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Abstract This study explores the behavior of transnational migrants in a global city—in this case, Koreatowns in the New York metropolitan area. Global changes in post-war capitalism and US immigration policies attracted various Korean migrant groups to the New York metropolitan area. These can be classified as old-timers, who migrated before or during the 1980s in the hope of securing permanent residency, and newcomers—relatively young and highly educated professionals who have migrated since the 1990s. Old-timers typically relocate to the suburbs via ethnic enclaves, on which they are strongly reliant. In contrast, newcomers are dispersed across the metropolitan area, sometimes visiting Koreatown as a node of the ethnic human network or for Korean-style service. These distinctive behaviors mean that migrant characteristics change with the economic growth of emerging countries, in turn changing the urban space of global cities.
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Introduction

Background and purpose of the research
As globalization drives rapidly increasing international migration, there is increased interest in the behavior and settlement patterns of international migrants. Up to the mid-twentieth century, migrants came mainly from politically unstable developing countries, seeking improved economic status and a peaceful life by securing stable employment and permanent residency in a developed country. Ethnic enclaves formed in the major global cities, providing temporary anchorage for migrants while adapting to their new environment (Portes and Bach 1985). Earlier research indicates that once they had built up economic and social capital in their ethnic enclave, migrants would relocate to better residential areas in the suburbs, gradually assimilating to the host society.

Since the early twentieth century, the polarization of skilled and unskilled migrants’ movements within the global economy has attracted considerable research interest. In the 1980s, the emergence of globalization and neoliberalism diminished the authority of nation-states and increased the international migration of human and material capital driven by international and multinational corporations and organizations. According to Sassen (1991), the global cities of New York, London, and Tokyo were central to this trend. The accumulation of human capital in these global cities can be explained in terms of the free movement of highly educated and professional elites, in contrast to the ongoing migration of low-wage workers from developing countries in search of permanent residency. Based on the concept of the dual city, Castells (1989) claimed that the urban spaces generated by migration related to the development of information and communication technology, enabling the spatial division of labor and a society in which social hierarchy and space are polarized. He also noted the polarization of labor, as highly skilled personnel and core functions were concentrated in the central core of global cities (where primary decisions are made) while low-wage workers were dispersed to the suburbs. According to Castells, international elites from developed countries could maintain the same lifestyle as the host society’s upper class even though they were migrants. In contrast, low-wage workers formed ethnic enclaves being incorporated into the lower classes of society.

In recent years, international migration has become more diverse, with more migrants entering directly into
middle and upper society in the dual city because of the resources they bring from their country of origin. This has fundamentally altered the previous bipolar structure of elite minority and low-wage majority. This is especially noticeable among migrants from emerging countries that have undergone rapid economic development since the Second World War. For example, Li (1998) reported that in the newly formed Chinese enclaves of suburban California, wealthy individuals and white-collar workers (for instance, those working in the financial sector) settle directly in such areas, where most residents are WASPs, rather than in traditional Chinatowns.

These "new immigrants" (Yamashita 2008) or "new-comers" (Lim and Lee 2011) reflect the flow of globalization. Although not members of a top elite as defined by Sassen (1991), they can be distinguished from earlier migrants in that, unlike low wage workers, they tend to establish a global network.

This transnationalism is characterized by multilayered interrelations between individuals, between individuals and institutions, or by institutional systems extending across nation-state boundaries (Vertovec 1999). This adds a new dimension to international migration, involving the multi-directional movement of people between country of origin, host country, and sometimes other countries (Hannerz 1996, Thapan 2005). Beyond physical travel, migrants maintain their own culture and human networks at a global scale rather than merely assimilating to the host society. In this way, globalization has facilitated a new form of migration, changing migrants' behavior in terms of relationships, cultural activities, and mobility. In this new environment, migrants' ethnic spaces become a space of flow (Castells 1989), contributing to change in global cities and urban space, especially in former ethnic enclaves.

To comprehend the qualitative change in patterns of international migration at the global scale, including the emergence of new migrants and the implications for urban space, it is useful to examine migrant enclaves and residential choices. In particular, the differing behaviors of new migrants and traditional immigrants are reflected in spatial aspects of migration and settlement, especially where new migrants are not seeking low-wage work.

