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Immigration, Culture, and Ethnicity in Transformative Consumer Research

David Crockett, Laurel Anderson, Sterling A. Bone, Abhijit Roy, Jeff Jianfeng Wang, and Garrett Coble

Immigration, culture, and ethnicity (IC&E) research has a lengthy history in consumer research, though most research focuses narrowly on identity (and related topics) and has been done at the individual level of analysis. First, the authors discuss the need for research focused on assessing well-being at the collective level and highlight the important role of social networks and communities in improving consumer well-being and creating effective policy interventions. Next, they explore the utility of the emerging intersectionality conceptual framework for research on well-being and IC&E. They offer specific suggestions for designing policy-oriented research using this approach and illustrate the process by taking a well-regarded IC&E study and reimagining its design using a process-centered approach to intersectionality.
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Immigration, culture, and ethnicity (IC&E) are complex and controversial phenomena. Recently, raising constitutional questions about overstepping the bounds of state jurisdiction, Arizona passed a highly contested immigration bill resulting in myriad legal challenges (Harris, Rau, and Creno 2010). France and other European Union states are considering bans on Islamic headwear for women on the grounds that they restrict women’s liberty. Not surprisingly, opponents consider such policies unwarranted infringements on Islamic cultural practices (Corbet 2010). In South Carolina, a Republican state senator referred to a Republican gubernatorial candidate (later elected governor) as a “raghead”—an ethnic slur—in reference to her Indian Sikh heritage (Santaella 2010). Each of these instances dramatically portrays how deeply IC&E are embedded in and how much they structure social relations and institutions.

Consumer researchers have highlighted the central role of consumption in how IC&E are enacted (Askegaard, Arnould, and Kjeldgaard 2005; Deshpandé, Hoyer, and Donthu 1986; Oswald 1999; Peñaloza 1994). However, in general, IC&E research has focused on individual identity. Although identity is important, consumption’s role in larger collectives, such as social networks and communities that operate within and across identity categories, is comparatively underresearched. In their book Successful Societies, Hall and Lamont (2009) argue that the structure of social relations is foundational to the well-being of society. Thus, the social fissures that emerge around the domains of IC&E have direct implications for consumer well-being. More research is needed to understand macro level forces in the area of IC&E. Even when social and cultural phenomena, such as acculturation, socialization, and social contexts, are the focus of study, they are usually examined as impacts on the individual consumer—most frequently on his or her identity (e.g. Jafari and Goulding 2008; Üstün and Holt 2007). Consumer research on IC&E needs a broadened focus that incorporates not only individual agentic but also collective agentic and structural accounts.1 Certainly, no investigation of the transformative impact of globalization, cultural fragmentation, or acculturation—for good or ill—can be complete without accounting for both agency and structure.

Some recent research has highlighted national culture (Zhao and Belk 2008) and material culture organized by family networks (Epp and Price 2010), but these examples...
are noteworthy exceptions. To address this imbalance in IC&E research, we offer two related approaches to designing policy-based and transformational research. Each approach takes a more collective approach to IC&E research. First, we explore the topic of collective consumer well-being within the IC&E context to generate topic- and policy-oriented questions for further research. Second, we highlight the importance of the concept of intersectionality and discuss its promise for research on IC&E.

A Focus on Collective Well-Being

Across time and space, the social fabric is woven differently. How do differences among societies affect the well-being of those who live in them? (Hall and Lamont 2009, p. 1)

Social collectives are important because they provide resources that people draw on to bring about or hinder well-being. In the Canadian Successful Societies Program, Hall and Lamont (2009, p. 2) argue that a successful society is a collective that “enhances the capabilities of people to pursue the goals important to their own lives, whether through individual or collective action.” Focusing on collective well-being involves looking beyond individual agency and responsibility and acknowledging the influence of social structures, milieus, determinants, forces, institutions, and context on well-being. If, as Rose (1992) argues, the primary determinants of ill-being are economic and social, the solutions must be as well. The Successful Societies Program uses collective health, or “health plus,” as an indicator of collective well-being. This encompassing concept includes life expectancy, infant mortality, and positive social outcomes, such as greater equality, social inclusion, and democratic participation. We adopt this broadened definition.

