:91). The realm of consociates is composed of individuals “sharing a community of space and a community of time” while the realm of contemporaries is made of individuals “sharing neither a community of space nor a community of time” (Zhao 2004:92). Schutz, however, did not go far enough to create a third realm composed of individuals sharing time but not space. However, this third realm is needed for understanding the changing lifeworld under globalization because the “dislocation of space . . . from place . . . allows people to share a community of time without sharing a community of physical space (place), in other words, to stay in an emergent realm where their ‘Now’s’ converge but their ‘Here’s’ diverge” (Zhao 2004:97). In order to fill this gap, Zhao (2004) discusses the third realm as the realm of “consociated contemporaries” (p. 102). This realm is “a form of nonterritorially based community that brings distant people temporally together in cyberspace” (Zhao 2004:102). However, one flaw to Zhao’s (2004) third realm is that it is aimed more towards analysis of “people interact with one another as ‘intimate strangers’” (p. 103), there is no framework for how people who are familiar with each other in space communicate through time; such as how immigrants stay close to people in their home communities.

Habermas, who draws heavily on Marx in his theoretical framework, applies his concept of lifeworld to the modern world “is forced to abandon a Marxian approach . . . since he concludes that the deformation of the life-world is ‘no longer localizable in any class-specific ways’” (Ritzer 2008:541). What Zhao might argue is that the lifeworld is,
additionally, no longer localizable in any time or space-specific ways as well. Zhao (2006) writes:

Today, more and more distant locales are being connected through the Internet for instant contact, and the world beyond reach is shrinking correspondingly. With the rapid spread of the Internet across the globe in the years to come, the zone of the “there and now” will continue to expand at an accelerated pace, thereby further altering the spatiotemporal structure of the reality of everyday life” (P. 461).

Increasing globalization is impacting our very identity. As time and space are altered through globalizing processes, so too are the structures and construction of our lifeworlds.

A NEW AGE OF STRANGERS?

The move towards a globalizing world can be articulated as a move from the modern society towards a postmodern society. This change, Bauman (1997) argues, has had a drastic impact on the way strangers are perceived; “In the modern society and under the aegis of the modern state, cultural and/or physical annihilation of strangers and of the strange was a creative destruction” (p. 19). Giddens (1990) agrees, writing, “Globalisation – which is a process of uneven development that fragments as it coordinates – introduces new forms of world interdependence, in which, once again, there are no ‘others’” (p. 175, emphasis mine). Nasu (2006) writes that the disappearance of “others” is due to globalization’s adaptation of a set of so-called global standards to almost all areas of this globe. It can also be expressed in such slogans as ‘All Together’ or ‘Everyone is Equal.’ Therefore, globalization can be characterized as a process of reduction or disappearance of ‘otherness.’ Such a process might carry along a chance to
repress otherness” (p. 385).

Cultural annihilation, the disappearance and reduction of “others,” I believe, can be seen as forces of assimilation. Bauman (1997) continues:

Under the pressure of the modern order-building urge, the strangers lived, so to speak, in a state of suspended extinction. The strangers were, by definition, an anomaly to be rectified. Their presence was defined a priori as temporary, much as the current/fleeting stage in the prehistory of the order yet to come. A permanent coexistence with the stranger and the strange, and the pragmatics of living with strangers, did not need to be faced point-black as a serious prospect. And it would not need, as long as modern life remained a life-towards-a-project” (P. 19).

“Strangers were either to be excluded or assimilated (Morley 2000:211). However, Bauman (1997) asserts that “Not everywhere do these conditions seem to be holding today. . . at a time which Anthony Giddens calls ‘late modernity’. . . and I have (together with many others) chosen to call ‘postmodern’” (p. 19). Put otherwise, Bauman is describing a shift from assimilation to a state of bicultural pluralism or hybridity. Bauman (1997) argues that, while certainty characterized the modern, uncertainty characterizes the postmodern, even when it comes to identity. “In this [postmodern] world, everything may happen and everything can be done, but nothing can be done once for all. . . . In this world, bonds are dissembled into successive encounters, identities into successively worn masks” (Bauman 1997:24). “Like everything else,” Bauman (1997) continues, “the self-image splits into a collection of snap-shots, each having to conjure up, carry and express its own meaning” (p. 24).
Cosmopolitanism, is a worldview that adopts a different stance on the presence of strangers. Cosmopolitanism can be thought of as both a worldview or orientation towards the world and as a moral stance (Roudometof 2005). In terms of cosmopolitanism as a world view, “Hannerz observes that cosmopolitanism as a state of mind refers to a mode of managing meaning which includes being open and involved with otherness” (Marotta 2010:112). It is, according to Merton, a type of knowledge about a group, which is in contrast to the “local” which is a type of knowledge based on acquaintance (Ossewaarde 2007:371). In other words, cosmopolitan knowledge is based on second-hand knowledge while local knowledge is first-hand. “Cosmopolitanism argues that in order to appreciate humanity, the social bonds between locals must somehow become weaker, less binding and less partial, and more abstract, universal, indeterminate and virtual, so that the Other can be included” (Ossewaarde 2007:368). Yet, if cosmopolitanism is an ideology of inclusiveness, can we still say that there are “others” to be included? And is there still an “us” to include “them” in?

In short, under the ideology of cosmopolitanism there are still “others” because cosmopolitanism is an unfinished project. Under pure cosmopolitanism, there arises an “ethos” of being citizens of the world (Ossewaarde 2007). “As an ethos of world citizenship, cosmopolitanism legitimates the inclusion of strangers by stating that strangers are not strange, deviant or dangerous but have their own human goodness, despite their social characteristics” (Ossewaarde 2007:377, emphasis original). Another way to envision cosmopolitanism and strangers is that, under cosmopolitanism there are no strangers because everybody becomes a “stranger.” The “stranger” then becomes the person who has no attachment to a certain place and can move effortlessly through spaces
and cultures. As Ossewaarde (2007) writes, “Cosmopolitanism stresses that in the era of
global interconnections, human beings are expected to live, survive or flourish without
local, immediate, concrete and exclusive bonds” (p. 384). Cosmopolitanism argues for
detachment from the local and attachment to a global ideal of common humanity.

However, Vince Marotta (2010) offers a critique of the idea of cosmopolitan
strangers. Of his four major critiques, I will focus on only two: first, that
cosmopolitanism actually “objectifies” the other and second that the actual psychological
position of cosmopolitanism as detached from any locality is not possible. Marotta’s
(2010) first criticism states that “openness, respect and engagement with otherness are
key qualities of the cosmopolitan stranger. What is problematic here is not the ‘openness’
but how it is manifested. Hannerz argues that a ‘more genuine cosmopolitanism’ relates
to an ‘aesthetic stance of openness’ in which other cultures are seen ‘as works of art’ . . . .
If we view the other as a ‘work of art’ we may fall into the trap of objectifying the other,
thereby placing undue focus on the beauty and difference of the other rather than on their
actual material condition (p. 117). What Marotta is arguing here is that cosmopolitanism
as a grand narrative which seeks openness and inclusion does, in fact, not include
everyone. Instead, it labels groups as “others” and marks them for inclusion which
highlights their otherness. Marotta (2010) argues “The unequal relationship between the
cosmopolitan self and the other is underscored by the way the discourse of the
cosmopolitan stranger constructs the other as passive,” (p. 17).

His second critique focuses on the (im)possibility of the psychological condition
of cosmopolitanism. Marotta (2010) explains the “discourse on the cosmopolitan stranger
implies [a third position. . . between the local and the global] is possible because locals,
natives, nationalists and the other are confined within their epistemological framework or prison. Cosmopolitan strangers can synthesize and have access to a ‘total perspective’ not available to those immersed in their essentialist particular/local or global/universal frameworks” (p. 118). However, Marotta (2010) argues that this third position is not possible because people “do not occupy a boundless social and cultural vacuum” (p. 118). Marotta (2010) continues, “cosmopolitan strangers are not ahistorical social actors who float above those who are socially and historically located. Social actors, and their understanding of the world, are formed in the context of customs, traditions and prejudices. The idea of the cosmopolitan stranger assumes that one’s historical, social and cultural position can be placed on hold when analyzing and engaging a social world which is immersed in essentialist and binary thinking” (p. 118). It is a fundamental charge to the sociology of knowledge. Cosmopolitanism asserts that one can distance oneself from the specific history and biography which we are socialized in and, additionally, not draw on that when engaging with another culture. It is a position which Marotta (2010) calls a “fallacy” (p. 119).

There is another lens through which to examine strangers now: through the lens of postmodernism. “The essential difference between the socially produced modality of modern and postmodern strangers... is that, while modern strangers were earmarked for annihilation, and served as bordermarks for the advancing boundary of the order-under-construction, the postmodern ones are joyfully or grudgingly, but by common consent or resignation, here to stay” (Bauman 1997:30). In other words, strangers are forced, in a postmodern society, to live a bicultural identity because, while they may be marked as different still, they are not marked for destroying their original culture. In fact:
One may say: a new theoretical/ideological consensus is emerging, to replace another one, more than a century old. If the left and right, the progressivists and the reactionary of the modern period agreed that strangerhood is abnormal and regrettable, and that the superior (because homogenous) order of the future would have no room for the strangers, postmodern times are marked by an almost universal agreement that difference is not merely unavoidable, but good, precious and in need of protection and cultivation (Bauman 1997:31).

Of course, Bauman warns, this does not mean an end to discrimination or racism. As Bauman (1997) warns, “All societies produce strangers; but each kind of society produces its own kind of stranger, and produces them in its own inimitable way” (p. 17).

As societies still produce strangers, how are strangers navigating their situation in a postmodern condition at a social-psychological? This research is an attempt to combine the literature of the stranger and apply it to a globalized world. This research will update the literature on the stranger and make it applicable for a globalized world.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

In order to understand the experiences of immigration and assimilation of my Korean and Nepalese participants, I adopted a comparative case study design using qualitative interviews. A comparative case study is appropriate for this research because of my focus on a relatively small number of participants which were selected because of their comparative significance of coming from a country with high Internet access and a country with less Internet access. Case studies, due to their nature, are not generalizable. Instead, they provide a detailed account of a specific group for a specific period of time.

DATA COLLECTION

I collected data in two ways: observations and semi-structured interviews. For my informal observations I attended ethnic group meetings as well as faith services at a Korean church and a Hindu temple. During my observations, I looked for characteristics of the community I was observing. For example, I wanted to understand how immigrants are active with their ethnic organizations and in what capacity they participate. Additionally, during my observations I also engaged in informal interviews. I wanted to know how my participants came to belong to those organizations and what those organizations meant to them. Observing the milieu in which immigrant communities manifest themselves offered a context to how immigrant identity is shaped and formed.

My second strategy for collecting data was through semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews “are usually scheduled in advance and [are] expected to last a certain amount of time; during them, the interviewer might engage in dialogue with the interviewee, rather than simply ask questions” (Bailey 2007:100). I used a structured interview guide composed of 31 questions regarding their level of personal access to
global communication technology prior to immigrating as well as since they have been residing in America (see Appendix A). Additionally, questions were also asked about my participant’s level of personal integration into ethnic communities and American institutions. There were also open-ended questions at the end of the interview guide regarding my participant’s identity. The open-ended questions allowed my participants to express their identity in their own words. The semi-structured nature of the interview guide allowed me to establish common themes across categories I had already created while simultaneously allowing my participants the freedom to share their own stories and experiences, creating their own categories in the process. All participants were asked the same questions, though sometimes in a different order. Furthermore, probing questions differed because I let my participants move the conversation naturally. Each interview lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes and was held at a location of my participant’s choosing. A few participants insisted on phone and email conversations, so they were accommodated. Furthermore, all interviews, with the exception of those conducted over the phone, were recorded so I could transcribe them.2 All audio files and transcripts were kept safely locked in my office to protect the confidentiality of my participants.

**SAMPLING**

A total of 21 participants were interviewed; 10 from Korea and 11 from Nepal (see Appendix C). I chose my sample populations of Korean and Nepalese immigrants for two reasons. First, out of convenience based on who I could find to participate in the time I had to complete my research and who I had access to already. Second, in order to choose my participants, I first relied on Internet usage data from the CIA World

---

2 Six participants insisted on not being recorded for privacy reasons.
Factbook. Dividing total Internet users by the total population, I arrived at percentages of the total population of a country which has Internet access. Based on this number, I choose two countries, South Korea (80 percent access; 39.4 million Internet users by 48.7 million total population); and Nepal (1.9 percent; 577,800 Internet users by 29.3 million total population), which were on opposite ends of the spectrum and also represented large populations within my sampling area.

Referring to the digital divide, Manuel Castells (1996) writes, “CMC [computer-mediated communication] as such will remain the domain of an educated segment of the population of the most advanced countries, numbered in tens of millions but still counting as an elite on a global scale” (p. 359). Castells (1996) continues, “. . . CMC starts as the medium of the communication for the most educated and affluent segment of the population of the most educated and affluent countries” (p. 360). In addition to technology being unequally distributed on a global scale, technology is “more often than not in the largest and most sophisticated metropolitan areas” (Castells 1996:360). In other words, access to technology is divided between urban centers and rural areas as well as between developed and developing countries. Again, Korea and Nepal fell on opposite ends of the spectrum, according to the CIA World Factbook, with 83 percent of Korea’s population living in urban areas and only 19 percent of Nepal’s population living in an urban environment. Therefore, I identified two characteristics which related to distribution of communication technology: a country with a high rate of Internet usage (Korea) and a country with a low rate of Internet usage (Nepal), and where my participants came from in their country of origin: either a rural area or an urban area.

Using this 2x2 table I created ideal types based on country of origin and either urban or rural background in order to identity and place my participants in Schutz’s model more accurately.

