ANNUAL REVIEWS

Annual Review of Sociology

Immigrant Organizations

Irene Bloemraad,[1,*] Ali R. Chaudhary,[2,*] and Shannon Gleeson[3,*]

[1]Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA; email: bloemr@berkeley.edu

[2]Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA; email: arc249@sociology.rutgers.edu

[3]Department of Labor Relations, Law, and History, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA; email: smg338@cornell.edu

Annu. Rev. Sociol. 2022. 48:319–41

First published as a Review in Advance on February 15, 2022

The *Annual Review of Sociology* is online at soc.annualreviews.org

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-030420-015613

Copyright © 2022 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

*These authors are listed alphabetically

ANNUAL REVIEWS CONNECT

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Keywords

immigrants and migration, organizations, nonprofits, civic engagement, transnationalism, social movements

Abstract

We call for incorporating organizations into migration scholarship, and for considering immigrants in organizational research. By centering immigrant organizations (IOs) as a unit of analysis, migration scholars can reconsider whether and how IOs affect well-being, integration, political voice, identities, globalization, and development. Migration scholars must learn from scholars of organizations, but organization scholars must in turn question assumptions of nativity and citizenship in their research. Doing so illuminates the unique challenges—and, at times, opportunities—faced by IOs, especially regarding inequities tied to legal status and stigmatization. We further argue that cross-national and transnational analyses of IOs help unpack organizational embeddedness—that is, the ways in which contexts at the local, national, binational, and geopolitical levels generate opportunities and constraints. Studying IOs raises critical questions of civic inequality and organizational stigma but also highlights IOs' potential to give voice to and effect positive change for migrant communities.

INTRODUCTION

Immigrant organization (IO): a collective group with shared history, goals, identity and opportunities for recurring interactions, whose leaders and/or members are foreign-born

Civic engagement: voluntary activity beyond the private (family) or market (work) sphere done as an individual (e.g., volunteering) or through an organization

Transnationalism: the ways in which individuals, communities, and organizations maintain cross-border linkages between two or more nations over time

Political voice: the ability of individuals or their representative organizations to advance their interests by influencing political agendas, public knowledge, and decision-making

In the face of substantial and growing global mobility, and despite over a century of sociological scholarship on migration and immigrant integration, the organizational dimension of immigrant life remains analytically underdeveloped and undertheorized. We see signs, however, that this is changing.[1] In this review, we explore how researchers have studied immigrant organizations (IOs) across multiple subfields, including migration studies, nonprofit organizations, social movements and civic engagement, transnationalism, urban sociology, and research on inequality. We argue that while international migration (IM) scholars have developed a rich scholarship on migration and integration processes, analytical attention to IOs has been rare. We review recent research that prioritizes organizations as objects of analysis and contend that IOs are significant meso-level actors mediating the sociocultural, political, and economic landscapes of migrant communities in the twenty-first century. Furthermore, we suggest that scholars interested in studying IOs should focus on inequities stemming from immigrants' community-level vulnerabilities, including noncitizenship and the stigmatization of groups deemed as potential threats (i.e., outsiders) due to nativity, religion, national origin, language, ethno-racial background, and other ascriptive markers of otherness. We conclude by considering recent work that interrogates how IOs navigate opportunities and constraints stemming from local, domestic, homeland, bilateral, and geopolitical contexts.

Empirically, sociologists of migration have long documented how voluntary associations and community-based groups influence both migration and immigrant incorporation, from settlement houses and places of worship to ethnic mutual assistance associations and formally incorporated refugee resettlement organizations. Yet IOs have not featured prominently in key theoretical debates in the IM literature, which have focused on individual-level or household-level analyses of emigration, immigrant integration (or assimilation), and cross-border transnational engagements. Existing IM research largely views IOs as proxies for aggregated individual behavior or community-level processes.

IOs are not just aggregations of people, however, but critical mediators of structural dynamics, reservoirs of social capital, nodes of collective action, and conduits for transnational engagement. They represent sites of authority and leadership and can be loci of conflict over organizational missions, activities, and funding sources, as well as domestic, homeland and diaspora politics. They may develop bureaucratic structures with norms, routinized procedures, and temporal horizons beyond the scope of any single migrant. By centering IOs as a core meso-level unit of analysis, migration scholars can reconsider whether and how migrant organizations facilitate or impede integration, enhance or constrain political voice, influence identities, affect globalization and development, and impact migrants' well-being. Migration scholars can, and should, learn from existing research on the birth, persistence, and death of organizations conducted by colleagues who study nonprofit, social movement, or civic organizations, as well as from organizational scholars' attention to resource dependency, internal conflict, and other tensions.

While migration scholars can benefit from greater engagement with organizational scholars, organizational scholars must in turn examine their implicit assumptions about nativity and citizenship. By doing so, they can better engage the unique challenges—and, at times, opportunities—specific to migrant-run or immigrant-serving organizations. Organizational researchers can learn from migration scholars' theoretical and empirical work on legality and the cultural, religious, linguistic, ethno-racial, or ascriptive stigmatization of migrants and their organizations, as we

[1] A recent analysis of publication titles in Google Scholar for the terms "(im)migrant" or "refugee" and "organization(s)" found barely three items per year in the 1980s. The count has increased almost twenty-fold since 2010 (Bloemraad et al. 2020, p. 299).

elaborate below. Future research should investigate topics such as inequality in organizational resources and infrastructures (Ramakrishnan & Bloemraad 2008, Bloemraad et al. 2020), immigrant organizational ecology (Bloemraad 2005, 2006; Vermeulen 2013; Chaudhary & Guarnizo 2016; Chaudhary 2018a), and ascriptive organizational stigma (Chaudhary 2021).

We also see fruitful learning opportunities at the nexus of transnationalism and migrant organizations. Although organizations engaging in cross-border activities are well documented in nonprofit studies, this scholarship tends to engage in top-down analysis, focusing on prominent international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), international regulatory frameworks, elite networks, or global markets. Migration scholars, in contrast, underscore the bottom-up work of migrants who create transnational political, civic, and charitable organizations that operate across borders to connect origin and destination communities through homeland development efforts, cultural connections, and diaspora politics. The study of homeland-oriented IOs is also fertile ground for research on organizational embeddedness. The geopolitical context of armed conflict, civil wars, and ascriptive stigma can put migrant nongovernmental organizations at risk. Comparative cross-national and transnational analyses of IOs open a window onto the opportunities and constraints that organizations navigate, embedded as they are in myriad local, national, binational, and geopolitical contexts.

In what follows, we argue for incorporating a meso-level analysis of organizations into migration scholarship and for considering immigrants in organizational research. We start by defining IOs, and then we review earlier studies of IOs from the twentieth century in the pre– and post–World War II eras. We flag social scientists' changing views on whether IOs help or hinder integration, and we call for careful investigation into the impact of IOs on migrant well-being. We next discuss three areas of research that have considered IOs more deliberately, that is, in the study of migrants' civic and political engagement, (panethnic) collective identities, and transnationalism. In the final section, we outline research agendas that help bridge micro, meso, and macro levels of analysis. We highlight two agendas: first, the need to better understand when and how characteristics associated with migrants affect the organizations that they establish or that seek to represent them, and second, the importance of unpacking organizational embeddedness, that is, the ways in which temporal, social, political, and geographic contexts can result in opportunities as well as constraints for IOs. While both agendas raise questions of civic inequality, they also spotlight the potential of IOs to give voice to and effect positive change for migrant communities.[2]

Ascriptive organizational stigma: negative perception of an organization stemming from group-level stigma based on ascriptive categorical markers (e.g., nationality, religion, ethno-racial identity)

International nongovernmental organizations (INGOs): nonprofits that often collect resources in richer countries and engage in advocacy and humanitarian work in moderate- or low-income countries

Organizational embeddedness: the ways in which contexts at the local, national, binational, and geopolitical levels generate opportunities and constraints for an IO

Civic inequality: disparities in the number, density, breadth, capacity, and visibility of organized groups in a community

DEFINITIONS: WHAT IS AN IMMIGRANT ORGANIZATION?

What, precisely, distinguishes an IO from other organized groups? We take a capacious view of the organizational life of immigrants that captures the wide range of immigrant civil society. First, we define an organization as a collective group with some shared history, goals, or identity that offers opportunities for recurring interactions or activities over time. An organization's existence is justified by a purpose or a mission, and its persistence requires a nominal structure or standard operating procedures, resources, and an affiliate base. These organized groups might be formally registered or incorporated, but they need not be.

We are particularly interested in not-for-profit or voluntary organizations that are neither public nor for-profit entities. Not-for-profit organizations play a crucial role in providing social services, legal brokering, and policy advocacy to immigrant communities, as well as enriching

[2] We focus primarily on US scholarship and secondarily on research conducted in other Western liberal democracies. An important future direction for scholarship is comparing and contrasting findings from the Global North with research in Asia, Africa, and the rest of the Americas.