Consumers’ well-being naturally raises questions about both individual agency and social structure. The question we pose in this section focuses primarily on collective aspects of well-being: What roles do society, collectives, social structures, and social relations play in well-being? To address this, we foreground two types of collectives that have significant impact on IC&E: social networks and communities.

We highlight social concepts that hold promise for research and policy, offer illustrative examples from extant research, and suggest productive research questions for IC&E. We take a constructive view by emphasizing the resources and empowerment that can derive from these collectives.

Social Networks

Consumers are inescapably interconnected; therefore, their well-being is interconnected as well (Smith and Christakos 2008). Social networks focus on the characteristic pattern of ties among network members in a social system rather than the characteristics of individual members. This focus allows better visibility of network structure and composition, in addition to the movement of resources and stressors through these networks (Hall and Wellman 1985). A growing body of research suggests that the flow of social capital through social networks enhances well-being through a variety of means (Berkman and Glass 2000). For example, Peñaloza (1994, 1995) finds that social networks are foundational elements in immigrant consumers’ acculturation. Concentrated clusters of immigrants (e.g., the Hmong in Minneapolis–St. Paul and Fresno) structure the resources for acculturation support. For example, Anderson (2010) notes that immigrant informants were suspicious that policy makers were restricting the flow of resources by closing local schools and busing children outside the community, which led to decreased community social cohesion and networks.

Social Contagion

“Social contagion” refers to the substance that spreads and flows across social networks. These substances may either promote or hinder well-being in the network. Their spread is demonstrated by the diffusion of behaviors and practices, emotions, ideas, beliefs, and knowledge (Fowler and Christakos 2008; Hatfield, Cacioppo, and Rapson 1993). For example, immigrant parents often express concern for the new and separate social networks their children adopt along with the concomitant social contagion and the loss of contagion from previous networks (Netter 2009). Christakos and colleagues (Christakos and Fowler 2007; Fowler and Christakos 2008; Smith and Christakos 2008) and others (Nickerson 2008) suggest that numerous behaviors and propensities such as smoking, eating, exercise, drug use, happiness, altruism, privacy, and voting behavior can be spread by social contagion in social networks. In the context of immigration, Korinek, Entwisle, and Jampaklay (2005) also find support for the social contagion of attitudes and decisions. In their longitudinal study of Thai urban settlements, they find that immigrants who join new social networks characterized by positive attitudes toward urban migration are more likely to stay in the new culture than those who are more isolated or who join social networks characterized by negative attitudes toward urban migration.

Research and Policy Implications

Immigrants and members of cultural and ethnic groups are often parts of several social networks. However, these social networks frequently have pronounced differences. How are conflicts negotiated within and across these social networks, and what are the implications for consumer well-being? For example, a Latina executive may be a part of a social network that prioritizes family and consumes to affirm this tie symbolically. However, how does she negotiate differences that arise from also being a member of the social network of upwardly mobile executives that values professional success and status above other values? What type of wear and tear occurs as consumer ethnic groups manage these tensions? Which network provides the social support and social capital that play a part in well-being?

Significant research is needed on social contagion. What are effective service and communication mechanisms that could diffuse well-being behaviors throughout a social network? Who has the most impact and influence on social contagion, especially in cross-cultural contexts? What roles within the social network collective have the most impact on its members with regard to well-being? For example, would nutritional expertise be sought from members who are boundary spanners, or would respected elders play a
more important role? Why do some ideas and behaviors develop into social contagion while others do not?

Compelling implications arise for policy research as well. The indirect, downstream, and cascading effects of social contagion and social networks are important to consider when designing and targeting interventions and analyzing costs, benefits, and impacts. To illustrate, consider that a health intervention, apart from its effects on any one person, may have unintended health effects (positive or negative) on other people in the network. This suggests that a collective—rather than individual—approach to cost-effectiveness analysis may be needed. The findings cited here from research on social contagion suggest that some policies and interventions are better aimed at collectivities rather than individuals. Researchers could aid policy makers by determining when interventions are more effectively focused on groups rather than individuals.