I used a combination of criterion and snowball sampling techniques. Both sampling techniques are considered nonprobability techniques, meaning they “are less likely than are probability samples to represent the populations they’re meant to represent” (Adler and Clark 2003:130). My findings cannot be considered generalizable because my sampling technique was not random. However, using these sampling techniques provided the necessary participants in which to evaluate a model. To be part of the research, my participants had to meet the criterion of being an immigrant from Korea or Nepal and live within 100 miles of the Kansas City metropolitan area. Once I had established contacts and relationships with gatekeepers in the Korean and Nepalese communities, I relied on snowball sampling, asking my participants if any of their friends would be willing to participate in my research.

MEASUREMENT

I engaged in both an inductive and deductive analytical approach in the interviews. Deductively, I created categories and chose variables relating to access to global communication technology prior to conducting interviews. I then constructed questions based on those categories and variables. Inductively, I still allowed my participants the freedom to create their own categories, knowing that people do not normally fit into categories created for them. I proceeded in both manners in order to gain data which could be compared across groups, yet which would also allow me, as the researcher, an
understanding of what these macro-forces of assimilation, immigration and globalization meant to my participants.

In order to develop my interview guide as a tool, I identified four characteristics which I would focus on: distribution of, and access to, global communication technology, level of hybrid identity, length of journey or stay, and demographic questions regarding age, race/ethnicity and gender.

By distribution of, and access to, global communication technology, I mean the ability to access technology such as the Internet and the familiarity to use it. For example, I will be looking at whether the individuals in my study came from a rural area or an urban area in their countries of origin. There are two reasons why I chose an urban/rural dichotomy as an example of global integration. First, urban areas, specifically cities, are hubs, or nodes, of globalization. Modern cities are a visual presence of an invisible force; they are specific space/time expressions of a spaceless/timeless phenomenon. Second, cities are seen as more cosmopolitan than rural areas. This point builds off the first point; as cities are hubs for globalization they draw in capital which, in turn, draws in people, ideas and technology. As people are brought in from all over, they express their culture in the new environment. Someone living in a city is exposed to people, cuisine, and languages from all over the world. Therefore, my assumption is that people who come from urban areas in their country of origin are more likely to view themselves as “global citizens” than would be their rural homologues.

Second, I will assess levels of access to information technology. Levels and access to information technology for individuals prior to coming into new environments, such as instant messaging and Skype, are resources which are unevenly distributed
among people. Some countries, and additionally, some areas in a particular country, may have far greater access to this type of technology than others. I assume that persons coming from urban settings will be more literate in the use of global information technologies.

Finally, I will measure the highest level of formal education completed in the person’s country of origin. I assume that the higher the education then the more familiar one is with the world events. For example, one who has completed a bachelor’s degree in one’s country of origin will have a stronger view of oneself as a “member of the world” than would one who has graduated from high school in the country of origin.

For levels of cultural hybridity, I mean how the stranger comes to view her/himself in the country of reception. Does the stranger view her/himself as a product of her/his country of origin or does the stranger view her/himself as a hybrid of the country of origin and country of reception? I will measure this by assessing the level of English language proficiency and use my research participants possess in addition to their own language. My assumption is that levels and locations of use of English or one’s native language is an indicator of one’s identity. If one can easily switch between the use of her/his own language and her/his use of English depending on the social location at the time, I would argue this represents a level of cultural hybridity relevant to cultural pluralism. Furthermore, I will assess levels of hybridity through open-ended questions as to how my participants identify themselves. Put otherwise, how do my participants think of their identity as strangers in the country of reception? The variable of cultural hybridity will be used to assess the level of psychological distance or proximity the stranger feels with her/his country of reception.
For length of stay or journey, I will be looking at how long the stranger has been living in the new society. If Schutz’s original model was a linear progressive model towards assimilation, and I am attempting to alter the model in a new globalized epoch, then time that the stranger has spent in the new country becomes a critical variable. Although in the original model, Schutz does not address the temporal aspect of moving through his three stages, so comparing time spent in one stage among my participants to the model was impossible.

Demographic data that will be collected to assess any different trends that may emerge include age, gender, and race. My choice of age as a variable is premised upon the assumption that assimilation will differ between those who come at a young age versus those who come at an older age. Specifically, I presume that younger participants will assimilate at a more accelerated pace than their elder counterparts. This is due to my assumption of cross-cultural flexibility and the degree to which one’s original culture has been engrained in the “thinking as usual.”

My choice of gender as a variable is also premised upon the assumption that the assimilation process differs between men and women. Are men stronger carriers of culture or more steeped in tradition or are women? Do men have more or less access to new communication technology than women or is it the opposite? Furthermore, men and women may migrate and enter new societies under different circumstances which may impact the assimilation process.

Finally, my choice of race as a variable will be to seek to understand if racial categorization impacts assimilation processes. Often, immigrants enter into a society with racial categorizations that differ from categorizations existing in their home societies. My
assumption is that strangers perceived to have a similar racial make-up to the racial
majority of the approached group will assimilate faster than those who are racially
different.

Based on these four characteristics, I developed a tool in which to help understand
which, if any, stage of Schutz’s model my participants were in. I developed
characteristics to describe each stage:

Disinterested observer

- Dominant use of native language
- Friendships and social network exclusively made of members of own
group
- Residentially concentrated with fellow group members
- Frequent trips back home

Would-be member

- Approximately even number and level of non-ethnic and ethnic
organizational involvement in country of reception
- Diverse social network
- Ease of use of both English and native language
- Limited travel back to country of origin

Full member

- Almost exclusive use of English
- Social network exclusively made of members of the country of reception
- Low level of ethnic organizational involvement
- Very limited trips back to country of origin
ANALYSIS

The model which I am using for my research is not originally a model. Schutz described the stages a stranger passes through; I operationalized that portion of his article as a model:

| Disinterested Observer | Would-Be Member | Full Member |

In order to understand where my participants fit into the model, each interview was recorded, transcribed and coded in order to identify emerging themes as well as to look for characteristics which were previously identified. For observations and for interviews which were not recorded, I coded my interview notes.

In order to analyze the ways in which Schutz’s model has changed, I conceptualized four alternative models using the characteristics developed for each stage. Using this tool, I classified each participant and placed them in each category to discern social position within the model.

Alternative Model 1: Due to increased global communication and the free flow of information across all borders, full strangerhood is no longer a realistic category. Strangers enter a new society already possessing a certain degree of knowledge, of “thinking as usual,” for the new society of reception. Thus, the stranger is entering as a “would-be member.” By skipping the first category of “disinterested observer,” the assimilation process, which is still desired, is sped up.
Alternative Model 2: Cultural pluralism has allowed strangers to live a hybrid identity. Full assimilation is not pressured on strangers. Thus, the second category is extended and assimilation is either not reached or delayed, perhaps indefinitely.

Alternative Model 3: Due to increased global communication and the spread of global information technology, the stranger stays as a “disinterested observer” for a much longer period of time because she/he is able to maintain relationships with friends/family in the country of origin. The stranger gradually moves to the stage of “would-be member” more out of being forced to engage the society of reception and less out of choice to do so.

Alternative Model 4: Full strangerhood is no longer a realistic category and cultural pluralism allows for a hybrid identity to persist. The stranger enters the new society as a “would-be member” and is allowed to exist in this state with no pressure to assimilate.

These four alternative models were used as a conceptual guide as I analyzed my themes. In order to assure reliability, the “capacity to produce consistent results when applied time after time” (Adler and Clark 2003:150), and dependability I kept an “audit trail, a detailed account of the entire research process” (Bailey 2007:184). Additionally, I
assured reliability through my use of a semi-structured interview guide which allows for structure instead of a fully unstructured interview guide. Moreover, to ensure validity I have included a detailed methods section (Bailey 2007:182). Furthermore, working within an “interpretivist perspective,” I triangulated data sources “to capture and report multiple perspectives” (Patton 2002:546) by “comparing the perspectives of people from different points of view” (Patton 2002:559), such as from different countries and different ages. Additionally, I have attempted to contextualize my research both in the theoretical debate on the subject as well as contextualize the setting in which my research took place. Concerning generalizability, this research is not able to be generalized easily. However, the focus of qualitative work is not to generalize. Rather, qualitative researchers seek specificity and rich, detailed accounts; depth over breadth.

ETHICS

In order to conduct my research in an ethical manner, several steps were taken to protect my participants’ anonymity. All interviews were voluntary and each participant was informed that they could withdraw from the study at anytime and face no negative consequences. Furthermore, I explained to each participant that they were free to skip any questions they did not wish to answer. I gained written consent from all participants (see Appendix B). In the cases where my participants insisted on interviews over the phone or by email, verbal or electronic consent was gained. All recordings, transcripts and consent forms were kept locked in my office in order to maintain the confidentiality of my participants. Additionally, pseudonyms are used in this study in place of my participants’ real names. Finally, my research was approved through the Human Subjects Review Committee at the University of Central Missouri (see Appendices D, E).
CHAPTER 4
BRIDGING LOCAL AND TRANSNATIONAL SPACES

Speaking with my interviewees\(^5\) revealed the nuances and contradictions of being an immigrant in a globalized era. Through my conversations with my research participants there emerged three themes. First, I note among my participants a transformation of the “disinterested observer” and “full member” categories outlined by Schutz. The second theme which I discuss is my participant’s perceptions of physical and emotional proximity and distance from their original countries. The final theme concerns the ways in which my immigrant participants conceptualized the importance of their ethnic community.

A SHIFT IN THE “DISINTERESTED OBSERVER” AND “FULL MEMBER”

For the purposes of my research, I operationalized characteristics for all three stages of Schutz’s model. These characteristics, which were ideal types of each stage, were used to measure how my interviewees fit into the model. Based on these characteristics, none of my participants fit into the categories of “disinterested observer” and “full member.” While all of my interviewees came to America with knowledge of the culture, omitting them from the first category, the applicability and usefulness of that knowledge often became a challenge. Additionally, none of my research participants could be classified as “full members” either. Most were living a cultural duality. Although some were attempting to become more American, none of my interviewees had fully assimilated and, more telling, few expressed a desire to assimilate.

\(^5\) All names mentioned in this study will be pseudonyms.
“Knowing it and feeling it is different”

The “disinterested observer” of Schutz’s (1944) model is based on cultural knowledge which is “a subject matter of his thought” (p. 503). In other words, cultural knowledge is not experienced as a “disinterested observer;” it only exists as a hypothetical reality. It is only when the stranger moves into the realm of a “would-be member” that the cultural knowledge becomes a “segment of the world which has to be dominated by actions” (Schutz 1944:503). In my interviews, the cultural knowledge which my participants possessed existed in both a hypothetical world and a lived reality. This is because, unlike Schutz’s conception of the disinterested observer, which is someone who is a disinterested observer while in the new group already, my interviewees expressed the characteristics of a disinterested observer before their migration experience. That is, American culture existed to them as a matter of thought. Yet, I would argue that once that decision to migrate was made, that hypothetical reality became very much lived as their actions began to reflect their impending departure from their home country.

However, while they began to encounter American cultural patterns and those patterns entered their lives, their interactions were still mediated because they still were only interacting with America through certain channels (Internet, TV). A comparison could be drawn with someone using the program Google Earth. I can use the street view option to place myself on the street of almost any city in the world and feel like I am there. I can feel like I am going to and experiencing and learning about a new place. However, it is an illusion of sorts because, while I am to an extent experiencing a new place, my experience is mediated by the Internet and I am unable to interact with that
environment. Yet for some of my interviewees, the feeling of gaining cultural knowledge through TV and the Internet was both real and perceived as useful.

The prevalence and consumption of American media prior to the migration experience was widely discussed among my participants. Roshi,\(^6\) for example, commented that she “used to watch American movies and listen to American songs.” And Roshan\(^7\) commented that he “watched more American TV in Nepal than Nepalese TV [because it was] just [my] preference.” He added it was because “I never liked Nepalese movies and music.” However, even though he watched many American TV shows and movies, he explains that, “I never thought about the culture until I got here. . . when I got here I think it changed [me].” Although he asserts that having watched so much American media has indeed prepared him for his life in America. On the other end of the spectrum, though, is Junyong\(^8\) who, prior to migrating to America, “searched for information [by] reading books” on American culture and life. However, she concedes, “It didn’t help. [Information was] difficult to find.”

In another conversation with Trikal,\(^9\) I asked how he had prepared for life in America. He explained to me, “In Kathmandu, you have a library, USIS\(^{10}\) in Kanachur, that’s an American library that’s open by the American embassy. If you go out there they will give you information about the American culture. Like if you want to learn about the

---

\(^{6}\) 20 year old Nepalese student from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2008. Interview conducted 1/17/2011.

\(^{7}\) 35 year old Nepali from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2003. Interview recorded 1/15/2011.

\(^{8}\) 41 year old Korean woman from Seoul who has been living in America since 2000. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.

\(^{9}\) 21 year old student from Pokhara, Nepal who has been living in America since 2009. Interview recorded 1/11/2011.

\(^{10}\) United States Immigration Services
United Kingdom, then you go to British councils and if you want to know about United States then you go to USIS. So, yeah, I went there. And I had some idea about that. And moreover, in Nepal the Hollywood movies reach us out there; watching Hollywood movies. Like, in Nepal you have the American channels, too. We watch that. So it wasn’t that difficult [to adjust].” When asked if he had experienced any culture shock, Trikal continued, “I knew it [was coming], but knowing it and feeling it is different. I knew that, but when I came out here, for a couple of weeks it was difficult but after that I got used to it.” Trikal’s account is interesting because he mentions getting information from the American library in Nepal, but then he explains that he also watched American movies and television. He is putting the view from the media and the view from the American embassy library on the same level of importance as tools for having prepared him for a smooth transition into American society.

The globalization of media has reached into almost every corner of the world, even among the small villages. Bimal,11 who was born and raised in a very small village in Nepal which, according to him, was so remote, “[f]rom the nearest transportation site, you have to walk about five, six, seven hours on foot, walking up and down the hills.” However, on his last visit to Nepal he went back to his small village and described what he saw:

But now, last year I went to the same countryside, most of my family lives in the city, but I just wanted to go look around the countryside where I was born and raised, so when I went over there then I saw almost everybody carrying a cell phone – almost everybody. I couldn’t imagine that. . . . And they have televisions.

