

Lowell Turner and Lee Adler
ILR School, Cornell University
Project proposal, with grant awards from:
Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, Carnegie Corporation, and the Public Welfare Foundation
Summary, December 2008

**Labor and the Integration of Immigrant Workers: Germany, France,
United States and United Kingdom in Comparative Perspective**

The purpose of the proposed research project is to examine the contributions labor unions can make to the civic integration of immigrant workers. An often-neglected phenomenon in studies of both immigration and unions, workplace-based activities have always offered a potentially important site for the economic, social and political integration of workers and their families. As one of the key associative forms of industrial civilization, unions have long provided a central, if complex and contested, venue for the integration and education of immigrant workers in industrial societies. In today's global economy, the role of unions in this regard is more important than ever.

Thus we propose a two-year comparative study of contemporary worker interest representation and the integration of immigrant workers in four advanced industrial societies: Germany, France, the U.S. and U.K.¹ There are three streams to the research. The starting point is a *consolidation of findings from existing literature*. While many studies have been conducted on the problems of immigrant workers, no one has brought together the research findings and analysis to present an overall picture of current knowledge as it relates to the role of labor unions. We believe there is much to be learned from published and other available research – including our own previous

¹ To clarify, our focus is on unions in the U.S. and U.K. and on unions and works councils or works committees in Germany and France (and in this proposal we will use the generic “works councils” to cover both). In the U.S. and U.K., unions are the relevant actors for both internal processes of integration and for external coalition building. In Germany and France, works councils are most relevant for internal strategies, while unions play the leading role in external coalition campaigns.

research on innovative union strategies and social coalition building – to strengthen the foundation for our study and enrich the analysis.

The other two streams together make up the focus of our primary research efforts. First, we will look at the workplace, and specifically *the ways in which unions and works councils do or do not integrate immigrant workers into the organization of work and the life of the union*. Our sample will include selected national unions in each country as well as local unions in selected metropolitan areas. We will consider cases in which unions and works councils have specific integration strategies, and we will seek out “best practice” cases that can inform future research on unions and immigrant workers. This research stream addresses largely, but not entirely, individual integration into the institutions of worker interest representation.

Second, we will study cases of *union collaboration with other social actors in campaigns that include immigrant advocacy groups*. In a recent survey conducted by the Survey Research Institute at Cornell University, as part of our two-year study of union coalition building funded by the Hans-Böckler-Stiftung (HBS), we found – surprisingly for us – union collaboration with immigrant rights groups to be the best predictor (among all the groups considered) of union coalition work with other social actors in the U.S. (Turner and Greer 2007). From this and related findings, we have reason to believe that common efforts including unions and immigrant groups have the potential to bring immigrant workers into a broader nexus of social integration. In this research stream, we will examine selected coalition campaigns in each of the four countries to determine the extent to which such integration occurs, again with an eye out for what works and does not work, and for best practice cases to inform future research and policy recommendations. The coalitions research addresses largely, but not entirely, collective civic integration.

A four-country comparative analysis presents challenges of logistics, comparability and personnel. In this regard, our research strategy includes two dimensions we believe will facilitate multi-country research and analysis. First, we will sub-contract much of the

research to experts in each of our countries. We will be drawing in some cases on already completed research and commissioning additional country-based analysis by well-regarded scholars of immigration and work. Second, we will coordinate the project at Cornell University, assigning reports carefully to ensure parallel research and comparability. Reports from experts in the field will allow for efficient research collection and cross-national comparison at a cost considerably less than the cost of conducting our own research in all four countries.

Project objectives and issues

Goals:

- To consolidate findings in the literature that provide a basis for the study of unions and immigrant workers in four countries of the global North.
- To identify a cross-national set of union strategies aimed at integrating immigrant workers, in both workplace and society.
- To analyze cause/effect relationships accounting for the strategic choices made by unions.
- To analyze cause/effect relationships accounting for relative success or failure, for accomplishments and limitations, of such strategies.
- To relate the findings to literature on industrial relations, varieties of capitalism, union revitalization, immigration, and civil society.
- To present a systematic four-country comparative analysis to inform mutual learning, best practice, and future research.