Finally, methodological challenges arise in the study of collectives. One challenge is gathering data on entire networks to avoid missing important ties. Consumer researchers might better utilize large, existing databases that contain social network information. Examples include the Framingham Heart Study (Christakis and Fowler 2007) and the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (UNC Carolina Population Center 2010). Data collection on the Internet and social media represents another promising venue because online social networks are commonly more clearly defined than offline networks. Moreover, community-based organizations can aid data collection on social networks (e.g., minority chambers of commerce, fraternal and service organizations, retirement homes, health clinics, neighborhood action groups, sports clubs, churches).

Community and Neighborhood

This section expands on larger-scale social determinants of consumer well-being. The World Health Organization (2010) defines these social determinants as “the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, including the health system.” The World Health Organization states that these conditions emerge from inequitable resource distribution systems operating at multiple levels, which themselves are structured by policy choices. These social determinants are mostly responsible for wide disparities in well-being within and between countries.

In addition to large-scale social determinants, well-being also emanates from processes that draw on collective aspects of community life, such as social cohesion, social control, social expectations, the provision of institutional resources, and collective efficacy ( Sampson 2003). Because we want to underscore the resource-building aspects of community, we focus on collective efficacy and its application to IC&E.

Collective Efficacy

Paralleling Bandura’s (1977) notion of self-efficacy, “collective efficacy” refers to a shared willingness and capability of community members to look out for one another and intervene on behalf of the community (Cohen et al. 2006). This shared expectation, combined with mutual trust, defines collective efficacy. Efficacy connotes control, collective agency, and building community resources and social capital. Collective efficacy is even more important and proximate for understanding well-being than social networks, which create the conditions for collective efficacy ( Sampson 2003). Davis and Erez (1998) examine collective efficacy in a study of immigrant crime victims’ willingness to report victimization. Their decision to report crime and use justice services did not differ by education, country of origin, immigrant status, or ethnicity of the criminal. Rather, the presence of collective efficacy within the community was predictive of reporting crime.

Research and Policy Implications

The aforementioned immigration policy in Arizona presents a useful context for exploring research questions related to collective efficacy. Arizona State Senate Bill 1070 is the strictest immigration policy passed in recent history (Archbold 2010). It requires law enforcement to check the legal status of immigrants who seem suspicious and makes it illegal for officials to forgo enforcement (State of Arizona Senate). Recently, the Maricopa County sheriff has targeted Hispanic communities for immigration sweeps. Widespread and massive demonstrations in Arizona, California, and across the United States in opposition to this law have occurred (Harris, Rau, and Creno 2010).

We speculate that this policy is likely to lower the collective efficacy of Arizona’s Hispanic community, particularly its sense of control over community well-being. As evidenced by widespread protests and evacuations, fear and resistance exist throughout the Hispanic community regardless of citizenship status, representing a type of social contagion. Widespread demonstrations in Arizona in the days leading up to the passage of the law and in its immediate aftermath may also indicate efforts to maintain collective efficacy. Consequently, SB 1070 and similar policies raise questions for consumer researchers interested in IC&E. How does fear emanating from this public policy affect the consumption of services that promote well-being among marginalized or stigmatized communities facing threats to collective efficacy? For example, has collective efficacy been diminished so that children are not attending school as regularly or community members are not seeking health care for fear of being questioned? How is the resultant stress, fear, or feelings of impotence embodied physically, psychologically, and socially as a community? Are cortisol stress levels elevated? Are there more incidences of diseases, depression, or accidents since this public policy was enacted? How are these negative feelings manifested in ways that may not respond to traditional service delivery meant to bring about well-being?

Researchers interested in general well-being might consider investigating how collective efficacy is developed, especially in vulnerable and underserved populations such as immigrants and ethnic minorities. What services build up stores of social capital and a sense of control? What aspects of services and service delivery might undermine collective efficacy? Are certain types of institutions or service providers more likely to be successful in this endeavor? For example, black churches in the United States often build collective efficacy, as exemplified in the Boston initiatives, in which a group of black ministers came together to work
as a coalition with the police to deal with problems of gang-related youth violence (Berrien and Winship 2002). Are certain types of collective decision making more impactful on the development of collective efficacy?