11 43 year old professor from a rural village in Nepal who has been living in America since 1999. Interview recorded 12/21/2010.
They watch BBC, CNN, and it’s still the countryside. So much has been changed in just about seven or eight years. My grandma, who is almost like 20 years older than my mom, who is now about 80-something, she lives in the same village and she talks about CNN and BBC. She uses a cell phone. And both of these ladies were illiterate.

The transformation and introduction of global media and technology into his village has, according to him, changed the people of that village. They are now discussing and commenting on news from around the world which they are exposed to through satellite television and Internet access on their cell phones.

However, it is not just the prevalence of American media which matters. Rather, it was the cultural knowledge which my participants were taking away from that media. For example, Aakash\textsuperscript{12} shared a story which illustrates this point. During his time studying at college, he spent one year living with five American female roommates, though, he never told his parents about it:

I don’t know [why], I just didn’t want them to be worried about it you know, [because] it’s just like when I grew up to, we grew up watching the Hollywood movies back home. And you have this stereotyping American woman to be wild, that’s how they portray them in movies and stuff. So when I came in that’s what I was thinking too, it’s going to be all wild and everything. But I came down, nope it’s not like that. There’s people just like us, like really – and there’s

\textsuperscript{12} 26 year old male Nepalese student from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2003. Original interview conducted 3/3/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 12/13/2010.
people that where the rules and regulations are so strict, it’s like amazing, it’s like, wow. So I assumed if I tell my parents they won’t be happy. . . .

His image, his reserve of cultural knowledge of how American college women act was shaped dramatically by media he says. However, his lived experience was very different and surprising to him. However, because his parents have not experienced that cultural knowledge, he fears he cannot tell them because they would pass judgment on him based on the mediated cultural knowledge.

Some of my participants, however, did not specifically cite any source of American cultural knowledge which they had relied on before they came. Instead, they had assumed that they could easily transition to an American lifestyle without preparation. Kishan,\(^{13}\) for example, had never visited America and did not have family living in America before he came to study at college. Yet according to him, “Nepal has changed a lot. So we have both the Western culture and the traditional culture. But the traditional culture is more preferable to me than the Western culture. . . . There is no difference between American and Nepali culture [now]. There is no difference.” He did not have to prepare, in other words, for life in America because he has already been conditioned for a Western way of life simply through the prevalence of Western influences in Nepal now.

Similarly, another Nepalese, Bimal, who had never visited America prior to migrating, recalled of his first experience coming to America that it was “Nothing new because I knew a lot about this country, about this people. I basically, some of these social issues I was not really familiar with, but in terms of place, people. . . . I think I was pretty comfortable with what I was going to see. It is because of my study of America

---

\(^{13}\) 53 year old professor of geography from a rural part of Nepal who has been living in America since 1995. Interview recorded 12/15/2010.
and also about working with Americans for nearly about 10 years [with USAID].\textsuperscript{14} So I saw Americans with so many different tastes and abilities and all that stuff. That gave me some idea about what it’s going to be like.”

I would argue that the “disinterested observer” in the Schutzian sense does not exist among my interviewees, yet a form of the disinterested observer still persists. In Schutz’s model, the image of the approached group exists and originates in his/her own group. Based on my interviews, this is still the case, yet more and more the image of the approached group is originating from the approached group itself via global media.

Schutz (1944) writes:

“[T]he ready-made picture of the foreign group subsisting within the stranger's home-group proves its inadequacy for the approaching stranger for the mere reason that it has not been formed with the aim of provoking a response from or a reaction of the members of the foreign group. The knowledge which it offers serves merely as a handy scheme for interpreting the foreign group and \textit{not as a guide for interaction} between the two groups. Its validity is primarily based on the consensus of those members of the home group who do not intend to establish a direct social relationship with members of the foreign group” (P. 503, emphasis mine).

This still seems to be the case. Even though the knowledge and view of the approached group now emanates more from the approached group itself and less from the members of the original group as Schutz discusses, the knowledge coming from the approached group is still knowledge which cannot be used as a guide for interaction.

\textsuperscript{14} USAID is the United States Agency for International Development.
The question is whether someone with inutile cultural knowledge can be said to be participating in American culture. If an immigrant migrates with a type of cultural knowledge which turns out to be less than useful in everyday life and interactions, as was the case with Aakash, can that person be said to be a disinterested observer still? Among my participants, those two who commented that they had no problem adjusting to life in America were the same who had prolonged contact with Americans in their home country through USAID and Peace Corps prior to migrating. However, even those who did not have constant contact with Americans before migrating commented that media did make them feel more prepared. Does exposure to media and information from the approached group (in this case, America) enable a potential migrant to feel that they will be able to slip into the flow of society easily? For some it did enable them to feel like they were participants in American culture before they arrived. However, in some cases it appears to be constraining this ability to adjust because they are unexpectedly presented with something unfamiliar. They feel lost because they thought they knew what to expect and that reality is different from the expectation. In other words, they illustrated Schutz’s original conception of the disinterested observer who finds their cultural knowledge about the approached group unsatisfactory once immersed in that group. However, for the majority of those in my study, their role of a disinterested observer is different than Schutz’s original concept. Schutz (1944) writes of the disinterested observer, “The stranger, therefore, approaches the other group as a newcomer in the true meaning of the term. At best he may be willing and able to share the present and the future with the approached group in vivid and immediate experience; under all circumstances, however, he remains excluded from such experiences of the past” (p. 502). In this case, through
access to American culture, strangers are now able to share in the past with Americans. Strangers and Americans can share similar events and certain elements of popular culture together. However, in lived out experiences, it seems media has the ability to do away with disinterested observers, but the key factor in whether it eliminates the strangerness of the immigrant or not seems to lay in the personality of the person; in whether or not that person is able to pick out the cultural components of a media piece and what is being used as an exaggeration.

“I am happy I am in-between”

Along with the reconceptualization of the “disinterested observer,” I also witnessed a lack of “full members” among my interviewees. For Schutz, full membership is a sea change in the “thinking as usual” of the stranger. To become a full member, the stranger begins to doubt the cultural knowledge about the world that they were taught. As that knowledge shows itself to be inutile, Schutz’s stranger discards it in order to adopt the knowledge of the new group. Among my interviewees, I witnessed a lack of “full members;” that is, a lack of discarding original cultural knowledge in order to operate within an American context. Instead, my interviewees were attempting to live both cultures and utilize both sets of cultural knowledge in their daily lives. Instead of having to choose one culture over the other, my participants have been enabled to live a “contrapuntal” identity.

Instead of a bicultural identity, a hybrid or contrapuntal identity better describes the lived experience of identity among my participants. “Biculturality” limits identity to only two associations. Furthermore, biculturality is less descriptive compared to contrapuntality, which, as Edward Said (2000) describes, “Most people are principally
aware of one culture, one setting, one home; exiles are aware of at least two, and this plurality of vision gives rise to an awareness of simultaneous dimensions, an awareness that – to borrow a phrase from music – is contrapuntal (p. 186, emphasis original). Said (2000) continues, “For an exile, habits of life, expression, or activity in the new environment inevitably occur against the memory of these things in another environment. Thus both the new and the old environments are vivid, actual, occurring together contrapuntally” (p. 186). Though Said is principally applying his concept of contrapuntality to exiles, the same concept may be applied to the participants in my research.

Kishan provided an example of contrapuntality, explaining, “No, I am not [assimilating]. I am not, but at the same time what I am doing is that I am trying to bridge between the American culture and the Nepali culture. And I am respecting both the cultures together at the same time. . . . Human beings are born just for one purpose – that is what you can contribute to the community and to the world. That is the common goal of the human beings. . . . I am happy I am in-between. I am trying to bring that, my own culture with the American culture. I can adapt in the American culture, at the same time when I go back to my own culture, and I assimilate there; doing that I would have big disadvantage.” Kishan’s description of trying to “bridge” American and Nepali culture illustrates the vividness and actualness of his identity; that he is not choosing one over the other, but instead attempting to live both simultaneously, or contrapuntally.

However, the contrapunital identity among my interviewees was less of a proud statement of cultural pluralism. Rather, it seemed to present itself more as a contradiction; my participants attempting to hold on to their cultural identity while
simultaneously trying to function in American society. Though for some of my participants, a contrapuntal identity came less from a desire to move towards a new way of life and more from a loss of the old. For example, Heeson15 explained, “[Korean] language loss makes me feel half-half.”

One of my participants, Sanjay,16 took one of the firmest stands on his identity, saying “I am American. . . . I don’t feel Nepalese.” He even stated “This is my country. I don’t belong there [Nepal].” However, he also mentioned right after that, “but the culture can’t be changed.” He explains that he is a different type of American in the same way that Americans from Texas and Americans from California are both Americans but may not have much in common. So on the one hand, Sanjay is saying he is American and not Nepalese, but at the same time his Nepalese culture cannot be changed; it is who he is no matter what.

Other interviewees were more mixed on their perceptions of becoming Americans or not. In fact, there was only one interviewee, Hyemi,17 who said she felt like she was becoming American and “It’s a good thing for me.” All others were more nuanced in their expressions of a contrapuntal identity and the amount or lack of movement towards assimilating. For instance, one Nepalese student, Lilly,18 explained “I think I have changed a lot, because, well, back home I was with my parents all the time; I was living with them. . . . Here I stay in an apartment by myself, pay my rent, work.” Although this

---

15 44 year old Korean woman from a rural village who has been living in America since 2008. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.
16 54 year old Nepalese from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 1993. Interview conducted 12/17/2010.
17 51 year old Korean woman from Seoul who has been living in America since 2000. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.
18 21 year old Nepalese student from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2009. Interview conducted 1/18/2011.
change has not been a deep cultural change, “No, I don’t think [I am assimilating].
Maybe in some ways, in like work and stuff. But I’ve only been here for two years, so not really that long.” Additionally, Roshan said on whether he felt he was becoming more American, “No, it’s just the lifestyle. You feel like you have to fit in where you live in, you have to follow the lifestyles too. I think I’m still Nepali.” Though he adds, “I would like to learn more American culture, but still follow my own traditions.”

Another Nepalese, Anuj19 commented on if he is becoming more American, saying, “Yes and no. Yes in the sense I lived here for so long, I do almost everything a middle-class American does. So in that sense yes. But in the sense of, if I have been able to blend-in in the society – no. I have not been able to blend in.” Asked what has stopped him from being able to blend in, he replied:

I would say a lot of things, a lot of cultural things. Cultural, language, probably I’m still not really fluent in the language. . . . Cultural, religious. I’m not a Christian so I don’t go to church. If I meet someone you need to know some of their religious cultural background to move the discussion forward. So you always find somewhere you can’t do that. I don’t feel like it is possible to completely blend in. Having said that, whether that is really a big factor to be a part of the society – I don’t think so. I think that I am already a part of the American society.

Anuj is describing what I would call a “middle-of-the-road” stance on identity. The “middle-of-the-road” stance was also expressed by Kim.20 He said:

19 43 year old Nepalese from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 1999. Interview conducted 12/11/2010.
20 32 year old Korean professor from Seoul who has been living in America since 2005. Interview conducted 12/16/2010.
I think [I’m assimilating]. And now that I have a daughter who goes to school here, it’s only daycare now, so I’m getting much more used to the American lifestyle. Like, for instance, having a conference with teachers and volunteering for some school work and participating in some community work. So because of my daughter I think I am beginning; the assimilation process is getting much faster in a sense. . . . In terms of cultural assimilation, I think school plays a huge role. And I think Internet plays a huge role too. Because, so, when we were asked to attend the teacher conference, that’s something we’ve never done before. So what I did was just Google what they do in different schools because people post their experience online. . . . And that really helped me prepare for some of the things that I hadn’t experienced before.” Although he feels he is assimilating and learning how to act more “American,” he remains hesitant to a degree. “To a certain degree you want to be assimilated fully or assimilated to the community. But at the same time you want to keep your own identity, your heritage. . . .

In Kim’s case, the Internet is acting as a tool for cultural learning. Due to the fact that Kim has only recently moved to the area and has not had time to build relationships with other people, Korean or otherwise, he is relying on online information in order to know how to act; how to fit in.

In these three instances, my participants discussed any changes which they have experienced as surface changes; that the ways in which they have changed are ways just to make them fit in, but as a person they still are the same. They do not view their identity as in conflict with their location or way of life. Their contrapuntal identity is occurring as a result of meeting the new society half way. There were still areas where their deep
cultural values and thinking were not being changed by their new geographical location. For example, Anuj feels comfortable living in America, but does not feel “at home.” He says, “Personally, for me, I still feel. . . no matter where you live, right, where you grew up, you can never forget. . . .” In other words, wherever you go, you always carry your culture with you and you cannot change that. Other interviewees discussed similar feelings. For example, Dahyun\(^{21}\) commented, “I don’t know their [American] minds. I know what Koreans think and feel.” In other words, she feels she cannot relate to Americans like she can Koreans. For Lilly, “Some things are in common, like student life everyone is the same – study, work. But culturally, we are different. We were raised different.” Araju\(^{22}\) also mentioned, “I think we have a difference in thinking. If I see my neighbor come out, I never see them playing outside.” Roshi gave an example as well:

“I’d say probably the way they (Americans) think and the way I think – some are the same but some are not the same, you know? Like I have this co-worker, she is an American, she is from St. Louis and she hates her parents. I’m like, “Why are you saying that?” Me and my brother were so close – it might be different for everybody, but does not like her family at all. I don’t know why is that. You know what I am saying? . . . That kind of surprises me. How can you just hate your own sibling?

My participants were making a distinction between being able to function in a new society and adopting that society’s “thinking as usual.”