Nonprofit organizations: groups that operate without aiming to generate a profit for owners but to advance a charitable, public-good, or collective mission

immigrants' religious, cultural, and recreational life. We mostly bracket off ethnic businesses, although we note their relevance when they contribute to a public purpose, such as mobilizing immigrants for protest or political action (e.g., Zepeda-Millán 2017) or fostering group cohesion and collective identity (e.g., Mora 2014).

Second, we focus on organizations with leaders, members, and/or clients who are foreign-born. We recognize that diverse organizations serve or engage immigrants, including those led by the children or grandchildren of immigrants as well as other native-born allies. We highlight foreign-born individuals, though, because they are more likely to differ linguistically, culturally, and religiously from native-born residents, and they may face unique organizational barriers as noncitizens and people socialized elsewhere. In doing so, we recognize that scholarship on ethno-racial inequalities in the nonprofit or civic sphere is relevant to migrants; indeed, the immigrant experience in the United States is highly racialized. We nevertheless argue for an additional set of conceptual tools to address the unique dynamics that shape the experiences of first-generation immigrants and their organizations.

EARLY TOUCHSTONES: IMMIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS AS ADAPTIVE OR PROBLEMATIC

Over the past century, social scientists have adopted dramatically opposed positions on the adaptive benefits or problematic nature of IOs, for both immigrants and receiving societies. At times, these positions seem to stem more from normative beliefs than empirically driven research. We provide a chronology of these views and call for more thoughtful, data-driven research and theorizing in future IO scholarship.

Studying and Theorizing Immigrant Organizations in the Early Twentieth Century

Nonprofit organizations have served immigrants throughout history (Moya 2005). At the end of the nineteenth century, for example, social reformers in the United States directed their energies to creating settlement houses. Chicago's Hull House is the best known of these, but by 1911, a study by the Russell Sage Foundation counted 413 such institutions across 32 states, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii (Woods & Kennedy 1911, p. vi). In parallel, many immigrants, including new arrivals from Southern and Eastern Europe, established immigrant-led associations and hybrid binational communities (Thomas & Znaniecki 1984, Marinari 2020). Political observers at the time regularly saw IOs as threats to Americanization and vehicles of insular machine politics. Early sociologists, however, argued that IOs played an important role in ensuring the moral and behavioral organization of immigrant communities, thus aiding their adaptation.

Indeed, immigrants and organizations featured prominently in early sociological research. Chicago School sociologists relied on these organizations as research sites and viewed them as a conduit to activating social policies. Amid rapid industrialization and US capitalist expansion, the field's key theoretical concerns reflected anxieties over immigrant disorganization, urbanization, anomie, deviance, and—with the arrival of millions of immigrants—successful Americanization. The question of whether receiving societies could integrate newcomers has been a central concern ever since.

Thomas & Znaniecki's (1984) classic study of early twentieth-century Polish emigration to the United States illustrates this early focus on IOs. Migration had disrupted the lives of Polish immigrants, and Thomas and Znaniecki argued that few American institutions outside of work and commerce targeted these immigrants. To fill this gap, Polish-American organization emerged,

which was "the only factor which can. . . [keep] the individual under direct control and [uphold] certain standards of behavior" (Thomas & Znaniecki 1984, p. xvii). According to Thomas and Znaniecki, IOs recreated some aspects of homeland life but also, critically, facilitated immigrants' acculturation to their new life, producing neither a Polish nor an American community but rather a "Polish-American society." Community-based organizations—such as mutual benefit societies, ethnic parishes, community centers, political clubs, and parochial schools—were critical. They communicated values, provided benefits and services, institutionalized activities, and promoted ethno-national identities.

The role of IOs during mass migration from the 1880s to 1920s is also spotlighted in early political science research and contemporary historical accounts of immigrants' political engagement. IOs formed alliances with local political party machines and business interests, which encouraged naturalization (and, in turn, voting) and mobilized support for or opposition to policies ranging from immigration law to alcohol prohibition (Williams 1912, Schneider 2001, Marinari 2020). Yet critics at the time often saw ethnic bloc voting as indicating incomplete assimilation, rather than a celebratory instance of community organizing *à la* de Tocqueville. A persistent question for researchers has been whether, and to what degree, immigration organizations aid or obstruct migrants' incorporation.

Post–World War II Assimilation Frameworks

In the 1960s, sociologists and students of politics flipped their view on IOs. Previously, sociologists applauded IOs. But new linear assimilation theories now began to view IOs as impediments to immigrant integration. According to Gordon (1964), the end goal of full integration was "civic assimilation," devoid of "value and power conflicts" and marked by "large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of society" (Gordon 1964, p. 71). Entrance into mainstream groups—not IOs—would ensure direct contact with the "core society" through friendship and intermarriage, the lynchpin of assimilation.

Conversely, the politics of the 1960s cast doubt on the efficacy, and desirability, of the proverbial melting pot among students of politics. Second- and even third-generation descendants of European immigrants were neither shedding their ethnic identities nor experiencing unfettered upward mobility, two concerns often linked in public discourse (Glazer & Moynihan 1963, Novak 1972). As civil rights and student-led social movements underscored the importance of organized collective action, immigrant and coethnic organizations followed suit, becoming cornerstones of pluralistic politics (Dahl 1961) and engines for electoral mobilizing as well as some protest-oriented collective action (Bloemraad 2007).

Broader trends in sociology also affected research agendas. Sociologists' prior interest in Americanization was recast as statistical analyses of inequality, which eclipsed the ethnographic approach that used organizations and urban spaces to study social processes. Research on immigrant assimilation increasingly relied on large-scale census and survey data to track intergenerational changes in ethnic identities, intermarriage patterns, residential concentration, and economic mobility (e.g., Lieberson 1980, Massey 1981, Portes & Bach 1985, Lieberson & Waters 1988). Organizations other than schools were not generally part of these data collection efforts.

Dueling sociological perspectives on assimilation began to emerge in the early 1990s and would continue into the early twenty-first century. Straight-line assimilation theorists clashed with scholars outlining segmented assimilation patterns marked by racial hierarchies, the hourglass economy, and educational and linguistic inequality (e.g., Portes & Zhou 1993, Alba & Nee 2003). These debates also focused on the importance of contexts of reception. While host society institutions could replicate and amplify race-based and economic inequality, studies also

pointed to the potential for antidiscrimination protections to foster inclusion. IOs were largely absent in such debates. Segmented assimilation did focus on the insulating role of ethnic social capital against racialized patterns of inequality, but it mostly viewed social capital as interpersonal networks or a community attribute, paying limited attention to organizations.

On the ground, however, IOs continued to emerge, persist, or dissolve. Some organizations that grew out of turn-of-the-twentieth-century migration withered or were absorbed into mainstream groups as migration slowed in the 1920s. Yet a range of pre–World War II, religion-based charities, mutual aid societies, and advocacy groups remained active in immigrant gateway cities like New York City and San Francisco (de Graauw 2016, Marinari 2020) in the post-war period. With refugee resettlement, in particular, IOs have aided those fleeing violence and persecution, first operating as private actors and then as government partners (Holman 1996). Subsequently, after passage of the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act led to large-scale migration from Latin America and Asia, and as the civil rights era lifted up community organizing, new migrants established new associations and community-development initiatives, assisted at times by private foundations and government initiatives such as Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty and Great Society programs (Minkoff 1995, Okamoto 2014, Kim 2020b).

Immigrant Organizations and Immigrant Well-being

The explosion of organizing in the 1960s and over the following decades raises important questions about IOs and immigrant well-being. Scholars of inequality and nonprofits have paid increasing attention to whether and how community-based organizations act as a shadow state, providing health, social, and human services—sometimes through government contracting, other times as a privately funded safety net. Scholars of migration, however, have focused little on the possible impact of IOs on immigrant well-being, which is one measure of integration (Natl. Acad. Sci. Eng. Med. 2015). We view such analyses as a critical area for future research. Among researchers of inequality, there is active debate about whether nonprofits act as a support mechanism (e.g., by providing social services, as a node for networking, or as a place for psychological and cultural empowerment) or whether they exert a form of social control (Gilliom 2001, Soss et al. 2011, Marwell & Morrissey 2020). Do IOs advance migrants' well-being? In what ways? And why might they fall short?[3]

Students of migration also have important insights to offer colleagues who have tracked the consequences of the Reagan administration's funding cuts on nonprofits or the Clinton administration's overhaul of welfare policy on the devolution of social and human services. Welfare state and nonprofit scholars have shown the dire consequences of such policy shifts for vulnerable groups, but they have not adequately explored how government restrictions on grant-making or service provision generate extra burdens for immigrant-serving organizations. Such restrictions impact health care providers, including last-resort nonprofit clinics or public hospitals that rely on public funds restricted by legal status considerations (Horton 2004, Light 2012, Natl. Immigr. Law Cent. 2020). They also impact legal service providers who help low-income clients with access-to-justice problems (e.g., landlord-tenant disputes) but who are barred from assisting noncitizens due to restrictive federal Legal Services Corporation funding (Legal Serv. Corp.

[3]We focus on immigrant integration and well-being, a topic regularly tackled by IM scholars, but the study of why and how people migrate is also ripe for greater consideration of IOs. We know that both formal and informal IOs grease the migration machinery (Hernández-León 2013), ranging from unscrupulous groups to more benevolent organizations (Guevarra 2009, Martin 2017), but meso-level research on migration flows has been limited.