Specific objectives:

To pursue research aimed at answering the following questions regarding union strategies toward immigrant workers at both national and local levels, in both workplace and society, in Germany, France, the United Kingdom and United States.

At the workplace:

- To what extent do unions and works councils consciously pursue strategies aimed at integrating immigrant workers at the workplace and in the life of the union? Included here is both participation and integration in the leadership of works councils and unions at various levels.
- In what ways do unions and works councils pursue such aims, with what specific goals?
- What encourages or dissuades unions from pursuing strategies of immigrant worker integration at the workplace and in the union?
- What are the accomplishments and limitations of specific strategic approaches? In what ways and to what extent do workplace strategies help integrate immigrant workers, as individuals and groups, at the workplace and in the union?
- What accounts for relative success or failure, for accomplishments and limitations?

In society:

- To what extent do national and local unions join with other social actors in coalition efforts that include immigrant advocacy groups?
- In what ways do unions pursue such aims, with what specific goals?
- What encourages or dissuades unions from pursuing strategies of immigrant worker integration in a context of social coalition building?
- What are the accomplishments and limitations of specific strategic approaches? In what ways and to what extent do union coalition campaigns help integrate immigrant workers, as individuals and groups, into broader social relationships?
- What accounts for relative success or failure, for accomplishments and limitations?

To answer these questions we will conduct research and gather data that allow us to specify and examine union strategies in both arenas – workplace and society – at both national and local levels, with emphasis on selected firms and cities.

Hypotheses:

As with all good research, hypotheses will be elaborated and modified as findings are gathered and analyzed. In the most general terms, union and works council strategies are viewed as independent variables; workforce and social integration of immigrant workers as dependent variables. We will launch the study with a small set of general hypotheses to which more specific propositions will be added as research develops.

We expect to find significant differences in union strategy across our four countries, as well as across firms, unions and specific campaigns within countries. The impact of such strategies, we believe, including accomplishments and limitations, will vary according to factors such as: national and local contexts (political, social, economic), workforce demographics, leadership choice, ideology, strategies of immigrant advocacy groups, the presence or absence of “bridge-building” individuals. One key task is to sort out the relative effects of the above variables.

The most essential component for hypothesis development and testing for this project is the explicit comparative perspective. The significant differences we expect to find across our four country cases will shed light on the essential aspects of strategic approaches and causal relationships.

For the German case, for example, our sense – to be tested against the evidence – is that strategies of worker interest representation regarding the integration of immigrant workers are most significant at the workplace. We seek to understand why this is true, if indeed it is, and what approaches are most effective. Here we must examine works council approaches, workplace codetermination, leadership integration, and internal channels of communication.

In the United States, by contrast, we expect to find significant union strategies for immigrant worker integration in social coalition campaigns. Preliminary research, based

on our Survey Research Institute survey in 2007, indicates that union collaboration with immigrant rights groups is a strong predictor of coalition efforts with other social actors. We want to know why this is the case, and whether such coalitions have an impact on immigrant worker integration. We hypothesize that active union participation in coalition campaigns that address the specific interests of low-wage and immigrant workers – union organizing, public policy, job creation, economic development, mass transit – does in fact reinforce joint efforts of workers, immigrants, and members of other groups such as churches and community organizations, and in so doing contributes to civic integration, directly or indirectly.

Based on our own work and the research of a network of British colleagues, we expect to find patterns of integration in the U.K. that more closely resemble the U.S. rather than German case. We are not sure what we will find in France, a country case that adds an unpredictable dimension that we believe will allow us to sharpen the analyses of our other country, firm and union cases.

The general hypotheses outlined above will be condensed into specific testable propositions, based on extensive literature and data analysis and preliminary research in the opening months of project work. For more detail on our approach to hypothesis development, see the section below on Methods.