Methods such as community action research (Ozanne and Anderson 2010) are appropriate, given that their goal is to develop social capital as part of the research process and respect the knowledge and resources of the community. Tools like geographic information systems enable researchers to examine responses to health and well-being initiatives by networks, clusters, and communities. Ethnographic methods can facilitate group-level observations across multiple settings. For example, Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) utilize Systematic Social Observations, in which trained observers drive through a community in a vehicle equipped with video cameras to capture community-level social activities and physical features. Observers code these observations for the presence of direct and indirect indicators of lowered collective efficacy.

**Insights from Intersectionality**

In this section, we focus attention on research design in investigations on IC&E. More than two decades ago, feminist and critical race scholars called for research that explores the interconnected nature of race-, sex-, and class-based inequality; these researchers built theory around their connectivity rather than treating them as discrete phenomena with independent, additive effects. Though less interested in inequality per se, consumer researchers have also called for designs that better capture the dynamic processes that undergird complex social phenomena (e.g., Bristor and Fischer 1993). In response, we present an approach to consumer research design that can meaningfully explore the complex, interconnected, and frequently taken for granted in the context of IC&E. Gopaldas, Prasad, and Woodard (2009) point to intersectionality as an innovative approach that holds substantial promise for consumer research. We spend the remainder of this section developing and illustrating that promise and offering specific suggestions to aid IC&E researchers in incorporating intersectionality into research design.

Intersectionality’s genesis is in feminist and critical race theory (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1989). It refers to “the interaction [among] categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power” (Davis 2008, p. 68). Intersectionality has currency in consumer research on IC&E because scholars with an axiological commitment to enhancing consumer well-being must understand multiple interacting dynamics in terms of agency and power. Intersectionality’s core insight, which speaks directly to dynamics of agency and power, is that actors inhabit multiple identity, location, and power positions in a social system and that the relationships between these various positions are mutually constitutive and crosscutting, producing substantial complexity. In foundational articles, Crenshaw (1989, 1991) explores job market discrimination and sexual violence against women of color; she classifies their experiences as more than the additive effects of sexism and racism, but rather a unique product of the two borne of their interconnectivity. Crenshaw argues that women of color do not simply experience more discrimination and sexual violence; rather, their experiences in the two domains are qualitatively different from white women’s. She argues that these unique experiences are inadequately represented in either feminist or antiracist discourse.

Methodologically, intersectionality is committed to engaging the substantial theoretical and measurement complexity inherent in social systems, which makes it especially well suited for investigating IC&E. To illustrate, we rely heavily on Choo and Ferree’s (2010) recent review, in which they identify three broad methodological approaches to intersectionality: (1) Inclusion-centered approaches emphasize the importance of including the perspectives (or “voices”) of multiply marginalized people, especially (though not exclusively) women of color; (2) process-centered approaches involve a shift from merely adding voices of the disadvantaged toward analyzing the outcomes of interactions between actors and their locations in systems of power; and (3) system-centered approaches focus on conceptualizing dynamic, complex social systems. Each approach involves the power dynamics among multiple actors at individual, group, and institutional levels.