2020). Furthermore, although mainstream nonprofits can be a resource for immigrant communities, they often face linguistic, cultural, and even geographic barriers to engaging immigrant populations (Roth et al. 2015). We must therefore not only better incorporate IOs and meso-level analyses into migration scholarship, but also include migrants and migration more regularly into the sociology of organizations, nonprofits, and complementary subfields.

WHEN IMMIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED: THEMES OF POLITICAL VOICE, IDENTITY, AND TRANSNATIONALISM

To the extent that sociologists have studied IOs, they have illuminated the role of IOs for immigrants' political voice, their sense of personal and collective identification, and their transnational engagements. Some of this research examines settings beyond the United States, in places where public-private partnerships for immigrant settlement are more prevalent or where host societies did not expect immigrant assimilation. Through this research, we see how IOs can bridge, analytically and substantively, macro-level structures with micro-level experiences.

Immigrant Organizations and Political Voice

In the 1960s, as Milton Gordon was theorizing the importance of mainstream "core society" institutions for immigrant assimilation in the United States, noted Canadian sociologist Raymond Breton (1964) was exploring immigrant communities' "institutional completeness." Breton measured the number of institutions or organizations in an immigrant community, the range of issues those organizations tackled (e.g., schooling, worship, social interactions, business transactions), and the degree to which a person used those ethnic organizations in their daily life. He found that ethnic identity and political solidarity were more salient for those more embedded in the institutional life of their immigrant community, but also that an immigrant community's overall institutional completeness spilled over to affect nonjoiners. Breton did not share the assimilation anxieties of some of his US counterparts and saw immigrant community cohesion as compatible with political mobilization and psychological adjustment.

Unlike in North America, many European societies at this time did not expect first-generation guest workers and their children to become permanent, integrated members of society. Because these disenfranchised, often poor migrants lacked a path to political inclusion via easy naturalization or birthright citizenship, immigrant associations acted as crucial interlocutors with governments and as organizational vehicles for claims-making and advocacy (e.g., Schmitter 1980, Koopmans et al. 2005). Subsequent European scholarship reiterated the importance of IOs for individual and collective engagement (Schrover & Vermeulen 2005, Morales & Giugni 2011, Vermeulen et al. 2012).

A growing research program in the United States has increasingly studied the role of IOs in immigrants' political mobilization and civic voice. For some, IOs serve as civic or political schools that teach immigrants skills, empower them, and build bridges to coalition partners. Action-oriented community organizations, especially those addressing workplace precarity (Milkman & Terriquez 2012, Chun 2016), have been a major focus of this work, with some evidence that skills attained in one arena (e.g., union participation) can translate to other spheres, such as educational justice (Terriquez 2011).[4] An intriguing subtheme is the importance of IOs for women's empowerment.

[4]Historically, unions have been hostile to migrant workers (Hamlin 2008, Sullivan & Lee 2008), but contemporary accounts of labor organizing are more optimistic about their potential to improve immigrants' lives,

There is evidence that immigrant women in particular develop civic and leadership skills through interfacing with their children's schools, welfare state bureaucracies, community nonprofit organizations, and faith groups (Jones-Correa 1998, Heredia 2008, Rogers 2009, Watkins-Hayes 2009). IOs thus help immigrants become seen and heard as union members, parents, voters, and activists.[5]

IOs are also studied as collective resources and mobilization nodes used by social movements to produce societal change (Bloemraad & Voss 2020). US scholars have identified a wide range of organizations—from day labor and other worker organizations to the ethnic media, faith and advocacy groups, and even soccer leagues—as mobilizing structures that have pushed for comprehensive immigration reform, executive relief from deportation, or the end of family separation and other enforcement activities (Wong & Munoz 2004, Pallares & Flores-González 2010, Voss & Bloemraad 2011, Coutin et al. 2017, Zepeda-Millán 2017, Trouille 2021). A social movements approach is particularly useful since deportation risks and limited political rights can shut immigrants out of traditional political channels such as voting. While studies have often focused on the Latinx community and youth-led organizing (Nicholls 2013, Burciaga & Martinez 2017, Abrego & Negrón-Gonzales 2020), scholars are increasingly examining coalition organizing beyond Hispanic immigrants and the importance of intersectional identities (Terriquez 2015, Escudero 2020).

Much of the scholarship on IOs and political voice is celebratory, or at least hopeful, about the positive role organizations can play in advancing immigrants' interests. Greater engagement with the sociology of organizations and the well-documented problems around organizations' resource dependency, bureaucratic sclerosis, and leadership capture is necessary moving forward. Some research on intersections of race, class, and gender in progressive interest groups suggests that the most privileged often drive agendas, even in organizations seeking social justice (Minkoff 1995, Strolovitch 2008). Beyond agendas, Nicholls (2019, p. 174) documents how the need to "scale up" the fight for immigrant rights concentrates resources at the national level, producing a "hierarchical, class-like organizational structure" with national organizations at the top and precarious local grassroots organizations at the bottom. Another question is whether immigrant social movement organizations can transcend antimigrant forces and reformist institutions to achieve mass legalization, effective responses to asylum flows, and a demilitarized border. Critical ethnic studies scholar Alfonso Gonzales (2013) argues that the inertia of institutionalization makes large-scale transformative policy reform an unlikely prospect in the United States.

Organizations, Identity, and Panethnicity

Organizations also figure prominently in the longstanding sociological interest in individual and group identities. Classic research on later-generation, European-origin Americans centered on whether or not these people adopted hyphenated identities and on the significance of such identity categories. For Glazer & Moynihan (1963), Irish-American and Italian-American organizations

---

in the workplace and politically (Milkman 2020). In general, having representation via labor organizations is the strongest predictor of better workplace conditions in the United States. However, despite the radical shift toward immigrant inclusivity in the national labor movement, local unions differ substantially in their priorities to immigrants (Fantasia & Voss 2004). An organizational focus on immigrant labor is an important area for future research.

[5]The educational and empowerment work of organizations is not restricted to IOs. This raises the recurring questions of whether it matters that an organization is an IO or not, and when organizations cease to fit the label of immigrant, especially in multigenerational places.

reflected the continued salience of ethnicity, challenging the mythic melting pot narrative. With the decisive shift to non-European migration after 1965, researchers explored the emergence of Asian-American and Latinx "panethnic" identities (Lopez & Espiritu 1990; Espiritu 1992; Kibria 1997, 2000; Okamoto 2003). Panethnicity refers here to the categorical boundary derived from consolidating ethnic, religious, linguistic, tribal, and nationality subgroups under an umbrella label such as Hispanic, Latinx, South Asian, Asian American, or Arab American (Okamoto & Mora 2014). Early scholarship examined how panethnic identity became politicized for Asian and Latin American-origin communities, especially in light of hate crimes, economic marginalization, and student organizing during the civil rights era, noting—sometimes in passing—the role of organizations.

Panethnicity: the categorical boundary derived from consolidating ethnic, religious, linguistic, tribal, and nationality subgroups under an umbrella label

More recent scholarship on panethnicity theorizes the role of organizations more directly (Okamoto & Mora 2014). Drawing on organizational field theory, Mora (2014) highlights how the interactions between public, nonprofit, and for-profit organizations culminate in the formation of a pan-Hispanic category and sense of collective identity. But even within a particular organizational sector, some researchers find variations, as in the distinct understandings of Latinx advanced by diverse student groups across postsecondary institutions (Verduzco Reyes 2018). For Okamoto (2014), mobilization against discrimination, residential concentration, and socioeconomic inequality motivates Asian-American panethnicity and creates contexts for establishing civic and political Asian-American organizations. Placing the United States in comparative perspective, however, Kim (2020a) argues that shared racial status as "Orientals" does not necessarily produce coalition politics and shared identities; distinct political geographies of settlement mean that Asian coalitions are far from inevitable, as he finds in comparing Vancouver, Canada, with San Francisco and Seattle. All of these studies underscore that organizations are vital conduits for identity formation processes, but this research also raises questions about the importance of organizations relative to other determinants of identity formation such as hate crimes and economic marginalization, as well as questions over the ways that contextual embedding affects organizational formation, mission, and activities.

Immigrant Organizations and Transnationalism

IOs do not operate solely within national borders. They also link people, institutions, and governments between places of origin and settlement (Levitt 2001, Guarnizo 2003). A century ago, associations of Italian immigrants in the United States promoted transnational orientations and activities (Marinari 2020). In the 1980s, Linda Basch (1989) documented how organizations in the immigrant communities from St. Vincent and Grenada fostered political connections to the homeland, island identities, international development, and charitable giving. In what was subsequently dubbed the transnational turn (Levitt & Jaworsky 2007), an epistemological shift occurred among migration scholars, who pivoted from the canonical focus on immigrants' assimilation into host societies, which often implied that migrants cut homeland ties when they crossed the border. Instead, these scholars drew attention to the cross-border linkages shaping the sociocultural, economic, and political lives of some contemporary migrants (Itzigsohn & Saucedo 2002, Waldinger 2015, Portes et al. 2017). While some researchers asked whether transnational engagement slowed immigrant incorporation given their ties "here" and "there" (Jones-Correa 1998, Erdal & Oeppen 2013, Chaudhary 2018b), others focused on understanding what drives transnational activity among people and IOs (Portes et al. 2007, Fox & Bada 2008, Landolt 2008, Lacroix 2009, Portes & Fernandez-Kelly 2015, Zhou & Lee 2015).