Existing knowledge and literature

The proposed research should add significantly to our knowledge about contemporary innovative union strategies and their effects. While we know a great deal about unions and parties, unions and politics, institutions of industrial relations and labor-management relations, both within nations and in comparative perspective, we (social scientists) know less about labor and society. Rich research also exists regarding contemporary integration and the problems faced by immigrant workers. An important gap in the literature on both unions and immigrant workers concerns the relationship between the

two. Specifically, the role that unions do or can play in the workplace and civic integration of immigrant workers is to a large extent missing in the literature. Gaps in the research exist in part because such research is fundamentally interdisciplinary, and in part because the increasing salience of immigrant issues has increasingly, and in many cases only recently, challenged unions and works councils to develop new strategies.

The proposed research and analysis builds upon, critiques and moves beyond existing literature, including transformation of industrial relations, varieties of capitalism, civil society and union revitalization. In pursuit of new knowledge and theoretical contributions, this project also builds on an extensive body of recent work conducted by our research team at Cornell University.

The literature

Our analytical approach builds upon a growing body of literature on innovative union strategies, including the contributions we have made to studies of revitalization efforts such as member engagement and coalition building.

To step back, recent literature on union strategy has emerged in response to changing circumstances and theoretical inadequacies. Dominant industrial relations perspectives are rooted in a postwar context: unchallenged internal nation-state authority in a stable world order, with more or less stable systems of industrial relations. Significantly outdated worldviews have shaped traditional postwar labor research (1940s-1980s), the transformation literature (1980s-1990s), social movement studies (1970s-1990s), and the more recent “varieties of capitalism” literature (1990s-present).

The traditional systems approach in the U.S. (Dunlop 1958; Slichter et al. 1960) has been widely criticized, especially for an over-emphasis on system stability and actor adaptation. Transformation theorists (Kochan, Katz and McKersie 1986) and their critics (such as Goldfield 1987) developed and elaborated the now widely accepted criticisms. Surprisingly, then, the recent varieties of capitalism perspective (Hall and Soskice 2001)

again emphasizes the relative stability of national systems. While the varieties approach provides important insights for the comparative analysis of existing national institutions, especially their contrasting effects in shaping technological and other economic innovation, the fundamental bias is toward stability, neglecting the destabilizing effect of growing immigration and the development of innovations in worker interest representation that move beyond existing approaches. Unions are relegated to a largely reactive role -- as social partners (more or less institutionally integrated in a significant but generally subordinate role) in European coordinated market economies, but increasingly irrelevant although occasionally destabilizing forces in liberal market economies such as the U.S. and U.K. (Thelen 2001). Union behavior is largely determined by economic institutions and employer choices (themselves shaped by the institutions). Useful in understanding national differences, this literature's relevance is limited by its tendency toward institutional determinism in a turbulent global economy.

A recent outgrowth of the varieties literature, studies of institutional change that emphasize gradual transformation over extended periods of time, is more promising for our own work (Streeck and Thelen 2005). Allowing more room for the choices that social, economic and political actors make and the significance of resulting incremental change, this perspective sheds new light on the effects that reform-oriented actors might have. The emphasis of this literature is primarily on incremental changes that add up to neoliberal transformation. Our approach, by contrast, is to examine strategies and possible change in the opposite direction: the workplace and civic integration of immigrant workers as a potential source of stability and renewal for union influence. Because studies of institutional change are in processes of development, we hope to contribute to an independent actor perspective as well as a social dimension to what is so far a more conventional set of national studies.

The revitalization perspective brings unions and other social actors into the center of analysis, where they belong.² In our view, unions have meaningful proactive choices

² For significant examples of revitalization research, see Bronfenbrenner et al. 1998; Turner, Katz and Hurd 2001; Cornfield and McCammon 2003; Frege and Kelly 2004; and the 9/2003 issue of *WSI Mitteilungen*

beyond adaptation or subordination, in any institutional context and in the face of any set of power relationships or challenges. The decline of postwar industrial relations in the U.S., for example, was predetermined neither by the institutional framework (including labor law) nor mounting employer opposition. The great failure of American unions (under the conservative leadership of George Meany and Lane Kirkland) was denial, and above all the inability to craft appropriate, innovative strategies in the face of changing economic and political circumstances and a growing employer offensive. The organizing unions of the 1980s and 1990s, by contrast, turned to strategic innovation and grassroots mobilization, opening the door for John Sweeney and his allies in 1995 and the possibility of labor movement revitalization. A central component of new union strategy, especially in the U.S. and U.K., has addressed the organization and integration of immigrant workforces. In this project, we examine synergies between union strategy and the ongoing processes of immigrant worker immigration.