\(^{21}\) 44 year old Korean woman from Seoul who has been living in America since 2005. Interview recorded 12/19/2010.

\(^{22}\) 41 year old Nepalese from Kathmandu who has been living in American since 2003. Interview recorded 12/16/2010.
“Fitting in” was a prominent theme among my participants. During a visit\textsuperscript{23} to a local Korean church, the pastor was preaching on perseverance. During his sermon he said, “You may feel like you’ve not learned English very well. . . . But like the ant if you keep going you will be successful.” While his sermon was on perseverance, the choice of example is interesting because it is clearly directed towards the needs or wants of his congregation (made up almost exclusively of Korean immigrants). If he is preaching to keep persevering and keep learning English, then it is a desire some in his congregation have expressed. As Bimal explained his point of view on fitting in, saying, “I look at it this way. To some extent, yes [I am acting more American] because without that I cannot function. Because without that I will be singled out. Because without that I would, somebody would point finger to me. . . . But fully assimilated – impossible.”

However, Bimal continued, offering a noteworthy example of the dichotomy between a surface change and a deep cultural change in his story going out to eat at a restaurant:

I’ll give you one very nice example. Most of the Nepalese, I don’t know if you have interviewed Nepali Hindus, but you are likely to find Buddhist Nepali also. A lot of time there’s no distinction between Buddhists and Hindus among the Nepalese. It is the same thing almost. You can be a Buddhist, you also call yourself a Hindu. . . . Have you even been to one of those Japanese steam houses in the city where they burn fire in the dining places? Have you even been to one of those? They call it *teppenyaki*, that is the Japanese word. So I don’t think I can go to one of those *teppenyaki* [restaurants] and eat dinner with one of my friends, whoever

\textsuperscript{23} Observation conducted 12/5/2010.
it is: Nepali or American. You ask me why – because they bring all those foods
together: chicken, shrimp, steak and another food whatever that is. And they cook
that food in front of you. So now the problem for me is they can that cow meat
over here in one corner, they have chicken in the other corner. If I go with you,
you’ll like cow meat. That is okay with me, if you love it, enjoy it. I cannot eat
cow meat because I am Hindu. And now I have my chicken but the problem they
are the same spoon and forks. They have cow then chicken. I cannot eat that as
long as I see that. If somebody is cooking inside and bringing it – I don’t care.
Because if I give up all these things, maybe they have used the same fork and
spoon, I cannot survive in this country. . . . *You try to compromise in certain
things, but you cannot cross certain [barriers]. But personally [there are] a
couple of things I cannot compromise.* I think eating cow meat. That is
something. . . it is not about – as I told you I go to temple two or three times a
year, so I am not that deep into religion, but I don’t know if that makes sense to
you? For example, I know meat is meat, whatever it is – cow, dog, chicken,
turkey. My mom’s flesh is also meat. I know that. I mean if I cook my mom’s
flesh with barbecue sauce and all that I know it pretty much tastes the same just
like all the meat. Can I eat that? I cannot as long as I know that is my mom’s flesh.
So cow is something like that to me, if that makes sense to you. I mean, even if I
eat and afterwards somebody tells me, “You ate cow meat,” maybe now kill me.
Probably I’ll feel something really bad about it. But I know wherever I go inside
the kitchen they use the same spoon and same fork and same knife. I know it is
going on (emphasis mine).
Bimal is only able to compromise so much of his “thinking as usual” before it is too much for him and that boundary has been breached.

In addition to not fully taking on the American thinking as usual, my participants did not feel pressure to do so. As Kim responded:

Not really. Back in ‘70s and ‘80s, what the Korean immigrants would do was they wouldn’t – they would speak Korean at home but they wouldn’t let their children speak Korean. So they would ask them to speak English only because they thought that getting assimilated you had to be able to speak English without any accent and fluently to get assimilated faster into the society. That was their mindset in the ‘70s and ‘80s. But now it’s different. The parents are becoming more patient so they will just wait for their children to become more familiar with both languages. The research shows that the kids who are bilingual take more time to learn both languages. . . but most of the parents are aware of that and more patient. So my daughter, she turns three and I’m not really concerned about her picking up language late compared to her peers.

Among my participants, all of whom were first-generation immigrants, the trend leans towards embracing a contrapuntal identity rather than attempting to assimilate fully.

Whether this holds or continues in the second generation is beyond the scope of my research and would require a longitudinal study not permitted by time. Though, it appears the trend is switching to one where cultural pluralism is encouraged among their children. Kim, for example, said “I haven’t really talked about it with my wife yet, but we will try to make [our daughter] bilingual. We will definitely try to keep her heritage alive because my parents live back in South Korea so that means my daughter’s grandparents and other
relatives are in South Korea. So it’s very important she keeps this Korean identity with her. But at the same time, once she grows up it’s really up to her to decide whether she pursues the all-American way of life or if chooses to she could always learn more about her Korean heritage. She can always visit her grandparents.” His daughter’s name is a mix between an English first name and a Korean name. He explains, “[Her Korean name is] a name given by her grandfather, but we didn’t really impose [on] her identity. So that’s why we use Rebecca, westernized name, as her first name. If she decides to use her Korean name, it’s really her choice. That’s why we gave her a Korean name as a middle name.”

Bimal also plans to expose his daughter to Nepali culture and language. According to him, the time he spends with other Nepalese immigrants is more for his daughter’s benefit: “I do [spend time with Nepalese], but now the priority are changing. We have a smaller one. We are more focused about her upbringing. We are trying to have a balance for her so that she will have good amount of time spent with Nepali friends, girls of her age so that they will have something in common, speaking Nepali dialect. And also American friends so that she’ll have better understanding of the other part. So even when we get invited or even when we invite friends, Nepalese friends and families these days, I think the primary focus is who has the kids just like ours of the same age.”

He also expressed criticism for other Nepalese families’ motivations for teaching Nepali to their children. This criticism is grounded in his belief that his daughter should be explicitly bicultural, and that a bicultural identity is stronger and more important for her than an only Nepali or only American identity. He said:
I have seen a lot of my Nepalese friends who want to teach Nepalese to their kids
tell their kids “This is where we came from. This is our language. So you must
know that because that is what your dad is about, that is what your mom about.”
And for me that is not good enough [of an] explanation to convince these kids to
learn Nepali. Who cares? I mean, OK! That is your language, you came from that
one, but I do live in a different reality. I mean I have no friends in my space who
speaks or understand what you are talking about. You are just at home for
breakfast or lunch or dinner. Most of my time I spend with them. So what I am
trying to do and why I think it is important [to teach my daughter Nepalese] is
research one after the other has proven that the more access, the more
understanding, of multiple languages is good influence for a growing up mind.
You know, many more languages that only help you, it does not hurt you. And I
want Nepali to be fun. I am not telling her “This is your mom’s language, please.”
No. I mean, even if she cannot speak Nepali, she can communicate with all my
family members. All my family members that she needs to talk [to], basically
speak and understand English. So that is not a problem at all.

It is not only language and heritage which my participants were mindful of sharing with
their children. Many have taken, or want to take, their children on visits back to their
country as a way of exposing their children to their “original” way of life. As Araju
commented, “I would always like for [my daughter] to go and see how things are done
over there. It’s totally different.”

Similar to other parents’ ideas of not forcing their children to learn Nepali or
Korean, during visits to Nepal, Anuj allows his children to either love Nepal or hate it.
He says, “The elder one reacts differently than the younger one [when we go back to Nepal]. Elder one when we always go there, she likes very much. The younger one, no, she doesn’t like it there. Everybody has different value, right, like for example, my elder one likes when we go over there we have our relatives, our families are still there. They come and they actually give attention, right? She likes that kind of stuff. Younger one has a different value, like if you go there you got like all kinds of facilities, you know you have car you have everything. . . roads are clean. I mean go back there and [it’s] completely different. You won’t find the cleanness there; you don’t have a car you have to walk. So every individual has their own value.”

Towards a Sojourner-Orientation

Instead of fully assimilating, what I saw among my interviewees resembled more closely Uriely’s (1994) conception of the permanent sojourner orientation discussed in Chapter 2. However, one difference from Uriely’s permanent sojourner among my participants is that displays of ethnicity could not be considered rhetorical. Whereas the Jewish immigrants in Uriely’s study expressed their ethnicity only in terms of being familiar with the news from Israel, my interviewees lived their ethnicity as a part of their everyday life. It was a cornerstone for many of my participants to build their identity on.

The sojourner-orientation leaves the stranger living in a limbo state; they never planned to stay, yet they remain, like Bimal, “I never thought of spending this many years in Kansas City or in America. I never thought that way. Never, not even a single second.” Although, for the permanent sojourner, there is always vague plans to go back “someday.” As Anuj explained his ideas about returning to Nepal, “Not now, but you never know, you know? It depends upon how you will end up, you know? Now I have a job, I can
earn and I can live here. But tomorrow if I don’t have a job, I ultimately have to go somewhere and I may end up back home again, who knows. That’s my philosophy.” Kim echoed this sentiment, saying, “It depends on how [our daughter] handles her schooling and stuff. And, of course, it depends on my career as well. If I can gather a good career going here in the US, I don’t see any reason to go back.” Park is leaving it up to a higher power, saying that whether he stays or returns to Korea is up to God.

In keeping with the sojourner-orientation, most of my research participants came to complete a task; a task either for themselves or for their children. For most of my participants, that task was to study, get their degree, and then return home, as in Araju’s case: “The main reason for me coming here is to study, get a degree and go back home. Maybe after finishing my studies, I start applying [for] jobs, let’s see how it goes. Then once you get a job and they say ‘We want you to work,’ and that’s how it goes, just keep on dragging, dragging. So my original plan was to come here, study, get a degree and go back home. . . . I’m just tangled in the web. You start getting social security, then you start getting credit card payments, all this mess. And I went into more entangled, tangled, tangled. So there is no coming out of that web. It will be very hard for me to come out.”

When interviewing my participants who were currently students, it appears they were also on track to follow in the same direction. Tommy, who said he initially was not going to stay in America, now says, “I wish I could live here if I get a job, so I can find a job. but I dunno what, I haven’t decided my major yet, but I wish I work in like
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24 48 year old Korean from a rural village in Korea who has been living in America since 2005. Interview conducted 12/5/2010.
25 21 year old male Korean student from a rural village who has been living in America since 2006. Original interview conducted 2/23/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 1/21/2011.
medical field, dentistry field, you know, so if I be like nurse or pharmacy, I stay here, but if I be like dentist or kinda mechanic medical stuff, I’ll definitely go back to Korea, work in Korea. But it really depends on my job. Either I really work in like a medical field.”

And for other students, even those who discussed how much they want to return home, have mentioned they are not sure now. Roshi, for example, said, “I want to go home. I really miss my family.” I followed that up by asking if she is planning to return to Nepal after graduation. She answered, “No, I’ll probably try to look for jobs. And if I don’t, then yeah, I’ll probably go home. I need some experience working here so I can use it back home too.” Aakash mentioned a similar point-of-view:

I’m planning actually to like work, you know, like get some experience and if I really like it, I think I don’t mind staying. But at the same time I don’t mind going back home either. . . . At least I have an option, so that is good. But definitely I’d like to get some experience before I go home, you know with just college school credit, you know, even with the hands on training it’s not a lot of experience. And especially back home there’s not a lot of airlines so it’s really competitive so all the students basically go abroad to get study, you know, work and come back. So for me I have more chances of getting a job here than back home.

The same path was taken by Anuj:

I didn’t come here to migrate also. I got a scholarship for two years. So my plan was to complete that and go back again. So I never intended to stay here initially.” When asked what changed, he replied, “First thing is the job. I got a job and you start getting money, right, and you start feeling the life of here, right? And then, still even if you ask me, I still . . . today if I want to decide I’d probably go back
again. I don’t really like to stay here forever. What changes is the kids. After you’ll have a kid, that changes the whole thing. Because kids will start growing up here, they will. . . you know I have now 12 year old daughter, my elder one is 12 years and 8 years old and we just had another baby which is 9 months. So after you have a kid then it’s not. . . you have to decide for everyone, right.

Although in this excerpt, Anuj also touches on the second tasks which many of my participants mentioned – the education of their children.

Even when one of my participants was not here for any personal job to complete, for example if they followed their husband or wife in migrating, the education of their children became the task that must be seen through to the end. As Junyong illustrates, “[My] husband and I just endure for my kids so they don’t study too hard.” Indeed, her and her Korean husband “always talk about going back to Korea,” she says. However, she says they will stay here at least five more years because their children will finish school in that time. Additionally, Dahyun remarked that she does not like the “pushy Korean education system” and wants to return to Korea after 10 years; again, because that is when her children will finish their secondary education.

Kishan took his task of overseeing his children’s education to include, not just his children, but also the other Nepalese students at the university where he teaches at. In his view:

After finishing the education of my children, yes. I would [go back to Nepal] and do some social services and open some schools in the rural areas. That is the service I want to provide.” Kishan also views himself as a guardian to the Nepalese students on campus. “Yes, I am their guardian. . . . It happened and I
don’t mind doing that. Because the way, when I came in here, the difficulties I faced – I didn’t want other people to face the same difficulties that I did. . . . If they need food I will help them out, if they need a ride I will help them out. . . . I have brought these students from Nepal, these Nepali students and also my children are going to school and leaving them to go back home would be very difficult. So I am bound because of the family and the cultural ties. My niece and nephew are here. . . and their education would be jeopardized if I just leave them in the middle.

Though I argue that my interviewees exhibit characteristics of the permanent sojourner, I do not think all of them are permanent sojourners. Certainly some would fit into that category perfectly. Yet others are quite at home in America and are permanent settlers, not sojourners. With that difference, however, the settlers and sojourners exhibit similar contrapuntal identities. Instead, that the permanent sojourner ideal type is the best theoretical frame to understand the bicultural identity as an in-between state; one foot in each culture so to speak, instead of fully embracing one culture.