Organizations are highly relevant to transnationalism because they can help foster and facilitate transnational ties over time. Furthermore, by bringing people together, IOs can leverage

transnational interpersonal connections into a larger collective impact. For these reasons, two key research foci have been IOs' role as interlocutors for grassroots development efforts and their engagement in cross-national political activity.

On the subject of development, academics, international institutions, and other observers have celebrated migrants' transnationalism, especially their monetary remittances, for initiating and funding development projects in diaspora-sending countries (de Haas 2010). While many economists and policymakers fixate on the amount and impact of these financial investments (Faist 2008), sociologists have examined the organizational drivers of such activities (Portes et al. 2007, 2008). Unlike intergovernmental institutions like the World Bank or elite INGOs, these transnational IOs tend to be small-scale grassroots development organizations, such as hometown associations (HTAs) (Landolt 2008, Bada 2014). Their defining feature is a well-connected emigrant population bound to specific, often rural, communities of origin (Portes et al. 2007, Faist 2008). Observers often laud these migrant IOs' efforts, though some HTAs may be narrowly focused on building sports fields or symbolic projects celebrating emigrants rather than long-lasting structural improvements (Bada 2014). In some cases, sending countries have tried to leverage bottom-up efforts via financial matching programs, as in the case of Mexico and post–civil war El Salvador.

A second prominent research focus interrogates the determinants, frequency, prevalence, and significance of cross-border political activities, as well as possible trade-offs or complementarities in political engagements both "here" and "there" (Levitt & Schiller 2004, Waldinger 2015, Chaudhary 2018b). Researchers document how transnational political IOs can serve as conduits to community participation in the civic and political affairs of origin countries via expatriate voting, campaign contributions, and other activities (Brinkerhoff et al. 2019, Chaudhary & Moss 2019). Transnational political activity might also advance or complement civic and political engagement in destination communities (Guarnizo et al. 2003, Landolt 2008, Vonderlack-Navarro 2014, Boccagni et al. 2015, Chaudhary 2018b). For example, as with domestic IOs, transnational IOs might function as civic or political schools, providing fungible skills for host-country civic incorporation.

As in the case of development, scholars tend to see transnational political and civic IOs as beneficial to immigrants and their societies, but this is not necessarily the case. Future research must consider context more carefully. The significance of transnational IOs, be it to origin country politics or incorporation into receiving polities, can vary substantially across migrant communities (Chaudhary & Moss 2019). Political norms and government structures matter, as do the ways transnational IOs are celebrated or subjected to organizational stigmas. In the article's final section, we turn to the importance of organizational embedding.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS FOR IMMIGRANT ORGANIZATIONS

Looking to future research agendas, we call on not just migration scholars but also organizational sociologists, scholars of stratification/inequality, and political process researchers to spearhead the study of IOs. We highlight two directions among many paths forward. First, we must better understand the degree to which the characteristics associated with migrants as people—that is, their legal status, national origins, socioeconomic diversity, ethno-racial background, religion, culture, and so forth—affect the organizations that they establish or that represent them. Second, we see an urgent need to study organizational embeddedness, that is, the ways in which temporal, social, political, and geographic context affects the prospects for building and sustaining IOs. We elaborate on each agenda in turn.

From the Micro to Meso Level: Immigrant Characteristics, Community Diversity, and Immigrant Organizations

Noncitizen: someone who does not hold legal citizenship where they reside, spanning undocumented residents, those with temporary visas, and permanent residents

Refugee resettlement programs: international and domestically governed plans to identify, relocate, and orient refugees in new destination communities

Organizations are created by and dependent on people, but they are also distinct from individuals in that leadership, members, and clients can change while the organization lives on. Still, the types of people associated with an organization can have a substantial impact on its long-term sustainability and how its mission evolves. Although sociologists studying for-profit firms, nonprofits, and social movement organizations have at times considered the obstacles faced by organizations built by women, racial minorities, or LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning) individuals, researchers have largely operated from a presumption of constituents' citizenship status. We underscore that in the United States (and elsewhere), legality is highly consequential for organizing nonprofits and civic associations. A careful examination of IOs must take into account "the distinct resources, institutional support, and exclusions that come with the multiple legal statuses that people can hold" (Bloemraad et al. 2020, p. 293). This accounting is vital not only for understanding the undocumented experience but also the entire range of noncitizen categories that characterize the "second wall" of the US immigration enforcement system (including guest workers, students, and other temporary migrants) (Menjívar 2006, Chen & New 2018). Moreover, because legal statuses are variable across immigrant communities, national origin communities can also have very distinct organizational experiences and infrastructures.

All categories of legal status create ripples for IO activities and prospects. For voluntary and membership-driven organizations, key assumptions around the factors driving engagement must be rethought (Ramakrishnan & Bloemraad 2008), notably in neighborhoods and workplaces where a large percentage of the community are noncitizens and thus, in the United States, vulnerable to deportation. The vulnerability of migrants in irregular status is clear, but fears over participation and civic visibility are increasingly true for communities with high rates of legal permanent residency and even naturalization. Groups that may be targeted for enforcement and charges of un-American-ness, such as Muslim communities in the post-9/11 war on terror context (Chaudhary 2021) or East Asian communities blamed for pandemics, face particularly strong backlash (Chen 2020, Robertson & Manta 2020). Those studying voluntary organizations need to rethink the circumstances under which organizational life, celebrated as a Tocquevillian virtue of democracy and social connection, can thrive.

Legal status also affects organizational resources for voluntary and more professional nonprofits. As we noted above, publicly funded groups are often unable to serve unauthorized populations, or must do so under the radar. This prohibition affects a range of organizations, such as legal service providers that rely on restrictive LSC federal funding, health providers dependent on public funds restricted by citizenship, or even adult education, where institutions or policies may tacitly or outright ban teaching undocumented learners (Johnson 2017). Such restrictions are made worse by the fact that noncitizen immigrants do not vote and are unable to exert electoral influence over these public goods (Marwell 2004, Marrow 2009), although some join social movements to influence reforms.

Perniciously, constraints based on the politics of legal status or the stigmatization of immigrants' ascriptive characteristics (ethnicities, nationalities, religious identities, etc.) are not limited to public contracts or government restrictions. Even self-funded initiatives can face scrutiny. For example, in the post-9/11 context, Muslim immigrants' diaspora organizations worry about counterterrorism-inspired surveillance of transnational networks as well as charitable activities (Chaudhary 2021). Moreover, when outside philanthropies and private foundations reach out to immigrant communities, donors are more willing to fund some needs over others. Particularly popular efforts include naturalization drives, official refugee resettlement programs, and

Opportunity structures: institutional contexts that can be political or discursive and can shape organizational embeddedness

get-out-the-vote campaigns for new citizens; criminal defense funds for incarcerated immigrants or support services for single, adult asylum seekers get less support (de Graauw & Gleeson 2018).

Migrant background is not always a barrier to securing support. Some migrant communities are deemed especially deserving of public and philanthropic assistance, such as those who fled Communist-led countries and arrived in the United States during the Cold War (Eckstein 2022). These communities received government assistance through resettlement programs, allowing them to build richer organizational infrastructures than migrants with similar socioeconomic profiles but who were denied asylum status or viewed as economic or family migrants (Bloemraad 2005, 2006; Hein 1997). When policies change, the impact can be dramatic for migrant communities. President Trump's decision to drastically downsize the US refugee program in 2018 led dozens of refugee resettlement organizations reliant on federal government funding to close their doors (Darrow & Scholl 2020).

Such dynamics reveal important inequities in state-society relations and highlight the ways that organizations and interest groups can benefit or be deprived of public funding and infrastructure support. Migrant legality—as well as other sources of othering that affect immigrant communities—can be understood as a group-level ascriptive attribute, which can become conflated with IOs, transforming perceptions of legality into an ascriptive organizational-level stigma (Chaudhary 2021). Such insights from research on IOs open important research agendas for studying civic inequality—that is, disparities in the number, density, breadth, capacity, and visibility of organized groups in a community (Bloemraad et al. 2020).