From our side of the Atlantic, we have long admired German unions, their institutional anchors and strong position in the workplace through codetermination and in the broader economy through comprehensive collective bargaining and other forms of incorporation such as vocational training (Turner 1991; Thelen and Turner 1997). Yet in the face of membership decline, difficulties recruiting young workers and women, and conflicts arising from an influx of immigrant workers, especially from central and eastern Europe, we also believe it is essential to examine strategic innovation. In previous research, we have looked, for example, at the European Migrant Workers Union. We now seek to address questions concerning immigrant workers more broadly, expanding our focus to the internal and external strategies of other unions such as IG Metall and ver.di. The focus on immigrant workers is important in its own right, and also as an indicator of reformed practices of internal and external innovation.

The critical point here – and a theoretical contribution that our revitalization perspective offers – concerns intensified market pressure and immigration brought on by global

liberalization that can, to some extent, overwhelm institutions, weakening their shaping effects and broadening the importance of actor choice. In contemporary economic circumstances, the range of choice at both national and local levels widens along with possibilities for strategic innovation. For unions and works councils, this means that the significance of strategic choice as a causal factor grows, as existing institutions have diminished determining effects.

The revitalization perspective is helped along by insights from research on civil society and immigration, based mainly in sociology and political science, and long neglected in studies of industrial relations. While labor studies have largely ignored the study of society, theorists of civil society and immigration have often returned the favor by omitting labor.³ Studies of strategic innovation offer an opportunity to address both one-sided omissions.

Finally, there is a budding literature on unions and immigrant workers in the U.S., a body of work that will inform our research and upon which we can build (e.g., Milkman 2000 and 2006; Fine 2005; Cornfield 2007). Much of this work has been conducted by close colleagues of ours, with whom in some cases we will collaborate to produce research reports for this project.

Grounded in the reality of recent campaigns and present possibilities, revitalization research brings theoretical, conceptual, empirical and normative innovation to the study of labor in contemporary society. The proposed study of worker interest representation and the integration of immigrant workers, in conjunction with our past and ongoing work, aim to fill gaps and expand the revitalization perspective by comparing a new dimension of innovative union strategy in the U.S., U.K., Germany and France. In this effort we are well placed to build on past work on comparative labor movement revitalization (2000-2004; Frege and Kelly 2004), urban labor movements (2005-2007; Turner and Cornfield

³ In much of postwar social movement literature, for example, labor is marginalized as an “old social movement,” hardly worthy of serious study (Inglehart 1977; Keck and Sikkink 1998).

2007), and our recently completed two-year study, funded by HBS, of labor-inclusive coalition building in the U.S. and Germany (Greer and Turner 2007).

The relative strength of our grounding in literature on union strategy compared to our knowledge of migration/immigration studies is a weakness we plan to correct early on in the project period. The remedy for this weakness is reflected in our research design. The first of the three components of our investigation is a detailed review, one for each country, of the literature and existing research on unions and immigrant workers. An important part of each review will be a focused consideration of literature on immigration as it relates to our proposal. Country-specific research needs will be revised and sharpened based on the reviews.

Work program

Past research persuades us that in today's global economy and given the intensified challenges faced by national labor movements, the survival of strong, independent unions may well depend on the integration of immigrant workers and the broadening of alliances, from international to national and local levels. In the proposed research, we examine unions and immigrant workers at both national and local levels in four countries, with an eye out for linkages between these two levels and across national borders as well.

We look at the U.S., U.K., Germany and France in order to develop a cross-national comparative analysis across contrasting types of political economy, in four of the most important economies of the global North. We have begun our study with the U.S. because this is the case we know best (and funding was already available). Here we look at the strategies of two prominent unions, SEIU and CWA, one on each side of the AFL-CIO/Change to Win divide. We examine policies of the national unions aimed at the integration of immigrant workers and the building of coalitions with immigrant advocacy and other social actors. To deepen the analysis, we trace implementation to the local

level, in focused case studies in four cities: New York, Miami, Nashville and Los Angeles.