However, most existing studies have focused on ethnic enclaves, based on the assumption that migrants pass through these enclaves as low-wage workers before moving on to areas where members of the host society live (see for example Min and Joo 2010, Min 2012). This methodological nationalism can only explain changes in ethnic space as a simple increase or decrease of homogenous space as determined by the number of migrants sharing similar characteristics.

Among migrants of the same nationality, new migrants may exhibit different behaviors if their cultural background or characteristics differ. The traditional perspective described above is therefore liable to overlook the possibility that new migrants may live outside ethnic enclaves. In relation to ethnic business, too, a narrow focus on enclaves fails to capture the whole picture, as migrants' occupations become more diverse and professionalized. In these circumstances, it is necessary to investigate migrant settlement patterns across a broader range, taking account of the entire metropolitan area.

The present research sought to understand the influence of transnational migration on urban space in the global city based on a mixed methods investigation of migrants' experiences of migration in light of changes in immigration policy and the economic development of emerging countries.

Methodology

To understand the relationship between transnational migrants and ethnic space in a global city, the present study explores the case of Korean migrant groups in the New York metropolitan area. As well as being the center of the US economy, New York is also a global city, hosting multinational corporations and major finance and service sectors. According to the US census of 2010, the population of New York City is approximately 8.5 million while the entire metropolitan area has a population of 20 million, of whom 36% are foreign-born migrants. More generally, the country's inhabitants are immigrant or of immigrant descent. For that reason, while other developed countries restrict immigration mainly to those from neighboring countries or former colonies, the US has a more open immigration policy. Until the early 1900s, most US immigrants were European because the quota reflected the existing immigrant population by country of origin. However, the revised Immigration Act of 1965 established a new quota system based on a maximum number of immigrants by country of origin, leading to a rapid increase in Asian and Hispanic migrants.

At first glance, the migration patterns of East Asian migrants to the United States seem to reflect economic growth in their own country (with a slight time lag). However, these patterns differ in their detail; for example, from the late nineteenth century, a continuous flow of migrant workers from China and Japan formed typical ethnic enclaves (Kwong 1990), making it difficult to extract and discuss only post-war Chinese and Japanese
In addition, in the case of Japanese enclaves, other factors must be taken into account, such as the forcible use of wartime enclaves or the reduced need for international migration following Japan’s post-war economic growth. In the case of Chinese migration, although domestic restrictions have gradually eased since the 1980s, some remain in place. This again makes it difficult to assess how globalization has affected migration trends if one only investigates those who have already migrated overseas in restrictive circumstances.

In this context, it is useful when discussing new Asian migrants to focus on those from Korea, who were not directly influenced by the war or other historic events. Korean migration to cities in developed countries largely began after the Second World War, with the exception of labor migration, expropriation, and compulsory draft to Japan and Manchuria during the colonial era. For this reason, Korean ethnic enclaves can be more easily categorized as the result of post-war migration. For several decades after the war, Korean immigrants accounted for a significant proportion of its population. The variation in types of migrant reflects the country’s economic growth. Until the 1970s, Korea was a developing country and sent nurses, miners and other workers as immigrants to developed countries. However, the country’s economy has grown rapidly since the 1980s. With the Seoul Olympics in 1988, liberalization of overseas travel in 1989, and entry into the neoliberal economic system in the 1990s, Korea began to send highly educated professionals as middle- and long-term migrants. Tracking the chronological shift in migration patterns makes it possible to understand this diversification as a consequence of political and economic change. The arrival of new migrants marks a new phase of economic growth culminating in Korea’s emergence as a developed country.

After the Second World War, most Korean migrants moved to the United States. At that time, Koreans settled and congregated mainly in metropolitan areas, and the New York metropolitan area has the largest Korean population on the east coast. According to the US census of 2010, New York City’s Korean population is 102,280 while the Korean population of the entire metropolitan area (CMSA: Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area) including New Jersey is about 220,000. In reality, the figure is likely to be even larger, as the census does not capture students, expatriates, and illegal residents.