At the same time, immigrant communities are not monolithic or homogeneous. Researchers must be attentive to intragroup variation based on class and status distinctions linked to places of origin (e.g., caste, religion, homeland politics, etc.). For example, while many Asian immigrants are often associated with high socioeconomic success and model minority tropes (Lee & Zhou 2015), recent scholarship suggests that Asian and South Asian communities are starkly bifurcated along economic lines in the United States and Canada (Wong et al. 2011, Ameeriar 2017). Such divisions carry implications for IOs. For instance, in their comparative analysis of the Pakistani IO infrastructure in Toronto and New York City, Chaudhary & Guarnizo (2016) find significant class tensions. Organizations catering to the better educated and well-off tend to focus on transnational development in Pakistan, while working-class organizations emphasize social services and social justice issues relevant to impoverished Pakistani immigrants. Dynamics within IOs can also reflect tensions in origin societies. In her analysis of Ecuadorian migrant organizations in Barcelona and New York, Lacomba (2016) finds that the presence of homeland political parties in the receiving society exacerbates intragroup differences, which then increases mistrust. In short, organizational-level inquiry must also be attentive to intracommunity diversity and tensions.

From the Macro to the Meso Level: Organizational Embeddedness

A second research frontier involves probing organizational embeddedness, or the ways that temporal, social, political, and geographic context affects IOs. Such an approach advances well-established ideas in migration studies around the impact of the contexts of reception and departure for immigrant incorporation and, in the field of social movements, the way that opportunity structures affect movements, including social movement organizations. In terms of migration studies, scholars have been imprecise at times as to what constitutes a "context of reception," but researchers regularly consider immigration and citizenship laws, racism and public opinion, and settlement and integration policies (e.g., Portes & Zhou 1993, Portes & Rumbaut 2001, Bloemraad 2006); more rarely, they also include economic and residential context (Landolt 2008, Ramakrishnan & Bloemraad 2008). Despite imprecision, Luthra et al. (2018) contrast the

contextual approach with the individualist orientation inherent in certain assimilation models, arguing that "the context of reception [is] a feature of the society of immigration and one *shared* by *all* members of the group. . . [that] overrides or amplifies the effect of individual characteristics" (Luthra et al. 2018, p. 899; emphasis in original).

Multiculturalism: a norm of immigrant integration that values the recognition, accommodation, and support of cultural diversity

In the field of social movements, scholars have traditionally theorized political opportunity structures to be constituted by the political party in power, public opinion, and the political system's institutional arrangement (e.g., division of powers, electoral system, federal or centralized government) (Meyer & Minkoff 2004). An extension of these ideas, the concept of discursive opportunity structures, refers to how institutionally embedded and historically shaped notions of legitimate discourse influence claims-making. For immigrants, such discursive terrain includes host societies' narratives around multiculturalism or cultural homogeneity and their notions of citizenship grounded in civic norms or ethnic ancestry (Koopmans et al. 2005). Again, a core idea is that opportunity structures—whether political or discursive—affect all, including, we would argue, IOs. Although frequently viewed as a country-level attribute, organizational embedding can occur in destination and sending countries, as well as at the subnational level or as a feature of international governance and geopolitics.

Destination Contexts

Most obviously, immigration and citizenship laws contribute to a context of reception that affects migrants and IOs, as discussed earlier with respect to legality. Beyond entry or membership policies, Bloemraad (2006) has argued that integration and diversity policies generate opportunities for immigrant organizing through the provision of symbolic and material resources for IOs. Bloemraad (2005, 2006) found, for instance, that Canada's multiculturalism policies generated a larger and more diverse set of Portuguese IOs in Toronto relative to their conationals in the Boston area, but that Vietnamese refugee communities on either side of the border were more similar, thanks in part to the public support for refugee resettlement in both countries (see also Landolt 2008). At the same time, destination-country funding and policies can channel organizational agendas. Chaudhary & Guarnizo (2016) found that although multiculturalism policies enhance immigrant organizational capacities, such programs decrease homeland-oriented political and religious activities among Pakistani organizations in Toronto relative to those in New York, due partly to the Canadian government's emphasis on using federal resources for depoliticized, secular immigrant integration (see also Ameeriar 2017). Beyond explicit policy, ethno-racial stigma and racialization processes within destination societies can also constrain IOs (Bakalian & Bozorgmehr 2009, Chaudhary 2021).

The influence of funding, policies, public opinion, and officeholders can also affect subnational contexts of reception, including cities and metropolitan areas. Scholars have documented inequities in funding IOs between central cities with longer histories of immigrant settlement and immigrant-rich, newer destination suburbs (de Graauw et al. 2013), differential preferences for secular as compared with faith-based organizations (especially in the US South) (Nawyn 2006, Eby et al. 2011, Ehrkamp & Nagel 2014), and the varying impact of municipal officials (elected, appointed or career bureaucrats) on municipal IOs (Marwell 2004, Marrow 2009, Morales & Giugni 2011, Marwell & Gullickson 2013, de Graauw 2016, Vermeulen et al. 2016).

Taken together, distinct levels of governance (i.e., national, subnational, or municipal) can interact with varying public support to shape IO infrastructures and impact. For instance, in cities that are islands of hyperdiversity surrounded by conservative areas, such as Houston, Texas, IOs that are largely privately funded play a distinct role compared with their counterparts in places with strong public funding streams, progressive elected leaders, and multiple organizational

support structures, like San Francisco (de Graauw & Gleeson 2017). Conversely, small, rural, often conservative towns in what are thought to be immigrant-friendly states—such as those in upstate New York or California's Central Valley—can be organizationally poor, with tiny satellite IOs dependent on liberal big-city partners or precarious local organizations that face political opposition (Terriquez et al. 2020). Local and national discursive and institutional dynamics can also intersect to create distinct ecosystems of host- and homeland-oriented IOs (Landolt 2008).

Origin Society Contexts

Migration scholars have overwhelmingly concentrated on contexts of reception, but contexts of departure can also foster or constrain IOs (Portes & Fernandez-Kelly 2015, Chaudhary 2021). Scholarship on transnationalism is a helpful reference point, especially research on the efforts of sending societies to cultivate cross-border linkages with emigrants (e.g., Délano & Gamlen 2014). Origin countries use multiple channels to influence emigrants, from laws and policies around dual citizenship and external voting rights to direct financial and institutional support for organizations abroad (Lafleur 2013). The oft-cited Mexican Tres por Uno program, for instance, seeks to cultivate and build partnerships with immigrant transnational organizations by matching immigrant investments in the homeland with local and federal government funding (Wise & Ramírez 2001, Fox & Bada 2008, Bada 2014). This has given rise to government agencies and offices to oversee the program, further developing an institutional infrastructure to engage with transnational IOs (Goldring 2002). Origin societies may also impact agendas, as when homeland governments incentivize IOs sympathetic to their policies to facilitate business relations or to court emigrant loyalty. Such privileged IOs may have high-level, direct access to origin-government leaders and resources, as has been reported for China (Zhou & Lee 2015).

Origin societies can also affect IOs through their repressive actions or inability to serve their citizens. Rather than being helpful or benign, origin country governments may attempt to repress IOs, as the Moroccan government did with expatriate groups critical of the government (Lacroix 2015). Homeland violence, natural disasters, or other humanitarian crises can also spur the creation of IOs, especially in poor or weak sending countries. The civil war in El Salvador (1979–1992), as well as the more recent conflict in Syria, spurred the creation of IOs to protest war crimes. After a devastating 2005 earthquake in Pakistan killed 87,000 people and displaced 2.8 million others, the Pakistani diaspora mobilized to provide relief for victims (Najam 2006, Chaudhary 2018a); the IOs created went on to engage in social and economic transnational activities in Pakistan. Homeland-oriented IOs can also subsequently expand their reach to destination countries, and vice versa, underscoring how scholarship needs to track IOs over time to understand how context and temporal events intersect to impact IO activities.

Bilateral Relations

The interaction between sending and receiving destinations, which can be shaped by historic and contemporary bilateral relations, is under-studied. Notably, postcolonialism is a rich topic for research. In destination societies, postcolonial migration contexts may foster IOs' capacities through co-development policies (Portes & Fernandez-Kelly 2015, Chaudhary 2021). Pakistani IOs in London, for instance, are embedded in a resource-rich, postcolonial institutional environment that encourages cross-border linkages and differs from the context of Pakistani IOs in New York City (Chaudhary 2018a). Similarly, Godin et al. (2015) find that Congolese organizations in Belgium tend to opt for co-development-oriented funding and programs to support their actions back home, whereas Moroccan organizations—not part of the former Belgian colonial project—choose funding streams more embedded in local politics. Such opportunities and choices subsequently affect the activities and orientations of IOs.

Geopolitical and Supranational Contexts

Bilateral relations are invariably embedded in broader geopolitical contexts that can affect IOs. Such dynamics were especially evident during the Cold War (Adamson & Demetriou 2007, Pedraza 2007, Koinova 2013) but today can be seen in international political and economic competition (e.g., around China's place in the world order) or the stigmatization of particular religions, notably Islam. For instance, over the past five decades, anti-Castro Cuban IOs and advocacy groups in the United States have benefitted from being aligned with US foreign policy vis-à-vis Cuba (Pedraza 2007). Similarly, Taiwanese and Tibetan organizations critical of the Chinese government have benefitted from US support. Alternatively, as geopolitical alliances shift, IOs can become caught in the crossfire. This can affect interorganizational partnerships, determine the activities that IOs can safely conduct, and even threaten their very survival. For example, during the final three decades of the twentieth century, the Cold War–era alliance between the United States and Pakistan shaped the IOs established by high- and low-skilled Pakistani immigrants in New York City (Chaudhary 2018a, 2021). But following the 9/11 attacks and twenty-year war in Afghanistan that followed, US–Pakistani bilateral relations deteriorated, and Pakistani nationals residing abroad were increasingly perceived as supportive and sympathetic to militant groups and religious fundamentalism (Jalal 2014, Chaudhary & Moss 2019). As the bilateral relations deteriorated, and a stigma against Pakistan and Pakistani immigrants intensified in the United States, Pakistani IOs endured an ascriptive organizational stigma resulting in enhanced surveillance, state and public, harassment, and counterterrorism audits of their finances (Chaudhary 2021). Such pressures forced many Pakistani IOs to divert resources into regulatory compliance and public impression management, constraining capacities to fulfill core missions and objectives.