In Germany, France and the U.K., we seek functional equivalents that allow for meaningful comparison. Thus in Germany we will look at the IG Metall and ver.di, again tracing national strategies to the local level. Building on our own past research, we will also examine urban patterns of integration in Berlin, Hamburg, Stuttgart and Frankfurt. Our research in Germany persuades us that case studies targeting firms, with works councils as key actors in a context of codetermination, may yield more insight than U.S.-type research targeted at urban areas, although for purposes of research and analysis this remains an open question.

In the U.K., we will make use of well developed contacts at two large unions, GMB and Unite (TGWU branch). The case studies will move from national offices to local policies and processes, especially in the greater London area but also at particular firms and in other cities such as Birmingham, as indicated in initial research at the national level and in collaboration with British labor research experts.

We know less about the French case, but we also think it is important for purposes of comparative analysis to bring in a fourth country, especially one in which issues of immigrant worker integration are so critical – and distinct from the problematics in our other countries. While we will launch the French literature review at the start, we plan to integrate the French research more gradually in order to build on research lessons from the national cases – Germany, Britain and the U.S. – with which we are most familiar. Given our weaker starting point in France, Turner has scheduled a non-teaching semester in the spring of 2009, at the beginning of the project and with full salary support from Cornell University, during which he will spend two months in France developing contacts, access, specific research targets, and laying the groundwork for case studies.

We also see two additional points of leverage from our case selection. France, Germany and the U.K., in the context of the European Union, now have national labor markets that

have been opened for workers from other member states. This is a common challenge for both unions and civil society, and it is a question of mutual solidarity and international cooperation. Against the background of diverging traditions and cultures in our three E.U. countries, a cross-national comparison of union immigration strategies may well add to the richness of our comparative analysis.

One final consideration is the country origin of immigrant workers, with potential implications for integrative capacity. Different groups are prominent in each of our countries: in France, immigrants from North Africa; in Germany, central and eastern Europe; in the U.K., former Asian and African colonies; and in the U.S., Mexico and other Latin American countries. Intra-European as well as transatlantic comparisons may shed light on the analysis. In our research, we will consider the extent to which such variation is a significant factor in explaining union strategies and relative success.

Research methods

Our methods include in-depth, interview-based case studies at both national and local levels, as well as rigorous cross-national comparative analysis. We have extensive experience ranging over many years in interview-based case studies. Systematic, parallel case studies show us what actors are actually doing (as opposed to what they say they are doing), allow us to trace causal processes and the impacts of actor strategies, and provide a basis for comparative analysis.⁴ We target two types of cases:

First, we will examine the dominant approaches of selected *individual unions*. In Germany, for example, we will concentrate on IG Metall and ver.di, where we have good contacts at national, regional and local levels. Based on preliminary interviews, we will select specific representative cases within each union of strategies aimed at the integration of immigrant workers – both at the workplace (largely individual integration,

⁴ Based on a blossoming of qualitative research and methodology over the past decade, we draw on sources such as George and Bennett 2004; and Brady and Collier 2004.

depending on the attitudes of worker representatives) and in society (in the context, for example, of coalition campaigns with immigrant advocacy groups). As a backdrop, we will also explore the role of the DGB in work related to immigrant workers.

We will follow the same approach in the three other countries. In the U.S., we will concentrate on SEIU and CWA (Communications Workers of America). SEIU is a Change-to-Win Federation union while CWA belongs to the AFL-CIO. Both unions, in different ways, have focused on immigrant workers, and in each union we have good contacts. In the U.K., we will examine the strategies of TGWU/Unite as well as GMB, both unions that have placed an emphasis on organizing immigrants, in the context of TUC umbrella politics. In France, we will select one union from each of two major confederations: CGT and CFDT.

Second, we will set up and make use of our field research at specific unions to identify *patterns of integration in particular urban areas*. We believe this added step is important to avoid case study isolation and set strategies in a broader social context. This research stream will give us insight especially into coalition-building efforts and the extent to which union collaboration with immigrant groups and other social actors is significant for our analysis.