Inclusion-centered approaches, to borrow the language of experimental psychology, focus on interactions rather than main effects. For example, Steinbugler, Press, and Dias (2000) find that prejudice toward black women has separate effects from prejudice toward black men on white people’s attitudes toward affirmative action. Furthermore, these effects are different from prejudice toward blacks as a group. Prejudice toward black women has the largest (negative) effect on whites’ attitudes. In process-centered approaches, interactions are conceptualized differently. The components are themselves transformed—like a body changing sugars into new substances (Choo and Ferree 2010). Researchers in this vein commonly adopt a social constructionist understanding of intersectionality, highlighting processes over categories; in other words, “racialization rather than races, economic exploitation rather than classes, gendering and gender performance rather than genders” (Choo and Ferree 2010, p. 134). Process-centered approaches have greater methodological demands than inclusion-centered approaches, tending to be comparative and attentive to dynamic processes that vary across contexts and time. Patillo’s (2007) ethnographic treatment of a black middle-class Chicago neighborhood details processes by which power and disadvantage accrue in the context of segregation and gentrification. McCall (2005) notes that to manage rapidly escalating complexity, researchers sometimes take a given process as primary (e.g., class) and relegate others (e.g., race, gender) to secondary status (Briley and Aaker 2006). In contrast, system-centered approaches give no primacy to any process, leaving it as an open question to highlight how processes feed back on and co-construct one another. Thus, specifying localized and historicized processes is a methodological priority. Glenn’s (2002) study of labor and citizenship in the United States examines the coproduction of race, gender, and class inequality that happens at various historical intersections of labor and citizenship.
In practice, intersectionality is criticized as lacking in sufficient methodological rigor to be much more than a buzzword (Davis 2008). In response, Choo and Ferree (2010) note that researchers are now beginning to develop the kinds of systematic approaches that meet intersectionality’s great methodological demands. To that end, they offer three broad suggestions for designing research and analyzing data using an intersectionality approach. We highlight research designs (or features of designs) from multiple studies as illustrations, though some examples are not explicitly intersectional.

First, research design should draw attention to hegemonic relations of power, specifically highlighting typically unmarked categories in which power and privilege cluster. Consumer research often grants unmarked categories normative status, against which other nonnormative categories are compared (Bristol and Fischer 1993). Designing research that highlights these unmarked categories involves sampling and data collection procedures that capture both vulnerability and power. To cite a previous example, researchers interested in consumer responses to France’s and Arizona’s recent immigrant controversies should sample immigrants and natives to capture their situated understandings of both vulnerability and power. Researchers should also consider explicitly comparative designs that include multiple samples from multiple data collection sites, such as inside and outside immigrant enclaves or in multiple communities of varying immigrant and ethnic composition. Multiple regression methods are appropriate for analyzing multisample, multisite data sets that have large numbers of interacting variables (McCall 2001, 2005). For example, scholars have modeled the effects of various local labor market factors—including immigration status, the presence of manufacturing and unions, high-skill services, and flexible employment—on wage inequality between Latinos, Asians, and blacks compared with whites (Browne, Tigges, and Press 2001) and separately for men and women in each group (McCall 2001).

Second, research design should lead to dynamic models that privilege feedback loops and interactions rather than models that are simply additive. Ethnographic designs are well suited for capturing processes that generate feedback, in which categories of identity are transforming according to interactions with other socioeconomic factors. Although their intent is not intersectionality per se, Kjeldgaard and Askegaard’s (2006) multisite ethnographic design is useful for highlighting the feedback by which local consumption projects come to be informed by broader global discourses, and subsequently, these local projects inform those discourses. They investigate “themes of common difference” in youth culture across multiple (diverse) sites to understand how local identity/consumption projects are situated in both local and global structures.

Third, data analysis should be interaction seeking and context sensitive to avoid simplistic reductionism; both quantitative (e.g., general and hierarchical linear models) and qualitative data analysis techniques allow for this. McCall’s previously cited research on wage inequality utilizes hierarchical linear model procedures. Crockett and Wallendorf (2004) analyze ethnographic and interview data across multiple combinations of race, class, gender, and residence—inside and outside predominantly black sections of the setting—to understand where various forms of political ideology prevail.