PHYSICAL/EMOTIVE DISTANCE AND PROXIMITY

As my participants are enabled to live their contrapuntal identity and feel they are not pressured to assimilate, they are, instead, displaying characteristics which are more indicative of sojourners, in particular Uriely’s permanent sojourners, though without demonstrating rhetorical ethnicity. As sojourners, who are return-minded, they need to maintain ties to their home country and community. Whereas the reconceptualization of disinterested observers and full members was consistent between Korean and Nepalese immigrants in my study, the methods my participants utilized in order to maintain that
home connection was heavily reliant on new globalized communication technology. And as such, differences along the lines of the digital divide began to show themselves between the Koreans and Nepalese. These differences manifested themselves, not only in how my participants contacted home, but also in how they thought about how near or far home was from them.

The Backward Gaze

I am adopting the phrase “backward gaze” from Hiller and Franz’s article (2004) to discuss the ways in which my participants developed and maintained their ties to home. In keeping with the sojourner-leaning orientation, which I argued is more indicative of my participants, a backward gaze is important because sojourners are return-minded. Additionally, staying current on news and events from one’s home country also represents a piece in the maintenance of one’s contrapuntal identity, which I also argued for. While all of my participants used technology to connect to their home country, the differences in access and infrastructure had consequences for the psychological and emotional attachments to home and place for my participants.

There were several different ways in which my interviewees “did” their backward gaze. Watching satellite television was common. Kim explains “We have the DISH Network and it has one of the Korean channels. So my wife and I would watch it. . . . The station is called KBS International. KBS is one of the major media in South Korea, like ABC, NBC in the US. It is targeted specifically for audience overseas. So they will sometimes show some Korean shows. But it will also have English captions on the bottom. . . . I watch HBO and Showtime and other channels too.” I spoke with many Korean immigrants who also had the Korean channels on their satellite TV. Along with
the Korean channels, called the “Tiger Pack,” there is also a Nepali package called the “Kantipur Pack,” along with packages with content from many different countries and languages.\textsuperscript{26} Although none of my Nepali interviewees mentioned having Nepali TV from their satellite provider.

Many of my interviewees said they watched most of the television from their home country online. Junyong keeps in touch with Korean pop culture through downloading and watching Korean TV on the Internet, “almost three hours a day,” according to her. The ability for her to, as she says, “know about which Korean stars is famous, which style is good” is a strong part of her emotional tie back to Korea. According to Anuj, “You can watch almost everything in the Internet as if you are there in Nepal. Whatever my family can watch on the TV, we can watch through the Internet. But we don’t have the time to watch, but if you want to, you can. There is a video-streaming device which you can install which will broadcast all the local channels from back home. The Earth is very small, you know.” Chloe\textsuperscript{27} also said “I saw Korean program by using Internet or YouTube. [I watch Korean TV] more than when I was in Korea. It’s crazy. When I was in Korea I never saw TV, but in here I saw everything.” Chloe also elaborated that watching Korean TV online is a community activity in some instances. “Even yesterday we did it, we saw [Korean TV program] together in one room and talk[ed] about it. Really funny.” Additionally, Trikal mentioned “There is a site called canadanepal.net and I use that more often [to watch Nepalese dramas].”

\textsuperscript{26} http://www.dishnetwork.com/international/default.aspx
\textsuperscript{27} 22 year old female student from the capital of Korea, Seoul who has been living in America since 2008. Original interview conducted 3/22/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 12/19/2010.
Along with keeping up on entertainment, staying current on news from home was another way in which my interviewees practiced the backward gaze. Reading and staying current on news allowed some of my participants to feel like they were back in Korea, as Kim explains, “Every time I hear some news about South Korea, I try to think [about] it in perspective of a person who is living in South Korea. I will call my parents and ask them how they are doing and ask them is it really serious as it’s depicted on CNN or is it just an exaggeration.” For others, such as Chloe, “[I read Korean news] everyday! Even I know more than my family, my friends.” And Trikal explained how he gets his news, “In Nepal, like I didn’t have to look at the website. I used to get the paper at home. I used to read from the paper. Now I have to go to the website and read it. American news, I used to go to the website and read it and now it’s like I do the same thing. It’s not that different. I think it’s the same thing.” Furthermore, Kishan mentioned that he will “watch news on the computer. It is more accessible and easily accessible and very updated. . . . News from Nepal and worldwide, actually. BBC, I listen to BBC everyday and after this interview I will listen to BBC. There is a Nepali version of the BBC that is broadcasted from Nepal and so I listen to that.” BBC in Nepali was popular with Shyam also mentioning that “Once a day before I sleep I go to the BBC website to listen to the news.”

Although there was one of my participants who felt that News from Nepal was not necessarily relevant to him while he is living outside of Nepal. Araju, explained, “If I watch the TV, you know, the TV always shows about US news. . . . It depends, but I normally go online to check news, if it’s online, you know like CNN.com, then it’s 90%
American news. (Me: Do you still read Nepalese news?) Occasionally. I used to when I came here, at that time I used to go everyday to the news, but now I get out-of-touch with what’s happening over there. It’s the same news, the same killing, violence and protests; stone-throwing. You know, forget about it. So I stopped watching and reading the news online too much. But I know exactly what’s going on in the US.” He adds, “I think that once I go home, I’ll definitely get up to date from that point on. I’ll be disconnected from the US and all the US news won’t be that much valuable for me, like right now.” In other words, Araju feels like news from Nepal is less important, almost irrelevant to him, while he is living in America. And conversely, when and if he returns to Nepal, American news will also lose its importance. “Maybe because I’m here, right now currently in the US, so that’s why maybe I lost touch with my news from back home.” Although, while he says he does not follow the news from Nepal online, when he does call or contact his family back home, he explains that he will get news that way.

Calls and contact back home to friends and family, not only exposure to media, is where the largest differences between my Nepalese and Korean immigrants occurred. This is not surprising because all of my participants are living here and generally have good access to services like the Internet. Additionally, with the exception of a few participants who were older, most either learned how to use a computer or had one when they were young or, because of their job or being a student, have a computer and are very familiar with it. When we discuss contact to people back home, the difference in infrastructure becomes pronounced because it highlights the differences in those two countries.
Among my Korean participants, the ease of contact back home and the frequency were both high. According to Chloe, “My mother, actually not my father, my mother calls to me like three times a day every day. Wake me up kinda. She call me and “hey it’s time to go to school” kind of [laughing] She loves me very much. But I call to my parents, like, once per two days. Because they call to me every day I don’t call to them.” Tommy also spoke to his family very often, “Because we talk every day we don’t talk too long, we probably, sometimes we talk 10 minutes, sometimes we talk just 30 seconds, sometimes [we] talk one hour. My mom tries to call me every day, but if I missed it, there’s no way I could call her. If I miss it, like she, if I call her back she would be [in the] middle of working, so it was kind of tough. But since I got a cell phone and she got the cell phone we kinda feel free to talk [because] it’s free. So I can call like three times if she doesn’t get answer it. Or we can text too; Korean text.”

Among my Nepalese interviewees, the process was much more of a hassle. Shyam said, “If [my parents] call from the countryside it is really expensive, it costs like 15 rupee per minute (about 21 U.S. cents). . . . But if my brother want to call me from the city it only costs like 2 rupee. . . . So I usually call my mom and dad, but my brothers [who live in the city] call me.” The distribution of infrastructure between the rural and urban areas is shown in Shyam’s explanation. Furthermore, he adds, “Now, I have to call my mom, mom and dad. And for my brothers they are in the city area so we Skype each other and come online and chat, Yahoo and Facebook. But I have to call my dad and mom because they don’t have the Internet facilities in the countryside.” Among those Nepalese who have family in the large metropolitan areas, like Kathmandu, the
convenience is higher, though many of my interviewees cautioned that it is still less than ideal, with expensive rates, slow service and unreliable electricity.

For others who need to call back home, the inconvenience is the same. When Aakash wants to call home: “[C]alling, sometimes it just... stinks. [Because] there’s so long numbers and there’s one busy call and you have to redo the whole thing, you have to put the extension number, PIN number and the phone number... And usually the PIN numbers are so long... the 1-800 numbers are so long [if] there’s one busy signal and you have to redo it again and again...” And again, Anuj describes his troubles and the differences between contacting people in the rural areas versus those in Kathmandu, “You can get the card, the calling card. You know, for $5 we can get around 40 minutes... You can buy online. But nowadays with the Skype and all, because it’s not only my family we are talking to, my wife’s [too] and their family. So you know, every time $5, it costs a lot. So whenever they use Skype, you know, it’s free so we always sit and talk face-to-face every week... It depends where I’m calling. If I’m calling my home, they are not that computer savvy or they are not very connected. It depends where I am calling.”

The differences between the ease of contact for the Korean immigrants and the hassle for the Nepalese immigrants results in a contrast in how physical and emotive distance and proximity is perceived. The ability of Internet technologies to transcend time and space has led some to proclaim time and space irrelevant and to call it (prematurely) the “death of distance” (Hiller and Franz 2004:732). But instead of the death of distance, what we have seen is instead the transformation of distance and space (Castells 2000:696). But, there is not just one type of distance. Distance exists a priori, yet it is
also a social construction. As Bauman (1998) argues, “[I]t’s length varies depending on the speed with which it may be overcome (and in a monetary economy on the cost involved in attaining that speed)” (p. 12). Morley (2000) also describes Bauman’s argument, writing, “Bauman’s argument [is] that the very idea of that which is near is commonly associated with the familiar and reassuring world of unreflexive and unproblematic habit, a place where one seldom feels at a loss or uncertain how to act. The far away, by contrast, often connotes a space of anxiety and hesitation…” (p. 183). What is far and what is near depends less on the physical measurements of distance such as miles or kilometers, and more on how distance is conceptualized. There are at least, two ways to conceptualize distance. Both types relate to each other. There is the distance that we think about and a distance that we feel; physical distance and emotive distance.

*Physical and Emotive Distance between home and America*

As the Korean and Nepalese immigrants differed in how often they had the ability to be in contact with home; how easily they could make “virtual visits” to loved ones, they also expressed differing views on how near or far home actually was. Not surprisingly, the interviewees from Korea overall said Korea was not far away. Hawon said it most concisely, “No, Korea isn’t far. Just a phone call away.” Additionally, Chloe explained, “Right now, no, I don’t feel any distance. Even though when I go back to Korea I saw them [my friends], but I feel like I saw them yesterday.” And she also discusses if her relationship has changed with her friends back home – “I think not. I’m really sorry about because I cannot see them really often, like compared to when I was in Korea [because] I saw them every day. But here I can’t, but because we were really close,
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I have only a few friends who are really close, and I think distance doesn’t matter.” And Tommy remarked, “Sometimes my mom, once we got the Internet phone, she says it feels like [I’m] standing right next to the door.” Although for some of my Korean participants, even when they explained that Korea is not far away, distance can still be felt just because of the change of lifestyle and habits. As Heeson said, “I feel the distance being out of the loop.”

Although for Kim, distance is almost a trivial point; there are other factors which pose a larger problem than the distance: “Not really. If I want to I can always visit my family. I don’t see any obstacles. It’s not like if you’re from China or some other Middle-East countries where you have to get a visa every time you go back to your own country. But Korea is not like that. If I want to I can always visit. The problem is I have a job here and I don’t really have time to travel. And I don’t really have money.” He continues, “I mean we have family there, but we can always visit them. Doesn’t mean I have to live there in South Korea to interact with them. . . . I don’t see any good reason to move back, at least in the near future.”

Conversely, the Nepalese immigrants, with a few exceptions, described Nepal as very far away. For Aakash:

Right now [I feel] very far. [Because], like, I don’t – I hardly talk to them. . . .

Well, the thing is that I don’t talk to them a lot as I used to. [Because] one thing it’s expensive to call and have a long conversation and my mom she isn’t up to all the technology. You know like how I said earlier, she just went to school like 10th grade and she stopped and she’s a housewife so she’s not used to the computer and all this stuff. So my mom she calls me once in awhile so I would talk to them
sometimes twice a week to my mom. But my dad, he has the cell phone, so he
calls whenever he feels like it so I talk to my dad more often than my mom
[because] my dad knows how to send an email because he still works. He knows
all the computering stuff so he sends me emails regularly; he calls me often. But
to my mom I – it’s less. And most people use Skype and everything, messenger, I
don’t – like, I use with my friends to communicate with that, like messengers and
Skype, but with my family I don’t. It’s just [because] my dad is not really, like he
doesn’t use his computer a lot but he’s good enough to send email and do most of
the work but I haven’t really chat with them on the Internet or use Skype with
them. But then he often calls me though.
Aakash’s quote describes the lack of infrastructure in Nepal as well as the expense
associated with transnational communication.

Many other interviewees expressed similar sentiments: Lilly, for example, said
“Nepal is very far. . . . When I think about going back home, maybe for a vacation or
something, then I just remember it’s so far, it takes a day in an airplane to get there. So
it’s really far.” For Roshi, “Yeah, I do. Far away – it takes like 24 hours to get there. I
wish it were a little bit closer.” And Trikal said, “Yes, [Nepal] is far away.” The distance
has emotional implications as well. As Shyam said, “There are some days, it is only
before I sleep, when I’m lying on the bed and I don’t feel like sleeping. That’s the time
that I start thinking about, you know, I’m so far from my family. You know, I have to
work so hard and sometimes I cry missing my family.” And for others, like Araju, the
distance can cause emotional detachment because returning would be too troublesome,
“Ya, I feel like [Nepal] is very far away. Because even if I try to go, I have to think in
terms of three tickets, one ticket alone would cost me $1500. So for three people you have to multiply, $4500 easily, right. And then once you go home, they will think, ‘He came from United States,’ so we have to buy all the gifts now to everybody. So we have to buy gifts and then once you go there everybody will think we came from the United States so we have a lot of money and you have take them out for eating everywhere. So I have to pay that. So it’s not only the cost of tickets. I would think easily $7000 for a trip back.”