In the U.S., for example, our past work indicates contrasting patterns in the four cities we will examine (chosen for variation): New York City, Miami, Nashville and Los Angeles. We have conducted research in each of these cities and have solid contacts and preliminary analyses on which to build (based on a previous HBS project, with findings published in Turner and Cornfield 2007). Similarly in Germany we have conducted research in Berlin, Stuttgart, Frankfurt and Hamburg (Turner and Cornfield 2007; Turner and Greer 2007) – and will build on that research and our contacts to identify urban patterns of union efforts to incorporate immigrant workers, both at the workplace and in society.

In the U.K., much immigrant worker union activity centers on London, where we already have in place partners who have conducted preliminary research in areas related to our project (see, for example, Holgate and Wills 2007). In addition, our British contacts have suggested adding Birmingham as an interesting case that offers a “non-London” example to help fill out the picture. In France as in Britain, much immigrant worker activity centers on one dominant city, Paris. We will select one additional French city as a parallel but contrasting case.

Interpreting our field research data involves three separate, interrelated analytical tasks: *identification* of particular union strategies and urban patterns; *explanation* for strategies chosen; and *assessment* of accomplishments and limitations.

The first task will be a straightforward product of our field research. We will identify the types of strategy pursued at union and urban levels and the extent to which this work is a priority among a range of union efforts. The vehicle for the second task, explanation, is comparative analysis, both within and across countries. The dependent variable here is the type and extent of strategy rather than relative success. Comparisons allow us to pin down not just the apparent causes, or the key factors identified by our interviewees, but the underlying causes based on variable controls, similarities and differences.

Explanation is also facilitated by in-depth interviews that allow us to get inside causal processes. The third task, assessment, is the most challenging. Here we will build on our literature reviews, existing analysis, field research, other data sources and in-depth interviews and case studies to develop meaningful indicators and make well informed judgments about accomplishments and limitations.

Meaningful *hypotheses* are difficult to develop prior to the literature reviews and preliminary research. While we begin the research with some propositions in mind, our basic approach is one of *grounded theory* (see, for example, Glaser and Strauss 1967; Strauss and Corbin 1994; Munck 2004). The essence of this approach is to enter the field with an open mind, to avoid preconceptions and biases that may slant the findings. By contrast to a “fishing expedition,” grounded theory is a serious process of hypothesis

development and testing, aimed at producing not only narrow propositions but significant, generalizable argumentation. We believe this is a methodological approach well suited for case studies and qualitative, comparative analysis.

A four-country comparative analysis presents challenges of logistics, comparability and personnel. To reiterate the approach we have indicated in the summary described earlier in this proposal, we will bring in the work of other scholars to facilitate multi-country research and analysis. We will thus sub-contract much of the research to experts in each of our countries. In this way we will draw on already completed research as well as new country-based analysis by well-regarded scholars. We will coordinate the project at Cornell University, assigning national reports carefully to ensure parallel research and comparability. Commissioned papers from experts in each country will allow for efficient research collection and cross-national comparative analysis, at a cost considerably less than if we relied solely on our own research in all four countries.

To develop case studies into comparative analysis, we will select representative cases of union strategy toward immigrant workers at national and urban levels in each of our four countries. We will confirm or modify case selection as research proceeds, to ensure relevance as findings emerge. We will gather case-study data by conducting in-depth field research for internal union/works council policy as well as coalition campaigns, assessing the relative success of each. And finally, we will subject all cases to rigorous comparative analysis, both within and across our two countries. Analytical methods will include: the discovery and elaboration of national patterns, to the extent they exist; matched pairs including all possible country combinations, a total of six pairs (Germany with the U.S., Germany/U.K., Germany/France, U.S./U.K, U.S./France, and France/U.K.); and synthetic comparison that builds on the matched pairs as well as intra-country variation.

For each case in each country, we will gather the data necessary for comprehensive understanding of the cases and for hypothesis testing and comparative analysis. This means understanding the origins of each strategy, the initiators, focus and duration,

methods used to achieve goals, and accomplishments and limitations. Relevant information will be gathered not only from in-depth interviews but from newspaper articles, secondary sources, conversations with experts and practitioners, and other available data. Case studies and data as well as existing literature generate hypotheses for testing. Hypothesis testing is based on the preponderance of evidence, combining qualitative and quantitative data analysis as appropriate.