Beyond nation-states, supranational institutions like the United Nations, the European Union, INGOs, and multilateral human rights regimes also affect IOs and can foster opportunities for migrants to organize by leveraging human rights discourses and institutionalized international legal regimes (Soysal 1994, Keck & Sikkink 1998, Kastoryano & Schader 2014). Although most research suggests that the political and discursive opportunity structures of destination countries trump the influence of international institutions on IOs and their claims-making (Soysal 1994, Koopmans et al. 2005), careful process-tracing does reveal that international institutions can assist migrant communities to build IOs by providing models, technical support, financing, and legitimacy, even in relatively migrant-skeptical destinations like Japan (Tsutsui 2017). International and supranational institutions may be especially important for stateless communities—that is, groups of migrants without a nation-state to lobby or speak up for them—such as the Kurdish diaspora throughout Europe (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003, 2001).

CONCLUSION

Most scholarship touching on IOs since the 1980s has largely assumed—and regularly demonstrated—that IOs are beneficial to immigrant communities, whether through the positive insulating effects of social capital, the resources they provide, or their ability to mobilize people for collective action. Yet constraints abound, and institutional contexts and organizational capacities matter. IOs are neither neutral vessels unmoored from state policies nor homogenous aggregations of individual migrants. IOs, like any organization, can advance diverse projects and vary significantly according to leadership, membership, and access to resources. Still, for many IOs, the immigrant part of their identities, mission, and activities is deeply consequential, an observation insufficiently acknowledged or studied to date by scholars of organizations. Inequities exist in terms of which IOs can access resources, make their voices heard, and operate without

being surveilled, both relative to nonimmigrant organizations as well as across and within immigrant communities.

Of course, IOs represent only one dimension of an immigrant community's organizational life; other organizations can also be consequential for individuals and communities. Yet focusing on IOs can help us better understand at least four key phenomena: (*a*) intragroup dynamics, (*b*) multilevel embeddedness, (*c*) civic inequalities, and (*d*) organizational stigma. Migration scholars need to pay greater attention to IOs and better study the causes and consequences of their presence. IOs can play critical roles where state and market resources fail immigrant communities. In other contexts, IOs can develop a public presence and influence that help them command state and market resources. On-the-ground realities can consequently vary greatly for IOs across a receiving society or among a diaspora. In short, patterns of marginalization can be replicated when we focus on the meso-level analysis of IOs, but these organizations also have the potential for transformative change that can improve individual and community well-being.

Finally, given the multilayered embeddedness of IOs, global crises such as the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic can drastically alter the missions, funding sources, and day-to-day functions of IOs. Global restrictions on travel have likely constrained the work and activities of transnational IOs. The next iteration of migration scholarship on IOs should investigate how large-scale crises impact the opportunities, constraints, and organizational capacities of IOs to serve their domestic and homeland constituencies.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. The organizational dimension of immigrant life remains analytically underdeveloped and undertheorized.
2. By centering IOs as a core meso-level unit of analysis, migration scholars can reconsider whether and how migrant organizations facilitate or impede integration, enhance or constrain political voice, influence identities, affect globalization and development, and impact migrants' well-being.
3. IOs can face unique challenges and opportunities due to members', leaders', and clients' nativity, legal status, and additional markers of otherness, as well as group-level stigmatization.
4. The vulnerabilities that IOs experience can lead to civic inequality, between immigrant communities and vis-à-vis the mainstream organizational ecosystem.
5. IOs are not homogenous nor simple aggregations of individual migrants: They vary across and within migrant communities in their composition and organizational capacity, and they vary by the institutional contexts in which they are embedded.
6. IOs highlight how nonprofits and civic associations are not neutral vessels unmoored from state policies: IOs can advance established public agendas, fill gaps where state funding is absent, or be a node of mobilization against state policies.
7. A cross-border perspective is critical to understanding many IOs, which includes both top-down processes of organizational embedding and bottom-up processes of immigrant agency.
8. IOs' organizational embedding occurs at multiple scales within destination and sending countries, as well as at the level of international governance and geopolitics, which affects IOs' capacities, missions, and longevity.

FUTURE ISSUES

1. More research is needed on the inequality in organizational resources and infrastructures within and across immigrant communities, as well as vis-à-vis mainstream organizations.
2. This, in turn, will allow researchers to examine how the presence and function of IOs shape immigrant well-being.
3. We must go beyond typical dichotomous thinking for immigrant status and understand the entire range of noncitizen categories that shape organizational experiences, constraints, and opportunities.
4. Researchers should delve further into intragroup variation in IOs based on class and status distinctions linked to places of origin (caste, religion, homeland politics, etc.).
5. We need more research on how different funding sources (e.g., philanthropic, private foundations, public grants, government contracts) shape which immigrant needs are addressed.
6. More work is needed on organizational embeddedness—that is, the ways that temporal, social, political, and geographic contexts affect how IOs emerge, operate, and wither.
7. The study of IOs will require new data collection and innovative methods to identify IOs and better understand organizational density and ecology.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank our previous coauthors and collaborators for informing the way we understand IOs. For their suggestions on previous drafts of this article, we thank Ernesto Castañeda, René Flores, and Veronica Terriquez. We are also grateful for editorial assistance provided by Matt Seidel. All errors are our own.

LITERATURE CITED

Abrego LJ, Negrón-Gonzales G, eds. 2020. *We Are Not Dreamers: Undocumented Scholars Theorize Undocumented Life in the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Adamson FB, Demetriou M. 2007. Remapping the boundaries of state and national identity: incorporating diasporas into IR theorizing. *Eur. J. Int. Relat*. 13(4):489–526

Alba R, Nee V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Ameeriar L. 2017. *Downwardly Global: Women, Work, and Citizenship in the Pakistani Diaspora*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Bada X. 2014. *Mexican Hometown Associations in Chicagoacán: From Local to Transnational Civic Engagement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Bakalian A, Bozorgmehr M. 2009. *Backlash 9/11: Middle Eastern and Muslim Americans Respond*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Basch LG. 1989. The politics of Caribbeanization: Vicentians and Grenadians in New York. *Cent. Migr. Stud. Spec*. Issues 7(1):147–66

Bloemraad I. 2005. The limits of de Tocqueville: how government facilitates organisational capacity in newcomer communities. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 31(5):865–87

Bloemraad I. 2006. Becoming a citizen in the United States and Canada: structured mobilization and immigrant political incorporation. *Soc. Forces* 85:667–95

Bloemraad I. 2007. Unity in diversity? Bridging models of multiculturalism and immigrant integration. *Du Bois Rev.* 4(2):317–36

Bloemraad I, de Graauw E, Gleeson S. 2020. Immigrant organizations: civic voice, civic (in)equality, and civic (in)visibility. In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, ed. WW Powell, P Bromley, pp. 292–313. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press. 3rd ed.

Bloemraad I, Voss K. 2020. Movement or moment? Lessons from the pro-immigrant movement in the United States and contemporary challenges. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 46(4):683–704

Boccagni P, Lafleur JM, Levitt P. 2015. Transnational politics as cultural circulation: toward a conceptual understanding of migrant political participation on the move. *Mobilities* 11:444–63

Breton R. 1964. Institutional completeness of ethnic communities and the personal relations of immigrants. *Am. J. Sociol.* 70(2):193–205

Brinkerhoff JM, Johnson JM, Gudelis D. 2019. Are our assumptions about diaspora and immigrant philanthropy generalizable? Exploring the relevance to high-income countries of origin. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.* 48(5):1094–109

Burciaga EM, Martinez LM. 2017. How do political contexts shape undocumented youth movements? Evidence from three immigrant destinations. *Mobilization* 22(4):451–71

Chaudhary AR. 2018a. Organizing transnationalism and belonging among Pakistani immigrants in London and New York. *Migr. Stud.* 6(3):420–47

Chaudhary AR. 2018b. Voting here and there: political integration and transnational political engagement among immigrants in Europe. *Glob. Netw.* 18(3):437–60

Chaudhary AR. 2021. Ascriptive organizational stigma and the constraining of Pakistani immigrant organizations. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 55(1):84–107

Chaudhary AR, Guarnizo LE. 2016. Pakistani immigrant organisational spaces in Toronto and New York City. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.* 42(6):1013–35