These are, quite intentionally, general guidelines. Thus, to illustrate how a research design using an intersectionality approach might actually look, we reexamine an article published in *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*. We re-examine Peñaloza’s (1995) “Immigrant Consumers: Marketing and Public Policy Considerations in the Global Economy” (“Immigrant Consumers” hereafter). More than 15 years after publication, it is evident that “Immigrant Consumers” was ahead of its time. Given ongoing controversy surrounding Mexican immigration to the United States, it remains timely. Despite its publication contemporaneous with, if not predating, the genuine emergence of intersectionality, “Immigrant Consumers” is a close approximation of the process-centered approach identified previously as having the most imposing methodological demands. That is, it details the complex, dynamic process of Mexican immigration to the United States. The study’s focus is on how multiple actors embedded in multiple collective categories of identity (e.g., social class, national identity, ethnicity, language) interact with institutional (e.g., multinational corporations, governmental actors such as the Immigration and Naturalization Services) and structural power sources (e.g., globalization). Unlike Askegaard, Arnould, and Kjeldgaard’s (2005) review of “Atravesando Fronteras” (Peñaloza 1994), our purpose for revisiting this article is not to test its robustness. Rather, it is to illustrate how researchers could take a well-regarded, rigorous study and create a moderately to radically different research product by adopting intersectionality at the genesis of research design.

We begin by looking at Peñaloza’s assumptions about intersectionality. Implicit in her analysis is a hierarchy of effects model in which social class (i.e., high- and low-wage workers/consumers) is the primary identity category and source of disadvantage while other categories (e.g., Mexican, American, male/female) are secondary. In “Immigrant Consumers,” social class is the metaphorical Main Street, and other identity categories are the intersecting side streets. In her rendering, institutional actors (e.g., multinational corporations, governments) largely create the context for global flows of labor and culture. Therefore, although “Immigrant Consumers” details national identity as it transitions from one state (i.e., Mexican) to another (i.e., immigrant “other”), the process is fundamentally structured by elite class interests in ways that render Mexican immigrant workers particularly vulnerable. Although we agree with the broad contours of Peñaloza’s analysis, we ask what might change if we decenter social class in the design and focus instead on areas of broad overlap and feedback between multiple critical categories. An intersectional approach would explicitly seek out interactions among multiple categories of identity and systems of power rather than a Main Street–side streets approach, mining them more deeply for interactions and feedback with immigration. To illustrate, Peñaloza’s reported data provide ample cause and opportunity to investigate the gender dynamics of immigration, particularly how changes in women’s “second shift” obligations in the household—an
especially important site of consumption—structure the immigration experience itself. Consider that the migration patterns evident among many of Peñaloza’s informants seem to be significantly structured by gender. They largely privilege mobility among Mexican men wishing to enter U.S. labor markets, though without legitimate credentials both men and women are typically confined to unskilled, low-wage labor upon arrival. Many informants report men retrieving or sending for wives and children after they secure labor and shelter in the United States. Some also travel as (relatively) intact families. However, none report the opposite gender pattern, in which men remain in the country of origin to rear children while women sojourn to the United States to find work. The types of urban labor markets these informants inhabit are also most likely to feature the low-wage service sector work dominated by women. Peñaloza notes that immigration policies that emphasize mass deportation affect urban immigrant families disproportionately—and we would add urban immigrant women especially—because deportations maximize family disruption. So if anything, immigrant women’s “second shift” obligations seem to increase relative to time and resources available in the border-crossing experience. Many, if not all, informants mention working longer hours in the United States compared with Mexico and having little time for family life. All these factors indicate that gender may be playing a coconstructing role—one that overlaps with social class but is not reducible to it—in building an identity category labeled “immigrant.” However, an implicit Main Street–side streets model that places class as the primary explanatory variable leaves minimal space for such an analysis. An approach that seeks interaction more explicitly would be helpful.

We chose to reexamine “Immigrant Consumers” precisely because it is well regarded for addressing a complex phenomenon that operates on multiple levels involving different kinds of actors and because of the author’s demonstrated sensitivity to issues of power and marginalization. Nevertheless, we note how implicit assumptions that privilege certain categories of analysis while marginalizing others can leave important stones unturned even in the strongest research. The promise of intersectionality is that it sets out to capture that complexity in design and analysis.