The analytical process is interactive. We will analyze findings as we have done in the past, with flexible research strategies and exploratory typologies and hypotheses, revised or discarded as the evidence accumulates. We seek sensible interpretations of a preponderance of evidence. Systematic examination of causal processes is essential, in case-by-case and cross-case comparative analysis. Once substantial findings are in, we will categorize the strategies and outcomes and compare the cases. Follow-up research will fill in the gaps, test the findings for accuracy, dig deeper into indicated causal processes, and assess the validity of hypotheses.

We understand the difficulties of comparative analysis given contrasting national political, institutional and social contexts. This is the dilemma but also the advantage of cross-national studies: to use and control for specific similarities and differences to help sort out the relative importance of key variables. If, for example, we find similar internal integration strategies in IG Metall and SEIU, then we know right away that political, institutional and social contexts may not be decisive in comparing the choices unions make in strategies toward immigrant workers. Our attention is drawn to a less determinist strategic choice variable, with policy implications that point toward possibilities of mutual learning and innovation. Where we find cross-national or intra-national differences, the inclusion of four countries strengthens our ability to sort out the relative impacts of institutions, social context, opportunity structure and independent strategic choice.

References Cited in Proposal

- Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.). 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bronfenbrenner, Kate, Sheldon Friedman, Richard W. Hurd, Rudolph A. Oswald and Ronald L. Seeber (eds.). 1998. *Organizing to Win: New Research on Union Strategies*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.
- Cornfield, Daniel B. 2007. "Conclusion: Seeking Solidarity . . . Why, and with Whom?" In Turner and Cornfield (eds.). Ithaca: Cornell University Press/ILR Press, 235-251.
- Cornfield, Daniel, and Holly McCammon (eds.). 2003. *Labor Revitalization: Global Perspectives and New Initiatives*. JAI series *Research in the Sociology of Work*. Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- Dunlop, John. 1992. *Industrial Relations Systems*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Fine, Janice. 2005. *Worker centers: organizing communities at the edge of the dream*. Ithaca: ILR Press/Cornell University Press.
- Frege, Carola, and John Kelly (eds.). 2004. *Varieties of Unionism: Strategies for Labor Movement Renewal in the Global North*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm Strauss. 1964. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goldfield, Michael. 1987. *The Decline of Organized Labor in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, Peter and David Soskice (eds.). 2001. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holgate, Jane, and Jane Wills. 2007. "Organizing Labor in London: Lessons from the Campaign for a Living Wage." In Turner and Cornfield (eds.), 193-210.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Kochan, Thomas, Harry Katz and Robert McKersie. 1986. *The Transformation of American Industrial Relations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Milkman, Ruth (ed.). 2000. *Organizing Immigrants: the Challenge for Unions in Contemporary California*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2006. *L.A. Story: Immigrant Workers and the Future of the U.S. Labor Movement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Munck, Gerardo L. 2004. "Tools for Qualitative Research." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 105-121.
- Slichter, Sumner, James Healy and Robert Livernash. 1960. *The Impact of Collective Bargaining on Management*. Washington: Brookings.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1994. "Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview." In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Thelen (eds.). 2005. *Beyond continuity : institutional change in advanced political economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 2001. "Varieties of Labor Politics in the Developed Democracies." In Hall and Soskice (eds.), pp. 71-103.
- Thelen, Kathleen, and Lowell Turner. 1997. *German Codetermination in Comparative Perspective*. Gütersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Turner, Lowell. 1991. *Democracy at Work: Changing World Markets and the Future of Labor Unions*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Lowell, Harry Katz and Richard Hurd (eds.). 2001. *Rekindling the Movement: Labor's Quest for Relevance in the 21st Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Lowell and Daniel Cornfield B. (eds.). 2007. *Labor in the New Urban Battlegrounds: Local Solidarity in a Global Economy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press/ILR Press.
- Turner, Lowell and Ian Greer. 2007. *Union Coalition Building in a Global Economy*. Research project report to the Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, Düsseldorf, Germany.