In New York City, Flushing, Queens has had a Koreatown since the 1970s; others with diverse characteristics have since formed in Midtown, Manhattan and Palisades Park in Bergen County, New Jersey. The formation of new Koreatowns largely coincides with the period when globalization activated international migration. For that reason, in terms of location, inhabitants, and functions, these Koreatowns differ from the traditional ethnic enclave where newly arriving migrants stay temporarily before assimilating to the host society. Looking at Korean migrants in and around New York City and three Koreatowns that they habitually visit, this research clarifies the differences between Korean migrant groups based on their time of arrival and how these differing characteristics influence both the formation of ethnic space and urban space across this global city.

To begin, the study reviews major changes in US immigration policy and Korean migration throughout the United States, and assesses the validity of classifying migrants by time of arrival. There follows an overview of Koreatowns in the study area (the New York metropolitan area). Based on the interview data, respondents were divided into two groups according to time of arrival, and their characteristics were documented. The next section describes Korean migrants’ visits to enclaves in the New York metropolitan area and how they make residence decisions. Finally, the process of transnational migration is discussed in terms of the combined effects of globalization and economic growth in emerging countries.

The field work for this research was conducted from May to August 2012 and from June to August 2013. The main research methods were participant observation and in-depth interviews. Participant observations were carried out in three Korean churches in different areas by attending services and other activities. During this process, several church members agreed to be interviewed, and snowball sampling (Lee 2001) was used to recruit further interviewees.

Detailed interviews were conducted with 42 people, using Stone et al’s (2005) questions for reference. Through family stories, the interviews sought to clarify transnational characteristics of migrants’ daily life and culture. Adapted for Korean migrants, this qualitative approach proved effective in revealing underlying transnational aspects of migrants’ lives. The interviews provided information about motives for migration, experiences of visiting Koreatown, human networks, connections with Korea, and questions of identity. These data were analyzed to clarify migrants’ characteristics, routes and patterns of migration, and their utilization of Koreatowns.
Korean Migration to the United States and Formation of Koreatowns

Changes in Korean migration as a result of immigration policy

This section explores the basis for Korean migration by analyzing US immigrant policy in the twentieth century and its influence on Korean migration. The study also takes account of how the economic development of Korea influenced the variation in migration by non-skilled and skilled workers as income and education levels rose in the 1970s (Table 1).

Since the late nineteenth century, the United States has accepted foreign labor to support industrial development. Until World War II, however, there were few Korean immigrants because the immigration laws at that time prioritized Europeans. The first unskilled Korean migrants were 7,226 workers for Hawaii’s sugar cane farms who arrived between 1903 and 1905. In addition, about 11,000 people (including war orphans and women who married US soldiers) migrated to the United States during and after the Korean War (Kim 1999).

Following the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and the reformed Immigration Act of 1965, the US government began to adopt a more open stance on immigration, as rising labor force demand and human rights issues prompted abolition of the quota system. The reformed Immigration Act admitted highly skilled migrants without bias; this included 170,000 people from the eastern hemisphere and 120,000 from the western hemisphere, with a maximum per country of 20,000 (Lee 1989). Acceptance was also based on a priority system, which regularized family invitation based on relative and marital relationships for Korean migrants. As a typical developing country, Korea sent the medical professionals sought by the US government as well as almost 20,000 general migrants each year based on the family invitation system. In this way, migration to the United States became a major social phenomenon in Korea.

However, US demand for foreign labor decreased from the 1970s as a result of the recession caused by the oil crisis and defeat in the Vietnam War, and the 1976 revisions to the Immigrant Act restricted entry for immigrants with specialized skills. The number of professional migrant workers dropped sharply, and the annual quota of 20,000 people was filled mainly by family invitation migrants. As the family invitation visa was issued on the basis of family relationship with a US citizen, migrants did not have to be highly skilled. This led to an increase in the number of blue-collar workers seeking permanent residence in a developed country with a stable economy. However, because their lack of preparation and socioeconomic capital meant that they faced a higher entry threshold than highly skilled professionals, these