Chaudhary AR, Moss DM. 2019. Suppressing transnationalism: bringing constraints into the study of transnational political action. *Comp. Migr. Stud.* 7:9

Chen MH. 2020. *Pursuing Citizenship in the Enforcement*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Chen MH, New Z. 2018. Silence and the second wall. *South. Calif. Interdiscip. Law J.* 28:549

Chun JJ. 2016. Building political agency and movement leadership: the grassroots organizing model of Asian immigrant women advocates. *Citizsh. Stud.* 20(3–4):379–95

Coutin SB, Ashar SM, Chacón JM, Lee S. 2017. Deferred action and the discretionary state: migration, precarity and resistance. *Citizsh. Stud.* 21(8):951–68

Dahl RA. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press

Darrow JH, Scholl JH. 2020. Chaos and confusion: impacts of the Trump administration executive orders on the US refugee resettlement system. *Hum. Serv. Organ.* 44:362–80

de Graauw E. 2016. *Making Immigrant Rights Real: Nonprofits and the Politics of Integration in San Francisco*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

de Graauw E, Gleeson S. 2017. Context, coalitions and organizing: immigrant labor rights advocacy in San Francisco and Houston. In *The City Is the Factory: New Solidarities and Spatial Strategies in an Urban Age*, ed. M Greenberg, P Lewis, pp. 80–98. Berlin: de Gruyter

de Graauw E, Gleeson S. 2018. Immigrant rights funding in peril: closing down access routes to the American dream. *New Labor Forum* 27(3):58–63

de Graauw E, Gleeson S, Bloemraad I. 2013. Funding immigrant organizations: suburban free riding and local civic presence. *Am. J. Sociol.* 119(1):75–130

de Haas H. 2010. Migration and development: a theoretical perspective. *Int. Migr. Rev.* 44(1):227–64

Délano A, Gamlen A. 2014. Comparing and theorizing state-diaspora relations. *Political Geogr.* 41 (July):43–53

Eby J, Iverson E, Smyers J, Kekic E. 2011. The faith community's role in refugee resettlement in the United States. *J. Refugee Stud.* 24(3):586–605

Eckstein SE. 2022. *Cuban Privilege: The Making of Immigrant Inequality in America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Ehrkamp P, Nagel C. 2014. "Under the Radar": undocumented immigrants, Christian faith communities, and the precarious spaces of welcome in the U.S. South. *Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr*. 104(2):319–28

Erdal MB, Oeppen C. 2013. Migrant balancing acts: understanding the interactions between integration and transnationalism. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud*. 39(6):867–84

Escudero K. 2020. *Organizing While Undocumented: Immigrant Youth's Political Activism Under the Law*. New York: NYU Press

Espiritu YL. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press

Faist T. 2008. Migrants as transnational development agents: an inquiry into the newest round of the migration-development nexus. *Popul. Space Place* 14(1):21–42

Fantasia R, Voss K. 2004. *Hard Work: Remaking the American Labor Movement*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Fox J, Bada X. 2008. Migrant organization and hometown impacts in rural Mexico. *J. Agrar. Change* 8(2–3):435–61

Gilliom J. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limits of Privacy*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Glazer N, Moynihan DP. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Godin M, Herman B, Rea A, Thys R. 2015. Moroccan and Congolese migrant organizations in Belgium. In *The State and the Grassroots: Immigrant Transnational Organizations in Four Continents*, eds. A Portes, P Fernandez-Kelly, pp. 189–211. New York: Berghahn

Goldring L. 2002. The Mexican state and transmigrant organizations: negotiating the boundaries of membership and participation. *Latin Am. Res. Rev*. 55–99

Gonzales A. 2013. *Reform Without Justice: Latino Migrant Politics and the Homeland Security State*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Gordon MM. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press

Guarnizo LE. 2003. The economics of transnational living. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 37(3):666–99

Guarnizo LE, Portes A, Haller W. 2003. Assimilation and transnationalism: determinants of transnational political action among contemporary migrants. *Am. J. Sociol*. 108(6):1211–48

Guevarra AR. 2009. *Marketing Dreams, Manufacturing Heroes: The Transnational Labor Brokering of Filipino Workers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Hamlin R. 2008. Immigrants at work: labor unions and non-citizen members. In *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement*, ed. SK Ramakrishnan, I Bloemraad, pp. 300–22, New York: Russell Sage Found.

Hein J. 1997. Ethnic organizations and the welfare state: the impact of social welfare programs on the formation of Indochinese refugee associations. *Sociol. Forum* 12(2):279–95

Heredia LL. 2008. *Faith in Action: The Catholic Church and the Immigrant Rights Movement*, 1980–2007. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Hernández-León R. 2013. *The migration industry: brokering mobility in the Mexico-U.S. migratory system*. Work. Pap., Dep. Sociol., Univ. Calif., Los Angeles

Holman PA. 1996. Refugee resettlement in the United States. In *Refugees in America in the 1990s: A Reference Handbook*, ed. DW Haines, pp. 3–27. Westport, CT: Praeger

Horton S. 2004. Different subjects: the health care system's participation in the differential construction of the cultural citizenship of Cuban refugees and Mexican immigrants. *Med. Anthropol. Q*. 18(4):472–89

Itzigsohn J, Saucedo SG. 2002. Immigrant incorporation and sociocultural transnationalism. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 36(3):766–98

Jalal A. 2014. *The Struggle for Pakistan: A Muslim Homeland and Global Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Johnson M. 2017. Support adult English language education to invest in future. *Georgia Budget and Policy Institute Blog*, May 4. **https://gbpi.org/support-adult-english-language-education-invest-future/**

Jones-Correa M. 1998. Different paths: gender, immigration and political participation. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 32(2):326–49

Kastoryano R, Schader M. 2014. A comparative view of ethnicity and political engagement. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*. 40:241–60

Keck ME, Sikkink K. 1998. Transnational advocacy networks in the movement society. In *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*, ed. DS Meyer, S Tarrow, pp. 217–38. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Kibria N. 1997. The construction of "Asian American": reflections on intermarriage and ethnic identity among second-generation Chinese and Korean Americans. *Ethn. Racial Stud*. 20(3):523–44

Kibria N. 2000. Race, ethnic options, and ethnic binds: identity negotiations of second-generation Chinese and Korean Americans. *Sociol. Perspect*. 43(1):77–95

Kim JY. 2020a. How other minorities gained access: the War on Poverty and Asian American and Latino community organizing. *Political Res. Q*. **https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912920983456**

Kim JY. 2020b. Racism is not enough: minority coalition building in San Francisco, Seattle, and Vancouver. *Stud. Am. Political Dev*. 34(2):195–215

Koinova M. 2013. Four types of diaspora mobilization: Albanian diaspora activism for Kosovo independence in the US and the UK. *Foreign Policy Anal*. 9(4):433–53

Koopmans R, Statham P, Giugni M, Passy F. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Lacomba C. 2016. Mobilising abroad across ethnic lines: home-country politics and immigrant political engagement in comparative perspective. *Ethnicities* 16(1):86–110

Lacroix T. 2009. Transnationalism and development: the example of Moroccan migrant networks. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud*. 35(10):1665–78

Lacroix T. 2015. Moroccans in France: their organizations and activities back home. In *The State and the Grassroots: Immigrant Transnational Organizations in Four Continents*, ed. A Portes, P Fernandez-Kelly, pp. 212–35. New York: Berghahn

Lafleur JM. 2013. *Transnational Politics and the State: The External Voting Rights of Diasporas*. New York: Routledge

Landolt P. 2008. The transnational geographies of immigrant politics: insights from a comparative study of migrant grassroots organizing. *Sociol. Q*. 49(1):53–77

Lee J, Zhou M. 2015. *The Asian American Achievement Paradox*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Legal Serv. Corp. 2020. *Can LSC grantees represent undocumented immigrants?* Rep., Legal Serv. Corp., Washington, DC. **https://www.lsc.gov/our-impact/publications/other-publications-and-reports/can-lsc-grantees-represent-undocumented**

Levitt P. 2001. *The Transnational Villagers*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Levitt P, Jaworsky BN. 2007. Transnational migration studies: past developments and future trends. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*. 33:129–56

Levitt P, Schiller NG. 2004. Conceptualizing simultaneity: a transnational social field perspective on society. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 38(3):1002–39

Lieberson S. 1980. *A Piece of the Pie: Blacks and White Immigrants Since 1880*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Lieberson S, Waters MC. 1988. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Light DW. 2012. Categorical inequality, institutional ambivalence, and permanently failing institutions: the case of immigrants and barriers to health care in America. *Ethn. Racial Stud*. 35(1):23–39

Lopez D, Espiritu Y. 1990. Panethnicity in the United States: a theoretical framework. *Ethn. Racial Stud*. 13(2):198–224

Luthra R, Soehl T, Waldinger R. 2018. Reconceptualizing context: a multilevel model of the context of reception and second-generation educational attainment. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 52(3):898–928

Marinari M. 2020. *Unwanted: Italian and Jewish Mobilization Against Restrictive Immigration Laws, 1882–1965*. Chapel Hill: Univ. N. C. Press