The difference in distance and emotional attachment arises between Korea and Nepal because of the difference in ease and frequency of contact. During the actual time spent talking with friends and family, there is the emotional connection which can make the distance subside. Like Roshan explained when asked if he felt Nepal was far away: “Yes, but when you talk to them on the phone or you have them online they don’t feel like they are too far away. But when you think about the distance. . . .” Additionally, Roshi said, “This is like a second-home. I have lived here for three years now and you know most of the people. When I’m walking on campus I know some of the other person there. It’s alright, it’s just that parents are not here.” Whereas many of my Korean participants could talk with their families everyday or even multiple times a day, many of the Koreans said it was once or twice a week. That time appears to make a significant difference in how close or far one feels from their home community. As Roshi described, “We keep in touch on Facebook and my brother calls me and my sisters also calls me or I call them. They know what’s going on in my life, I know what’s going on in their life. So it’s not bad.” Though she still maintains that “Yes [my family is far away] because I can’t
see them. Even though I talk to them on the phone, still I can’t see them. I can’t be like, ‘Oh, this weekend I’ll go and see my parents.’”

These quotes display the notion that perceptions of distance and ideas of what it means to be “with” someone are culturally distinct. Furthermore, they are related to familiarity with and commonness of globalized communication technology in that country. Although most of my participants practiced the “backward gaze,” none of them lived permanently in it. All of my participants still formed and participated in, though in differing amounts, their ethnic community.

EXPRESSIONS OF COMMUNITY

Communities have traditionally been linked to physical and/or emotional proximity. The existence and importance of ethnic communities is not new. Indeed, as mentioned earlier in Chapter 2, early American sociology was built heavily on the study of ethnic enclaves, particularly in Chicago. However, not all immigrant communities are the same. Additionally, among my interviewees, the presence or importance of fellow ethnic community ties do not occupy similar psychological positions. The nature of what it means to be part of a “community” has not been immune to the changes brought about by a globalizing world. Members of a community can now be widespread, having not even met each other in some cases, and be linked by common interests. However, with the rise of interest-based communities, where does that leave traditional ethnic communities?

Among the scholars noting this change is Amin Maalouf (1996/2000). In particular, his perception of two types of communities, vertical and horizontal, which are present in the global age. Maalouf (1996/2000) writes:
Each one of us has two heritages, a ‘vertical’ one that comes to use from our ancestors, our religious community and our popular traditions, and a ‘horizontal’ one transmitted to us by our contemporaries and by the age we live in. It seems to me that the latter is the more influential of the two, and that it becomes more so every day. Yet this fact is not reflected in our perception of ourselves, and the inheritance we invoke most frequently is the vertical one. This is an essential point with regard to current concepts of identity. On the one hand there is what we are in reality and what we are becoming as a result of cultural globalization: that is to say, beings woven out of many-coloured threads, who share most of their points of reference, their ways of behaving and their beliefs with the vast community of their contemporaries. And on the other hand there is what we think we are and what we claim to be: that is to say, members of one community rather than another, adherents of one faith rather than another” (P.102-103).

The vertical community, Maalouf asserts, is the community built on blood and culture, while the horizontal community is built on common interests which span the traditional divides which are found in the vertical community. In other words, the horizontal community is a community of cosmopolitans, or “citizens of the world.” Some of my interviewees illustrated the cosmopolitan orientation, seemingly transcending their culture to build relationships based on mutual interests. Among my participants, elements of the vertical community and the horizontal community were displayed.

**Horizontal Community**

The horizontal community, built on common interests, is made up of individuals toting cosmopolitan identities. Among my participants, the cosmopolitan perspective was
demonstrated as a “world citizen” identity; looking past any ethnic or cultural guises which exist to see the other person as just a person. Sanjay, for instance, when asked if most of his social circle of friends consisted of fellow Nepalese or Americans, answered, “It doesn’t matter if it’s Japanese or Chinese, I’m looking for commonalities. It doesn’t matter where we come from, just trying to choose commonness in our friends. We all are humans and all have different interests.” Additionally, Lilly expressed a similar sentiment, saying “I see the person. . . it doesn’t really matter where they are from.” However, for Roshan, he commented on whether he thought there was a difference between himself and Americans, saying “I think some of the culture wise, it’s different, but when it comes to my interest, I don’t find much of a difference.” He is acknowledging there is a difference in culture; however, personal interests are able to transcend the difference and form a mutual bond.

However, not all of my interviewees expressed such a cosmopolitan perspective, although they still resided in the horizontal community. For example, according to Roshi, most of her friends are not Nepali, “I’d say, one of my very good friends, she is from Russia. I have good American friends, too, that I hang out with.” Although, she explains “It would be nice [to have Nepali friends], like you probably have the same thoughts or you can speak in the same language and you can be more expressive. Sometimes by speaking English you can’t be that expressive.” Moreover, in the middle, or “semi-cosmopolitan,” is Chloe. According to her, her social circle is made up of mostly Koreans, but when asked if she gets along well with students from any other county, she answered “Mostly Japanese. I don’t know, but Japan is really close to Korean. I don’t know if this is why but when I’m with them I feel comfortable compared to other countries. I think
because of culture maybe.” Even though her circle of friends is widened past her national border, she still remains mostly within her geo-cultural area. In fact, she expressed the difficulty of making American friends, saying “No, almost no [American friends]. Because I’m really afraid of talking to them because I know my English skill and I’m not that brave to make mistake. So I think I’m really shy. And I think I look kind of scary, isn’t it, because of my eyes?” In both Roshi’s and Chloe’s quotes, the issue of language comes up, specifically, the inability to be as expressive in English as Nepali and Korean. However, in Chloe’s quote she brings up a race issue. It is an issue brought up in another interview with Junyong. According to her, she is not becoming more American. In fact, she feels she can’t become American, saying “I want to become American a little bit, but [I have a] different skin color.”

In these quotes, there is a breakdown of my participant’s affiliation with the horizontal community and a leaning towards the more vertical; expressing that there are certain dynamics, such as language, which can only be appreciated with other Koreans or other Nepalese.

Vertical Community

Among my participants who were the most connected to global communication technology, I was expecting to find less of a connection among the place-based ethnic community. In fact, in casual observation and conversations, I noticed, especially among current students, a rejection of the vertical community because some felt it would hurt their English study or stop them from making friends outside of their ethnic circle. Aakash mentioned this in our discussion, saying, “[Because] you know how usually like if you see an international student you see they usually hang out with other, like the same
– like students from Nepal they usually tend to just hang out with the Nepalese group. You know like from Japan – I’m not saying I don’t, but I mostly have been hanging out with American friends more than Nepalese friends. . . . I just been hanging out with a lot of American friends and I love their company too. I was just been doing sports with them, like helping them out with their – whenever they needed me.” When asked if he still spends time with other Nepalese, he replied, “Not so much. But I do make sure I’m in touch with everyone. I do still see them like once a week for sure.”

However, I was surprised to see that the elements of the vertical community persisted, even among my most cosmopolitan participants. What I observed was, instead of just residing in the vertical community or just residing in the horizontal community, my interviewees moved between the two. Though most of them seemed to prefer one over the other, there was the necessity to live in both. While Maalouf argues that the horizontal community is more influential and where “we are in reality,” the importance of people’s personal interests in forming community needs to be taken into account. What Maalouf does not mention in his short excerpt on the different forms of community is that, while the horizontal community is based on common interests and the vertical is based on culture, sometimes individual’s personal and common interests are only found in the vertical community; food, in particular, surfaced in my discussions as something which persisted as a unique interest. Indeed, when the discussions moved to the nature of spending time with other immigrants from their home country, it nearly always centered around food and the social meaning of food. As Roshi said, “I miss home and I miss the food.” Even during my visits to the Korean church, after the services there was a pot-luck lunch full of home-made Korean food.
Some of my respondents illustrated this point. Chloe described the importance food has for her in feeling comfortable outside of Korea, “Really sometimes when I want to eat some kind of food which is not sold here it kinda, at that times, I feel far away. But, food and friends and some specific place which I like, but not often.” Additionally, Bimal talked about what his motivations were for making friends with other Nepalese immigrants once he arrived in Kansas City: “For me, it was more about trying to get the chance of eating Nepali food. For me it was all about that, honestly. . . . Coming into contact with these Nepali families gave me good opportunity to have Nepali food. Obviously we helped each other. In certain ways, for example, writing, making some kind of document. These folks trying to bring their family members, they wanted me to make those kind of documents, anything that has to do with reading, writing and I helped them in that capacity. And they helped me by providing food and giving me rides.”

A large part of food’s influence in the lives of my interviewees is its basic everyday occurrence which is taken for granted. For Tommy, he will notice he is living outside of Korea “[W]henever I miss food. Ya, food is. . . like when I was there (Korea) I totally didn’t know [because] I eat food everyday but right now I knew that is the major part [because] right now I ain’t got no problem with study, friends, I mean take care of some business, solve the problem with the bank or whatever, except food. Ah food, it’s major. . . that’s the one thing I can do, I can cook, I can cook but it’s totally different taste and I can’t even buy it [because] I love seafood and here’s like. . . . Food is major thing.”

In the case of some of my other participants, there was more than food which was driving them to spend time within their ethnic community. For some, like Junyong, just being somewhat homesick was the motivation: “I miss Korean people, that’s why I’m
coming [to the Korean church].” Kim also expressed a desire to build friendships among other Koreans. He had recently moved to the area at the time of the interview, so he had not had time to establish friendships; “Other than my wife, it’s pretty much zero. I heard that there were seven or eight Korean faculties here at UCM, but I only met one and he’s in the same college as I am. . . . [W]e moved here the end of July I believe, so we really haven’t had time to socialize yet.” When asked if he wants to become closer to other Koreans on campus, he responded, “I think so, and I have jobs to do, my teaching load is very high. So I spend most of the time doing teaching related stuff. But, for my wife who stays home with a three year old daughter at home, she needs to find some friends and that is one of the reasons we are trying to move near to Kansas City this summer because, I think, Warrensburg is very rural and we want to be a little closer to the Korean community so that my wife can find some friends and my daughter can find some friends as well.” He doesn’t know any specific Koreans who live up in Kansas City, but he “just heard [from] a couple of Korean faculty members in the physical education department live in Overland Park/Kansas City, so I may even contact them and ask them if they could recommend us a good place to live.”

For many of my interviewees, their ethnic community was available to them to get help in adjusting to a new lifestyle. As in Trikal’s experience “[The Nepalese community] was really important. When I first came out here, for one or two weeks, like I was experiencing a little culture shock. I knew it was going to happen, but I felt it when I came out here. So it was hard for me to accept the life out here. I never stayed away from my parents for a long time, this is the first time I’m doing that. There were new people out here, like, in Nepal or wherever you go, I have some friends, like when I went
to Kathmandu, I had friends out there or like any of the places I have some friends out there. But when I came here everyone was strange out here. At that time I met some Nepalese people out here and they told me how the lifestyle is out here. Yeah, they help me a lot. So Nepalese people being out here, initially they help me a lot.” He goes on, “I think it’s important [to have Nepalese friends]. I mean sometimes I miss Nepal, so at that time, when those Nepalese friends are with me, they help me [and] I don’t miss Nepal that much. Like some of these stuffs are, when you talk with American friends that don’t make sense than when you talk with a Nepali that makes sense; like culture, like celebrating any festivals. . . like during the times of festivals your friends are celebrating, your friends, family in Nepal they are celebrating there, they are enjoying out there. You’d like to celebrate that festival here in America. With Nepali friends, they understand why that festival is important. I can enjoy more with them. . . . Sometimes, like during the times of festivals, when I’m missing home, if I’m with my Nepalese friends, I feel good.” Although he also expresses a cosmopolitan, horizontal perspective, saying “I feel the more variety of friends you have, like American, Japanese, the more you learn. People have different things to offer so you learn more.”

However, in Tommy’s case, though he recognizes the importance of having relationships among other Koreans, saying that “I mean it’s good to have relationship with someone while we are both in US [because] you know people get lonely and you know it’s hard to stick with the Americans [because] different culture and English barrier and kinda stuffs,” that relationship did not materialize and instead of providing help, Tommy found the Korean community to be alienating; “It was really, really hard [because] no one could help and we kind of had a trouble with the others, like no one
helped us. . . . It was really tough year.” Particularly alienating because he also felt he could not get along well with Americans or other international students, explaining that “Well sometimes there are people that hate us. . . . I mean not hate me, but they act like you guys are weird or something.”

The logistics of actually finding other immigrants were discussed in our interviews as well. Anuj represented one of the most invested in the vertical community. According to him, “[I]t was definitely very important [to live near other Nepalese people]. But it wasn’t a factor to buy a house.” When he first arrived in Kansas City, he wanted to get in contact with other Nepalese. So he resorted to the phone book, “I came here, I knew that like from your last name who are from Nepal, right. So when I came here I started looking in the Yellow Pages. The Nepalese last name that I know and I call them. I found one of the common Nepalese last name in the Yellow Pages and then I called and thats how I found. . . . I didn’t know that guy but when you start talking, you will find common things and common people.” Bimal also described how he thought Nepalese usually find fellow immigrants:

I think some idea of these people came from the contact in Nepal. For example, your family, my family, his family they are likely to come into contact in Nepal. “Oh my son also lives in Kansas City. Oh my brother, my sisters also lives other there.” And somebody will tell you, see somebody is living over there, here is the phone number, get a hold of him or her. That’s one source. . . . The other source would be the Hindu Temple. Usually Hindu’s are flexible, they can go to temple anytime they want to. . . so that is one of the places where people might have seen each other, so usually either Indian or Nepalese, are likely to be over there. Once
in awhile you might see a couple of white Americans, but not many. So probably that is one of their source. A lot of times I can tell, I can’t explain this, but I can more than 90% of the time, by looking at somebody I can tell if that person is an Indian or Nepali. For you, they may look like the same. . . . [S]o once I feel someone is not Indian, then I’m going to ask, “Where are you from?” Then the third source would be Indian groceries in the city where you are likely to find south Asian spices. So that is one of the places where you are likely to go and see somebody around. The owner would tell you, “Oh are you from Nepal? I had someone from Nepal come in last time. Contact him.” Extending phone number and like that. Or college campuses. If you go to the same colleges, you are more likely to know or hear about or to see the person who is coming from your country.