| Year | The law | Contents | Influence to Korean migrants |
|------|---------|----------|-------------------------------|
| 1921 | Immigration Quota Act | Adoption of new migrants based on the proportion of existing migrants by nationality | Severance of labor migration |
| 1924 | National Origins Act | Fixation of the ratio of quota by country of birth to 2%, limiting the total number of immigrants to 150,000 per year | |
| 1952 | Immigration and Nationality Act | Ease of immigration regulation/Abolishment of refusal of entry against Chinese | Increase of marriage migration of war orphan and wife of U.S. soldier |
| 1965 | Reformation of Immigration Act | Abolition of quota system by country of birth/Adoption of 170,000 people from eastern hemisphere and 120,000 from western hemisphere per year/Regularization of priority system | Increase of medical-related workers and migrants with family invitation |
| 1975 | Reformation of Immigration Act | Restriction of migration of medical-related workers | Decrease of medical-related workers |
| 1986 | The Immigration Reform and Control Act | Legalization of the status of undocumented migrants who entered by 1st January, 1982/Imposing strict punishment towards undocumented migrants | None |
| 1990 | Reformation of Immigration Act | Establishment of diversity immigrant visa/Ease of regulations related investment immigration/Encouragement of labor migration and prevention of undocumented migration/Raise of criteria of education and skill level toward migrants who just visit or aim to get permanent residency | Increase of highly educated and high income migrants |
| 2000 | American Competitiveness in the 21st Century Act | Attraction of migration of skilled workers | |

Sources: Kim (2009) and Lee (2009).
migrants began to congregate in ethnic groups in order to acquire information and to maintain emotional stability (Kim 1999).

The Immigration Act of 1965 was criticized for increasing the numbers of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers, and the Kennedy–Simpson Act of 1986 sought to address this problem. The Immigration Act was again reformed in 1990 to facilitate increased migration of highly skilled personnel. These laws were part of a strategy to attract highly educated and skilled individuals. At the same time, Korea was experiencing rapid economic growth, decreasing permanent emigration to developed countries but increasing skilled labor who could migrate to the United States according to the new immigration policy. In 1960, Korea’s real GDP was 1.09 million won; this increased by between 100,000 and 200,000 won each year, reaching 2.1 million won in 1970 and 4.28 million won in 1980. This trend has accelerated since 1980, with GDP reaching 6.25 million won in 1985, 9.79 million won in 1990, and 13.9 million won in 1995.

In addition to this economic development, the education level of the general population improved dramatically, enabling highly educated workers to move abroad. Rather than depending on family invitation, Koreans were now able to obtain visas based on their occupation and income. At the same time, the liberalization of overseas travel in 1989 enacted by Korean government enabled Koreans to travel internationally without restriction, again reducing the need for family invitation. Rather than becoming immigrants, Koreans gradually began to stay on a mid- or long-term visa. As a result, the number of immigrants seeking permanent residency declined each year, but even after 1990, the Korean population in the United States continued to increase, especially in major cities where skilled labor gathers. According to Korea’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the annual number of Korean immigrants to the United States reached 30,548 in 1986 and remained at around 25,000 until 1988. The figure dropped to 21,336 in 1989, to 19,922 in 1990, and to 12,574 in 1991; since 1993, it has fallen to less than 10,000 a year. In contrast, the population in Korea’s major cities has increased continuously since the 1990s, with increasing mid- and long-term stays rather than immigrants.

**Classification of immigrants by time of arrival**

Most studies of immigration to the United States (for example, Yoon 2000) have classified migrants by generation, which helps to clarify assimilation to the host society by comparing first and second generations in terms of occupation, language ability, residential selection and educational background. However, where various first-generation groups exhibit different characteristics and behaviors, a generation-based classification may fail to capture differences among these groups. To accurately assess such variations, the present study classified migrants by arrival time. Lim and Lee (2011) categorized Korean migrants to Japan as old-timers (who migrated to Japan before or during the Second World War) and newcomers (who had moved to Japan since the 1980s). They found that old-timers were typically characterized by one-directional migration, acquiring the status of permanent resident, naturalized citizen, or illegal immigrant. In most cases, their jobs in the host society related strongly to ethnic business. On the other hand, newcomers were characterized by frequent and multi-directional migration, with mid- or long-term visas, and they were more likely to be professionals.