Marrow HB. 2009. Immigrant bureaucratic incorporation: the dual roles of government policies and professional missions. *Am. Sociol. Rev*. 74(5):756–76

Martin PL. 2017. *Merchants of Labor: Recruiters and International Labor Migration*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
Marwell NP. 2004. Privatizing the welfare state: nonprofit community-based organizations as political actors. *Am. Sociol. Rev*. 69(2):265–91
Marwell NP, Gullickson A. 2013. Inequality in the spatial allocation of social services: government contracts to nonprofit organizations in New York City. *Soc. Serv. Rev*. 87(2):319–53
Marwell NP, Morrissey SL. 2020. Organizations and the governance of urban poverty. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*. 46:233–50
Massey DS. 1981. Dimensions of the new immigration to the United States and the prospects for assimilation. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*. 7:57–85
Menjívar C. 2006. Liminal legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan immigrants' lives in the United States. *Am. J. Sociol*. 111(4):999–1037
Meyer DS, Minkoff DC. 2004. Conceptualizing political opportunity. *Social Forces* 82(4):1457–92
Milkman R. 2020. *Immigrant Labor and the New Precariat*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
Milkman R, Terriquez V. 2012. "We are the ones who are out in front": women's leadership in the immigrant rights movement. *Fem. Stud*. 38(3):723–52
Minkoff D. 1995. *Organizing for Equality*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
Mora GC. 2014. *Making Hispanics: How Activists, Bureaucrats and Media Constructed a New American*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Morales L, Giugni M, eds. 2011. *Social Capital, Political Participation and Migration in Europe*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan
Moya JC. 2005. Immigrants and associations: a global and historical perspective. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud*. 31(5):833–64
Najam A. 2006. *Portrait of a Giving Community: Philanthropy by the Pakistani-American Diaspora*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
Natl. Acad. Sci. Eng. Med. 2015. *The Integration of Immigrants into American Society*. Washington, DC: Natl. Acad. Press
Natl. Immigr. Law Cent. 2020. *Update on access to health care for immigrants and their families*. Rep., Natl. Immigr. Law Cent., Los Angeles. **https://www.nilc.org/issues/health-care/update-on-access-to-health-care-for-immigrants-and-their-families/**
Nawyn SJ. 2006. Faith, ethnicity, and culture in refugee resettlement. *Am. Behav. Sci*. 49(11):1509–27
Nicholls WJ. 2013. *The DREAMers: How the Undocumented Youth Movement Transformed the Immigrant Rights Debate*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Nicholls WJ. 2019. *The Immigrant Rights Movement: The Battle over National Citizenship*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Novak M. 1972. *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*. New York: MacMillan
Okamoto D, Mora GC. 2014. Panethnicity. *Annu. Rev. Sociol*. 40:219–39
Okamoto DG. 2003. Toward a theory of panethnicity: explaining Asian American collective action. *Am. Sociol. Rev*. 68(6):811–42
Okamoto DG. 2014. *Redefining Race: Asian American Panethnicity and Shifting Ethnic Boundaries*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
Østergaard-Nielsen E. 2003. The politics of migrants' transnational political practices. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 37(3):760–86
Østergaard-Nielsen EK. 2001. Transnational political practices and the receiving state: Turks and Kurds in Germany and the Netherlands. *Glob. Netw*. 1(3):261–82
Pallares A, Flores-González N. 2010. *¡Marcha! Latino Chicago and the Immigrant Rights Movement*. Champaign: Univ. Ill. Press
Pedraza S. 2007. *Political Disaffection in Cuba's Revolution and Exodus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Portes A, Bach RL. 1985. *Latin Journey*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Portes A, Escobar C, Arana R. 2008. Bridging the gap: transnational and ethnic organizations in the political incorporation of immigrants in the United States. *Ethn. Racial Stud*. 31(6):1056–90
Portes A, Escobar C, Radford AW. 2007. Immigrant transnational organizations and development: a comparative study. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 41(1):242–81

Portes A, Fernandez-Kelly P. 2015. *The State and the Grassroots: Immigrant Transnational Organizations in Four Continents*. New York: Berghahn

Portes A, Guarnizo LE, Landolt P. 2017. Commentary on the study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethn. Racial Stud*. 40(9):1486–91

Portes A, Rumbaut RG. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Portes A, Zhou M. 1993. The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Ann. Am. Acad. Political Soc. Sci*. 530(1):74–96

Ramakrishnan SK, Bloemraad I. 2008. Introduction: civic and political inequalities. In *Civic Hopes and Political Realities: Immigrants, Community Organizations, and Political Engagement*, ed. SK Ramakrishnan, I Bloemraad, pp. 1–42. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Robertson CB, Manta ID. 2020. Litigating citizenship. *Vanderbilt Law Rev*. 73(3):757

Rogers R. 2009. Political institutions and rainbow coalitions: immigrant-minority relations in New York and Hartford. In *Bringing Outsiders In: Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*, ed. JL Hochschild, JH Mollenkopf, pp. 93–110. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press

Roth BJ, Gonzales RG, Lesniewski J. 2015. Building a stronger safety net: local organizations and the challenges of serving immigrants in the suburbs. *Hum. Serv. Organ*. 39(4):348–61

Schmitter BE. 1980. Immigrants and associations: their role in the socio-political process of immigrant worker integration in West Germany and Switzerland. *Int. Migr. Rev*. 14(2):179–92

Schneider D. 2001. Naturalization and United States citizenship in two periods of mass migration: 1894–1930, 1965–2000. *J. Am. Ethn. Hist*. 21(1):50–82

Schrover DM, Vermeulen F. 2005. Immigrant organisations. *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud*. 31(5):823–32

Soss J, Fording R, Schram SF. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Soysal YN. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Strolovitch DZ. 2008. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Sullivan R, Lee K. 2008. Organizing immigrant women in America's sweatshops: lessons from the Los Angeles Garment Worker Center. *Signs*. 33(3):527–32

Terriquez V. 2011. Schools for democracy: labor union participation and Latino immigrant parents' school-based civic engagement. *Am. Sociol. Rev*. 76(4):581–601

Terriquez V. 2015. Intersectional mobilization, social movement spillover, and queer youth leadership in the immigrant rights movement. *Soc. Probl*. 62(3):343–62

Terriquez V, Villegas R, Villalobos R, Xu J. 2020. The political socialization of Latinx youth in a conservative political context. *J. Appl. Dev. Psychol*. 70:101188

Thomas WI, Znaniecki F. 1984. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press

Trouille D. 2021. *Fútbol in the Park: Immigrants, Soccer, and the Creation of Social Ties*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Tsutsui K. 2017. Human rights and minority activism in Japan: transformation of movement actorhood and local-global feedback loop. *Am. J. Sociol*. 122(4):1050–103

Verduzco Reyes D. 2018. *Learning to Be Latino: How Colleges Shape Identity Politics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press

Vermeulen F. 2013. Mutualism, resource competition and opposing movements among Turkish organizations in Amsterdam and Berlin, 1965–2000. *Br. J. Sociol*. 64(3):453–77

Vermeulen F, Minkoff DC, Meer T. 2016. The local embedding of community-based organizations. *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q*. 45(1):23–44

Vermeulen F, Tillie J, Walle R. 2012. Different effects of ethnic diversity on social capital: density of foundations and leisure associations in Amsterdam neighbourhoods. *Urban Stud*. 49(2):337–52

Vonderlack-Navarro R. 2014. *Immigrant Political Incorporation: The Role of Hometown Associations*. El Paso, TX: LFB Sch. Publ.

Voss K, Bloemraad I, eds. 2011. *Rallying for Immigrant Rights: The Fight for Inclusion In 21st Century America*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press

Waldinger R. 2015. *The Cross-Border Connection: Immigrants, Emigrants, and Their Homelands*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Watkins-Hayes C. 2009. *The New Welfare Bureaucrats: Entanglements of Race, Class, and Policy Reform*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Williams HP. 1912. The road to citizenship. *Political Sci. Q*. 27(3):399–427

Wise RD, Ramírez HR. 2001. The emergence of collective migrants and their role in Mexico's local and regional development. *Can. J. Dev. Stud./Rev. Can. Études Dév*. 22(3):747–64

Wong JS, Ramakrishnan SK, Lee T, Junn J, Wong J. 2011. *Asian American Political Participation: Emerging Constituents and Their Political Identities*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Wong K, Munoz CB. 2004. Don't miss the bus: the immigrant workers freedom ride. *New Labor Forum* 13(2):61–66

Woods RA, Kennedy AJ, eds. 1911. *Handbook of Settlements*. New York: Charities Publ. Comm.

Zepeda-Millán C. 2017. *Latino Mass Mobilization: Immigration, Racialization, and Activism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Zhou M, Lee R. 2015. Traversing ancestral and new homelands: Chinese immigrant transnational organizations in the United States. In *The State and the Grassroots: Immigrant Transnational Organizations in Four Continents*, ed. A Portes, P Fernandez-Kelly, pp. 27–59. New York: Berghahn