These quotes display that the ethnicity and culture of my participants is not a rhetorical ethnicity. Instead it is a lived aspect of their everyday lives.

Anuj further discussed the importance, to him, of having a Nepalese organization. I argue he is one of the most invested because he is the president of the new Nepalese association in Kansas City, “The Nepalese association in KC is, right now, completely unofficial still. It is not a registered association yet. When I came here in 1999, there were only a handful of Nepalese people here. You definitely, it’s by nature, that you will start forming your own group, right, because of the language probably and because of culture and other things that are common. So, as I said we do the gathering, sort of party every year, two times every year. I started doing that initially and people started coming and new people come we just invite. We used to do that in the house, we could fit
everyone in the house, there were only a handful of people there. So if some new people come, you will know that ultimately. That’s how we started growing and we opened up some Internet group, so I just opened up the Facebook group last year and we’re at like probably 67 families registered so far.” He also makes himself available to new Nepalese immigrants, “Most of the time, [new Nepalese] find me because of the fact that I have been here for quite a long time also. I have known by... because I have done... things for people, the newcomers, including I, for example, when you come here someone needs to learn driving and to get a job and to find a place to live. I have helped the people to teach them driving, get a driving license, find them a job and find them a place to live. I have done. I have become a little bit famous in the community.”

Despite the importance of one’s ethnic community, it is a relationship which can contradict itself. Furthermore, none of my participants fit exclusively into one community ideal type or the other. My participant’s identities as a member of their own vertical community, or as a member of the wider horizontal community, was very fluid, as in Lilly’s explanation, “[The Nepalese community] was very important. Like first when I came here I was dying to meet Nepali people because I didn’t know anyone and it would be really hard if there were no Nepali people, it would be really hard. You need your culture somehow. So it was easier.” However, she says that now “I don’t normally see Nepalese people that often. I mean when I first came in, then I used to spend more time with them. But then, as it goes, I got busy with stuff and then I just didn’t have enough time I guess. I normally spend more time with my other friends rather than Nepali friends.” And for those whom I interviewed who are working on a career, there was a balance between how they managed their interests.
For Kim and Kishan, whether they were in the horizontal or vertical community depended on what environment they were in. For Kim:

If it’s a professional relationship, like the similarity between me and my colleague in the department, I’ll say we’re pretty much similar because the path you follow is pretty similar, you know, to grad school and teaching. But, if you’re talking about similarities to me and other people that I meet outside the work, I guess there would be a huge gap. There would be lots of difference in terms of what we believe, what we do. I’ll give you an example. My daughter goes to the Child Development Lab. In October, we had this festival here at UCM, so what they will do, they will showcase some floats from different floats and organizations. . . . Homecoming parade. So, the teachers told us they needed some volunteers to help set up the floats for the Child Development Lab. And so she told us to be at her place which is outside Warrensburg and very rural, like out, out in the country. So we went there and we were building the floats and, of course, there were four or five other guys who showed up. Their daughters go to the same school, I guess. And there was just completely disconnect between them and me. I felt awkward to be there with them because for my whole life I lived in apartment, whether it was back in Korea, because you know Seoul is very big city and most people live in an apartment. So we don’t really have any chances to work with tools, like power tools, saws. But here. . . they were talking about some of the power tools and how to fix the float and make it looks better and stuff. That was one of the interesting moments for me. ‘so this is how they live here.’
Additionally, Kishan explains: “I spend quite a bit of time with [Americans] but not much in socialization.” Those whom I interviewed are adjusting in the areas of life where their circumstances require adjusting. In order to succeed at work, and because of the shared interest in the nature of the work, there is socialization along those lines of interest. However, as seen in Kim’s quote, if those interests break down, then it can be a somewhat alienating experience.

SUMMARY

Contrary to Schutz’s model, those whom I interviewed were not progressing towards a state of full membership; nor did they resemble the disinterested observer. Instead, it appears my interviewees felt they were coming with a certain degree of American cultural knowledge obtained through American media and the spread of Western and American culture around the world. Furthermore, once they arrived, they felt enabled to live a contrapuntal identity. The contrapuntal orientation, I argue, resembles the permanent sojourner orientation which Uriely described, due to the simultaneous vividness of both their home and adopted culture as well as their desire to return “someday,” yet ambivalent plans for that return. However, they are not necessarily the same as permanent sojourners because they have a lived ethnicity rather than a rhetorical ethnicity. Instead, their return-minded sojourner orientation, I argue, is more a result of wanting to stay in America while simultaneously feeling connected with their home country.

In order to maintain their feelings of connection to home, global communication technology has enabled a more direct “backward gaze.” While all of my participants used technology to facilitate their backward gaze, there was, indeed, a difference in how my
interviewees from Korea and Nepal viewed distance. Though this difference was less pronounced than I had anticipated based on the CIA World Factbook\(^{30}\) data, what became clear was that based on forces out of my control, such as class, most of the immigrants in my study from Nepal were from the urban areas, despite only 19 percent of the country living in those areas. The immigrants from the urban areas had greater access to resources than did their rural homologues, which allowed them to leave the country. Although, the discrepancy between infrastructure and access to global communication technologies like the Internet were still present in my interviews.

The analysis of vertical and horizontal communities strengthens the case for a contrapuntal identity. Both communities, at their root, are built on common interests, some of which are common between cultures. The difference is that some interests exist only in the vertical community. The tastes and textures of food that we come to like are sometimes only found in the culture we are socialized into and are mostly shared by individuals socialized into the same culture. Instead of only orienting one’s self in the vertical or horizontal, my participants moved between the two as needed to develop an identity which “fit in” to American society while also “staying true” to their ethnic and cultural heritage.

\(^{30}\) https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/
CHAPTER 5
TOWARD A NEW MODEL

Based on the themes and trends which emerged in my data, what can be said about the usefulness and applicability of Schutz’s original model? Perhaps it is no surprise to argue that the model from the 1940s has changed in the past 60 years. However, the more interesting and sociologically relevant question is how has it changed and to what extent has it changed? Or, alternatively, to what extent have the changes brought about by new communication technology rendered all or parts of Schutz’s model incapable of explaining the social-psychological process by which strangers assimilate?

INSUFFICIENCIES OF THE ORIGINAL MODEL

Despite Schutz’s essay being considered “one of the outstanding essays on the stranger” (McLemore 1970:90), it is not without its criticisms. Among the most outspoken critics was Aron Gurwitsch who “disputed what appeared to him to be Schutz’s uncritical privileging of the stranger’s bland and conformist social adjustments to modernity” (Lyman 1998:203). Gurwitsch wrote in a letter to Schutz: “According to you, the stranger is every person who changes his surrounding world for certain reasons. . . . But the situation of the immigrant of the last ten years is different. He had no choice. . . . The specific characteristics of this curious being. . . don’t allow themselves to be simply formalized, and the crises that this type lives through are incommensurable with those fundamentally harmless problems of adapting which you describe. . . .” (Lyman 1998:203). Gurwitsch’s main point of contention was not a surface-level complaint; Gurwitsch’s trouble with the article on the stranger was Schutz’s reason and motivation for writing it in the first place. Gurwitsch and Schutz had, previously, a very
warm relationship (Natanson 1998). The break in their friendship coincided, and in fact was caused, by Schutz’s article on the stranger.

The disagreement went to the very root of the nature of philosophy and sociology. Gurwitsch saw, in this article, an abandonment of Schutz’s philosophical roots and a move towards trying to explain human actions. “Gurwitsch argues, for immigrants such as Shutz and himself, it is more important to be responsible for the world and to give an account of it, according to Husserl and Plato, than to learn recipes for dealing with things” (Barber 2004:118). Additionally, “Gurwitsch bristles at any social-psychological reduction of humanity to trainable animals and at Shutz’s concentration on the “average” person” (Barber 2004:118).

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore the Gurwitsch-Schutz debate or engage in the debate on philosophy, sociology and phenomenology, I bring up Gurwitsch’s criticism of Schutz to frame my own critique of Schutz’s model. According to Natanson (1998), a student of Schutz, Gurwitsch “misread” Schutz. Natanson (1998) writes, “In my judgment, Gurwitsch misread Shutz. Gurwitsch was alarmed that Shutz had forsaken philosophy for a formal sociology which did not recognize or understand transcendental questions. . . . He was utterly convinced of the danger of conceptual shift” (p. 3). Ultimately, Natanson (1998) suggests the reason why this topic on strangerness caused such a rift between these two once close friends: “The reason, in my judgment, is that Gurwitsch – and Shutz as well – was not only a stranger in his American life; he was also and indelibly an exile. Shutz’s essay touches on the widest range of problems relevant to the stranger yet does not consider the very special case of the exile. . . . No one was better prepared to write an essay on “The Exile,” but Shutz did not publish such
a piece. Perhaps the irony overcame Gurwitsch’s judgment” (p. 9, emphasis mine). In other words, Gurwitsch was offended and perplexed because he could not understand how his friend could suggest that following certain cultural patterns would lead to adaptation and inclusion into a new group.

There is nothing intrinsically flawed about Schutz’s original model. Indeed, even Gurwitsch commented that “From the point of view of formal sociology there is nothing to say against it” (Natanson 1998:2). Where does the original model fall short in understanding our world today? Its inadequacy as a model is that times change and technology advances. And as such, claims which Schutz made in his essay can no longer adequately be used to describe phenomena of the stranger. The primary insufficiency in the current model, in my judgment, and building off of Gurwitsch’s criticism (to a point), is the linear progression towards, and desirability of, adaptation and assimilation. Schutz (1944) writes “The adaptation of the newcomer to the in-group which at first seemed to be strange and unfamiliar to him is a continuous process of inquiry into the cultural pattern of the approached group. If this process of inquiry succeeds, then this pattern and its elements will become to the newcomer a matter of course, an unquestionable way of life, a shelter, and a protection. But then the stranger is no stranger any more, and his specific problems have been solved” (p. 507). There is no room in the model, and Schutz does not address, strangers who remain in one stage and feel comfortable there. There is the expectation that the stranger moves through these three stages given enough time to do so.

Theoretically, I believe Schutz overlooked and simplified certain, crucial aspects of assimilation and adaptation. Schutz (1944) argued that, once the stranger fully adopts
the approached group’s cultural patterns, he or she is no longer a stranger anymore and “his [or her] specific problems have been solved” (p. 507). However, there are some elements of “difference,” some problems for the stranger, particularly the stranger as an immigrant, which cannot be overcome, such as race for example. In my interviews, race showed itself as a characteristic which some of my participants felt they could not overcome, more than my other demographic choices of age or gender. One cannot, by his or herself, change races in order to adapt and become less of a stranger.31 In addition, Schutz assumes that the host group will accept the newcomer if he or she “only acts more like us.”

TOWARDS A NEW MODEL

Based on my research, there emerged, I believe, a new model in which to understand the social-psychological transition and adaptation strangers go though as they migrate in a globalized world. The original model had an assumption of fixation to space built into it. Schutz wrote that along with the psychological transition there was a spatial transition which occurred as well. As the stranger moves closer in terms of adopting new cultural patterns, he or she also moves closer in terms of physical movement towards proximity with that group. However, I found among my participants that a physical move did not always need to coincide with a psychological move. My participants were already sharing physical space and proximity in many instances with members of the wider society, even though, for many participants, psychological distance remained.

31 I am not arguing that race is static and unchangeable. There are examples where groups of people have changed races; or rather their race has been reclassified. But these instances take larger, sustained movements over time instead of one individual attempting to reclassify his or herself.
Prior to beginning my research, I theorized four alternative models to use as a tool for understanding the changes to Schutz’s model (Chapter 3). After reviewing my data, the model which emerged is slightly different than my theorized models. All of my alternative models contained changes to either the “disinterested observer” stage or the “full member” stage of Schutz’s model, with the changes coming about as a result of new communication technology. After conducting my interviews, these changes remain, though not in the theorized manner. This new model is a suggestion based on my ungeneralizable research. It cannot be applied indiscriminately to all situations and is only valid concerning the participants in my study. It would be impertinent of me to claim otherwise. Furthermore, this model is based on an understanding of the stranger as an immigrant, which is not always the case when discussing the stranger.

Based on my research, I suggest an alternate three part model:

```
Would-be Participant  ➔  Would-be Member  ➔  Contrapuntal Member
```

This model shows a movement from a “would-be participant” to “would-be member” to a “contrapuntal member.” In my proposed model, the stranger enters as a “would-be participant” rather than a “disinterested observer.” The disinterested observer, which Schutz described, enters the new society a true outsider; outside of the group and not interested in becoming a member of the group. The “would-be participant,” which I am proposing is characterized by the *potential* to engage the approached group. The stranger is “would-be” because, like the would-be member, there is a change in his or her thinking as usual from their original group to the approached group. Although he or she is a newcomer, the stranger comes with a useful knowledge base, often obtained via global
media and communication technology. However, unlike the would-be member, this change does not occur due to a change in actions. The stranger is a participant because he or she is still outside the group or only newly arrived. If the stranger arrives with no cultural knowledge, then he or she is still the “disinterested observer” described by Schutz. Whether or not my participants really did possess any useful cultural knowledge regarding American culture does not matter as much as whether or not they felt they had useful cultural knowledge prior to migrating. However, it is the case that some knowledge is not accurate, which can cause trouble for the stranger as he or she attempts to orient themselves to their new society.