To complete this illustration, we offer two suggestions for reimaging “Immigrant Consumers” for policy and transformational research consistent with the three guidelines Choo and Ferree (2010) offer. The first involves a different approach to data analysis that leaves the original research question largely intact. It involves intentionally mining identity categories from encounters with informants for ways they interact with and feed back into systems of power and privilege. As we demonstrate, exploring gender alone could lead to different theoretical and policy insights and has different implications for efforts to enhance well-being. An intersectionality approach to data analysis would involve situating gender dynamics alongside class and ethnicity a priori rather than substantially different data collection procedures. Therefore, reanalyzing the same data would flesh out instances that exemplify the transformation and performance of gender, ethnicity, and class (e.g., through household consumption practices, competing gender and cultural norms, family disruptions), seeking out how these feed back into and inform emergent notions of immigrant identity. For example, negotiating the purchase of a car is a consumption practice with enormous implications for the performance of gender, class, and ethnicity. In “Immigrant Consumers,” one informant is adamant that the convention of nonstandard prices for the same car is fundamentally unfair—despite the prevalence of the same practice in Mexico. This is an instance ripe for investigation of how gendered, classed, and raced performances are transformed in border crossing that fundamentally alters the meanings of what were once commonly accepted consumption practices.

A second, more radical, suggestion for reimagining “Immigrant Consumers” is to redesign it as a comparative study, which is a substantial departure from the original research. A comparative design presents the greatest methodological challenges. One possibility for a comparative redesign of “Immigrant Consumers” is to examine multiple border-crossing experiences structured at the outset using different national treaty arrangements, which structure circumstances surrounding immigration (e.g., group size, refugee status, accessible paths to citizenship, institutional sponsorships). This move would allow for the emergence of a more nuanced understanding of the “immigrant” (e.g., itinerant workers vs. refugees) and “citizenship” categories—one that could reveal how inequality works on and through these categories. A single-setting/multisite comparative design set in Southern California could be a multi-ethnic comparison involving Mexican and Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, or Pacific Islander border crossings, as well as “native” citizens. Each immigrant group features different historical waves of immigration to the United States under different circumstances. Comparative study designs lend themselves to large-scale, team-authored, multisited (e.g., multicity, cross-national), and long-term engagements in the settings. In “Immigrant Consumers,” Peñaloza concentrates on immigrants who frequent a four-block urban retail enclave, an incredible resource for newly arriving immigrants. A comparative redesign might seek out directly comparable enclaves for other ethnic groups but would also be open to alternative forms of border-crossing consumption particular to local conditions because some immigrant groups may be less likely to cluster into residential or retail enclaves. We know from extant work in sociology that social networks inherent in immigrant enclaves are instrumental in how embedded migrant workers become in their culture of destination (Korinek, Entwisle, and Jampaklay 2005). Some consumer researchers have implemented single-setting/multiple-site designs (e.g., Askegaard, Arnould, and Kjeldgaard 2005; multicity) and multiple-setting (e.g., Kjeldgaard and Askegaard 2006; cross-national) designs. We echo their calls for more. Comparative designs would allow for richer discussion of the global flows of labor, consumption, gender, ethnicity, culture, and institutional power. It would also facilitate flipping the theoretical lens to investigate the role of such global flows in coconstructing hegemonic notions of identity categories (e.g., “American-ness”) and their impact on public policy.
Conclusion

Immigration, culture, and ethnicity will continue to play a critical role in structuring the social relations that affect well-being. Consumption will also remain a primary way that IC&E is enacted in society. However, consumer and policy researchers must offer insights into these complex and contested phenomena that operate at both the individual and collective levels. We encourage scholars to design research that is dynamic, multifocal, and sensitive to complexity. We call on IC&E researchers to choose areas of inquiry—such as (but not limited to) well-being—that employ concepts and generate data capable of assessing collective behavior. Furthermore, we call on them to utilize research designs that address complexity and capture interactions and feedback.

References


Hall, Peter A. and Michèle Lamont (2009), Successful Societies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harris, Craig, Alia B. Rau, and Glen Creno (2010), “Arizona Governor Signs Immigration Law; Foes Promise Fight,” The Arizona Republic, (April 24), (accessed February 16, 2011), [availl-


Copyright of Journal of Public Policy & Marketing is the property of American Marketing Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.