I maintained the “would-be member” stage in my proposed model because of the emphasis on action which Schutz put in this stage. In the previous stage, the stranger comes prepared to engage the new group because of the amount of cultural knowledge he or she already possess. In the second stage, the stranger engages the approached group, and for some, finds there are still aspects of everyday life to learn. Their would-be participant knowledge is tested as contradictions in everyday life begin to arise and mundane, lived-knowledge needs to be acquired, such as how to find transportation and which stores to shop at. The stranger has moved from the potential participant to the potential member in this stage.

In the final stage, the stranger moves to a contrapuntal member. This stage is the most different from Schutz’s original because the spread of globalization has done less to eliminate disinterested observers and more to eliminate full members. In the final stage, membership is achieved with the stranger feeling like a full functioning member of society. However, instead of Schutz’s full membership, contrapuntal membership is still
felt as full membership on the part of the stranger, but full adoption of the new society’s cultural patterns is not required. In other words, the stranger achieves membership while adopting elements of the new culture and holding on to elements of his or her original culture; living the old and the new fully and simultaneously. Instead of struggling with adopting a new cultural pattern and losing an old one, they are navigating and managing two cultural patterns simultaneously; living contrapuntally.

One major implication of the move towards contrapuntal membership compared to Schutz’s full membership is in regards to the loyalty which the new member shows to his or her new society. Schutz describes the calls of “doubtful loyalty” the stranger is prone to face. Schutz (1944) writes, “very frequently the reproach of doubtful loyalty originates in the astonishment of the members of the in-group that the stranger does not accept the total of its cultural pattern as the natural and appropriate way of life and as the best of all possible solutions of any problem” (p. 507). If the stranger is seen to be attempting to assimilate, then questions of his or her loyalty diminish, as Harman (1987) writes, “Strangers are tolerated if it is clear that their mistakes stem from an attempt to change their status from outsider to insider. Toleration is predicted on an initial predisposition of the host toward the stranger as a potential members. It is also, therefore, contingent upon the desire of the stranger for membership” (p. 38, emphasis mine). In other words, if the stranger is not seen as attempting to assimilate, then reproaches of disloyalty are more likely even though for the stranger the cultural pattern of the new group is not considered “a protecting shelter at all but as a labyrinth in which he has lost all sense of his bearings” (Schutz 1944:507).
If the participants in my study are happy being “in-between” and living a contrapuntal identity; not fully adopting American culture and not fully abandoning their original culture, then how are their loyalties perceived? Although it was beyond the scope of this research to explore the views of the larger society concerning the loyalty of immigrants, (though a rich area for future research to explore) my participants expressed strong loyalty to both their original country and their adopted country. While explaining that their ties to their home country were strong and built on memories and family ties, they simultaneously expressed strong ties to America; in other words not expressing “doubtful loyalty.” Indeed, Kim and Kishan both brought up this topic during our conversations and both expressed similar sentiments that America was not a “safety net” which could be easily abandoned in order to return home if their plans do not work out. Kim, for example, said, “Like I said, if I have better opportunity in Korea, then I’ll go back. But not as a backdrop or safety net.” Additionally, Kishan explained, “I don’t think that way. To me, the United States of America, although I told you I have Nepali blood, I would never ever do anything that hurts this country. This country has saved my life. It has given me a job, and it has given me opportunity to educate my children. . . . I owe a lot to this country because I have taken a lot of benefits from this country.” Although Schutz explained that views on the doubtful loyalty of strangers arise between the stranger and the host society because of a misunderstanding that the stranger does not view the host’s cultural patterns as a shelter, it appears that my participants are able to view the new society as a shelter while not necessarily having to fully adopt new cultural patterns from that new group. In the past, the stranger’s loyalty was tested by the group if the stranger was not adopting their new cultural patterns. However, members of the group
often do not or cannot understand the intimidating concept of identity, especially when that identity is questioned. In the past, the approached group’s cultural patterns did not seem as a shelter to the stranger. However, this pressure has been alleviated. Now, no shelter is necessary – a hybrid, contrapuntal identity is a shelter in itself.

CONCLUSION

The Korean and Nepalese immigrants I interviewed and spent time with are unable to fit easily into Schutz’s or any other model. What I have done is attempted to posit forth one alternative model in an attempt to capture the change which I believe is occurring. If this change is real, then there are implications for it; among the largest and most consequential concerns the perceptions of loyalty. If new technology is allowing immigrants to maintain ties home and live contrapuntally with more ease than in the past, yet this enabling is occurring in a political climate full of vitriol, where xenophobia and scapegoating of immigrants is becoming common, what challenges does the immigrant face in defending his or her loyalty to their adopted country?

Through my interviews with immigrants from Nepal and South Korea, the social-psychological condition of being an immigrant in a global age began to emerge. This research is by no means to be considered exhaustive or grand. There are plenty of areas for future research to explore. What is clear, however, is we need to advance the literature on the sociology of strangerness for a global age. We need a new theoretical framework for understanding the social psychology of strangers in a globalized age; in particular, a frame for how strangers identify themselves as they attempt to navigate two or more cultures. This is becoming increasingly more important to research as international migration and travel continue to become easier. The stranger in sociology has exhibited
impressive staying power. Additionally, it has shown its brilliance as a theory to remain relevant after one hundred years. As the organization of society continues to change from generation to generation from Simmel, there is certainly a need to continue in this line of research in order to understand the changing dynamics of a classic sociological theory.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW GUIDE

This research is related to my thesis at UCM. The purpose of this research will be to assess the experience of immigration and assimilation in a globalizing world. I appreciate your willingness to participate in this research. Your participation in this research is strictly voluntary. You are free to refuse to answer to any question. Your identity will be kept confidential. You are free to withdraw from this research at any time. Withdrawal from this research will not result in any negative consequence or loss of confidentiality. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. What is the highest level of education you completed in your home country?
   - High school
   - Some college
   - Associates
   - Bachelors
   - Post-graduate

2. Would you describe your hometown in your original country as rural or urban?
   - Rural
   - Urban

3. Did you have easy access to a computer in your home country?
   - Yes
   - No

4. Do you have easy access to a computer now?
   - Yes
   - No

5. How often did you use the Internet in your home country?
   - More than once a day
   - About once a day
   - Once a week
   - Other

6. How often do you use the Internet now?
   - More than once a day
   - About once a day
   - Once a week
   - Other

7. What do you use the Internet for mostly?
   - Work
   - Leisure
   - Chatting
   - Other

8. Did you have any American friends in your home country?
   - Yes
   - No

9. If yes, how many? ______

10. How often do you speak with friends/family in your home country?
    - Everyday
    - A few times a week
    - Once a week
    - Once a month

11. How much time do you spend with fellow countrymen?
    - Everyday
    - A few times a week
    - Once a week
    - Once a month

12. How much time do you spend with Americans?
    - Everyday
    - A few times a week
    - Once a week
    - Once a month
13. Where do you get most of your news from?
   American news sources   News sources from my country   Other sources

14. Do you belong to any organizations in the United States?
   Yes      No

15. If yes, what kind of organizations?

16. Do you have children in the American school system?
   Yes      No      I don’t have any children

17. How often do you use your native language?
   Everyday   A few times a week   Once a week   Once a month

18. How comfortable are you using English in your everyday life?
   I feel fluent (very comfortable)   I’m hesitant   I never use English

19. How much do you feel you have in common with Americans?
   I have a lot in common   Some things in common   Nothing in common

20. How long have you been living in the United States? __________

21. How often do you travel back to your home country?
   Once a year   Every few years   Whenever I can   Not been back

22. When was your last visit? _________________

23. Do you feel comfortable living in the United States?
   Yes      Somewhat      I don’t know      No

24. Age: __________

25. Race: __________

26. Gender:
   Male      Female

27. Native language: _________________________________________

28. Are you married?
   Yes      No

29. If yes, what is the nationality of your spouse?

30. How do you identify yourself when asked about your identity?

31. Describe how your transition into American society has been?
APPENDIX B
CONSENT FORM

You are being asked to participate in a research study on how immigrants assimilate into American society in a globalized world. I am asking you to participate due to your immigration status and your country of origin, which I have identified in my sample. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions before agreeing to this research. Thank you.

**Identification of researcher:** This research is being done by Daniel Alvord, graduate student with the Department of Sociology & Social Work at University of Central Missouri.

**What is the study about:** This study is about how immigrants assimilate in American society in an age marked by increased global interconnectedness. You must be a legal immigrant to participate.

**What the study will ask you:** Questions will be in an interview format. The interview will consist of questions about your home country, your familiarity with Internet technologies, and your life in America. The interview will last approximately 30-45 minutes. Pending your approval, the interview will also be recorded.

**Risks:** I do not anticipate any risks to you from your participating in this study.

**Your response will be confidential.** The records of this study will be kept private and locked in my office. Any mention of you in the study will be done by use of a pseudonym.

**Your participation is voluntary.** You are participating voluntarily and under your free will. Any question that you do not wish to answer, you may skip it. Skipping questions will not result in any harm, negative consequences, or loss of confidentiality. You are also free to withdraw from this research at anytime.

**If you have questions** you may contact me via email at dalvord@ucmo.edu, or by phone at (660) 543.4407. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Human Subjects Protection Program at (660) 543-4621.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.

Your Signature ______________________   Date ______________________

Your Name (printed)

In addition to agreeing to participate, I also consent to having the interview tape-recorded.
APPENDIX C
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Nepalese**

Kishan 53 year old male professor from a rural village who has been living in America since 1995. Interview recorded 12/15/2010.

Bimal 43 year old male from a rural village who has been living in America since 1999. Interview recorded 12/21/2010.

Trikal 21 year old male student from Pokhara, a large urban city, who has been living in America since 2009. Interview recorded 1/11/2011.

Roshan 35 year old male from the capital of Nepal, Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2003. Interview recorded 1/15/2011.

Roshi 20 year old female Nepalese student from the capital of Nepal, Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2008. Interview conducted 1/17/2011.

Sanjay 54 year old male immigrant from the capital of Nepal, Kathmandu who has been living in America since 1993. Interview conducted 12/17/2010.

Lilly 21 year old female student from the capital of Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2009. Interview conducted 1/18/2011.

Araju 41 year old male Nepalese immigrant from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2003. Interview recorded 12/16/2010.

Shyam 22 year old male Nepalese student from a rural village who has been living in America since 2007. Original interview conducted 2/26/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 12/13/2010.

Anuj 43 year old male Nepalese immigrant from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 1999. Interview conducted 12/11/2010.

Aakash 26 year old male Nepalese student from Kathmandu who has been living in America since 2003. Original interview conducted 3/3/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 12/13/2010.

**Korean**

Kim 32 year old male Korean professor from Seoul who has been living in America since 2005. Interview conducted 12/16/2010.
Chloe 22 year old female student from the capital of Korea, Seoul who has been living in America since 2008. Original interview conducted 3/22/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 12/19/2010.

Junyong 41 year old female immigrant from the capital city of Korea, Seoul who has been living in America since 2001. Interview recorded 12/19/2010.

Dahyun 44 year old female immigrant from Seoul who has been living in America since 2005. Interview recorded 12/19/2010.

Moonjung 56 year old female immigrant Korean from Seoul who has been living in America since 1979. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.

Jungmin 54 year old female Korean immigrant from a rural village who has been living in America since 1979. Interview conducted 12/4/2010.

Heeson 44 year old female Korean from a rural village who has been living in America since 2008. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.

Hyemi 51 year old female Korean immigrant from Seoul who has been living in America since 2000. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.

Park 48 year old male Korean from a rural village in Korea who has been living in America since 2005. Interview conducted 12/5/2010.

Hawon 56 year old female Korean from Seoul who has been living in America since 1980. Interview conducted 12/19/2010.

Tommy 21 year old male Korean student from a rural village who has been living in America since 2006. Original interview conducted 2/23/2010 for a previous project. Follow-up interview conducted 1/21/2011.
APPENDIX D
APPROVAL FROM THE UCM HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE - LETTER ONE

2/15/2010

Daniel Alvord
WD 232 A
, UCM

Dear Mr. Daniel Alvord,

Your research project, 'The Role of Technology in the Maintenance of Transnational Relationships and the Perception of Distance: A Case of Korean and Nepalese Academic Sojourners', was approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee on 2/15/2010.

Please note that you are required to notify the committee in writing of any changes in your research project and that you may not implement changes without prior approval of the committee. You must also notify the committee in writing of any change in the nature or the status of the risks of participating in this research project.

Should any adverse events occur in the course of your research (such as harm to a research participant), you must notify the committee in writing immediately. In the case of any adverse event, you are required to stop the research immediately unless stopping the research would cause more harm to the participants than continuing with it.

At the conclusion of your project, you will need to submit a completed Project Status Form to this office. You must also submit the Project Status Form if you wish to continue your research project beyond its initial expiration date.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the number above.

Sincerely,

Wendy Geiger, Ph.D.
Associate Dean of The Graduate School
geiger@ucmo.edu

cc: Karen Bradley
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APPROVAL FROM THE UCM HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE – LETTER TWO

12/3/2010

Daniel Alvord
WD 212 A
UCM

Dear Mr. Daniel Alvord,

Your research project, 'Strangers in a Globalized World: Immigrants, Identity and Assimilation', was approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee on 12/1/2010. This approval is valid through . Your informed consent is also approved.

Please note that you are required to notify the committee in writing of any changes in your research project and that you may not implement changes without prior approval of the committee. You must also notify the committee in writing of any change in the nature or the status of the risks of participating in this research project.

Should any adverse events occur in the course of your research (such as harm to a research participant), you must notify the committee in writing immediately. In the case of any adverse event, you are required to stop the research immediately unless stopping the research would cause more harm to the participants than continuing with it.

At the conclusion of your project, you will need to submit a completed Project Status Form to this office. You must also submit the Project Status Form if you wish to continue your research project beyond its initial expiration date.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the number above.

Sincerely,

Janice Putnam Ph.D., RN
Associate Dean of The Graduate School
putnam@ucmo.edu

cc: Kamel Ghozzi