Adopting this approach to Koreans in the United States, the distinctive forms of migration can be seen to relate to immigration policy, globalization, and the situation in the country of origin. In particular, changes in Korean migrant groups have been influenced by US immigration policy’s focus since the 1990s on attracting highly educated workers, as well as by Korea’s economic growth. The present study distinguishes between Korean old-timers, who migrated to the United States up to 1988, and newcomers, who moved after 1989—the year in which overseas travel was liberalized. Old-timers include those who migrated on a family invitation visa and run an ethnic business. Newcomers migrated on a mid- or long-term visa to a professional job requiring a high level of education. The study compares the behaviors of migrants in these two categories.

**Location characteristics of Koreatowns in the New York metropolitan area**

In New York City, the Korean population is concentrated in the borough of Queens; in the metropolitan area, the highest concentration is in Bergen County, New Jersey. According to the US census of 2010, the proportion of Koreans in the total population is quite high; in the Flushing area of Queens, Koreans number 27,881—about 11.3% of the total population (247,354). In the Palisades Park area, the number of Koreans is 10,115, which is about 51.5% of the total population (19,622). Koreatowns comprising residential and commercial areas have formed in both of these areas. Although not officially designated as Koreatowns, local government has provided Korean books in local libraries, and Korean has been designated as a second language class in local
elementary and junior high schools.

In Midtown Manhattan, there is another Korean ethnic commercial area called K-town. Although the relationship is less statistically clear because CBDs have smaller residential populations, the three areas share three characteristics. 1) The ratio of Korean inhabitants is relatively high compared to other areas. 2) There is a concentration of ethnic businesses, organizations, and religious facilities. 3) These agglomerations are recognized as Koreatowns by the media and by locals. It is hard to identify Korean communities on the basis of residential locations alone, but by plotting the distribution of ethnic businesses on a map, this becomes clearer (Figure 1). For present purposes, these three areas will be treated as ethnic enclaves, and their location characteristics will be explored.

Flushing Koreatown Flushing Koreatown is the largest Korean ethnic enclave and has the longest history of Korean settlement on the east coast of the United States. Although it remains unclear why this area was selected as a Korean enclave, there are several possibilities. Among these, one explanation is that Koreans working at a bread factory formed a residential area near the workplace; another is that the people responsible for Korea’s pavilion at the New York World’s Fair (which was held in Flushing in 1964) subsequently remained in the neighborhood (The Korean American Association of Greater New York 2010). The Korean commercial area lies to the east of Flushing Main Street Station on Subway Line 7 (Figure 2). At first, the whole area around the station was developed for Korean ethnic business. However, the area later attracted people from Hong Kong and Taiwan, who felt politically insecure after the Chinese regained possession of Hong Kong and looked to buy real estate in the United States. House prices in Flushing rose sharply at this time, and the original Korean stores moved east of the station, where rents were cheaper. The oldest remaining cluster of Korean tenants is now the Union Shopping Center building, which defines the new border of Koreatown.

The general living standards of Korean immigrants have improved since the 1990s. Many now own private cars, and a new Korean commercial area now extends...
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nearly 90 blocks along Northern Boulevard (Joo 2011). As well as a shopping street (Joo 2011), another commercial area emerged in the 2000s in the vicinity of Murray Hill Station on the LIRR (Long Island Rail Road) Line, which links Long Island to Manhattan. In this area, there are now Korean restaurants and bars targeting commuters, and the Korean American Association of Greater New York has moved to a nearby building. Nearby, there are detached houses and townhouses, and the Korean population extends beyond Flushing to Bayside and Clear Water.

Most ethnic businesses are located near the station and along Northern Boulevard, but the number of stores decreases rapidly further from the station. In terms of businesses (see Table 2), the relative prevalence of medical clinics seems to reflect local demand based on the increasing number of senior citizens in the area. The proportion of “Other” businesses is also high, as almost every kind of store can be found in Flushing. Sectors classified as “Other” include churches, construction, insurance, transportation, accounting, social organizations, travel agencies, and businesses such as general stores and funeral halls.

Manhattan K-town Manhattan K-town is a commercial area created by Korean business owners running stores in Broadway, Midtown. According to respondent A5, 1980s wholesalers who sold wigs or accessories on Broadway discussed the development of a Koreatown in the CBD. Four blocks around 32nd Street were initially considered, but the plan was downsized for two reasons: landlords did not want to sell their estate to unreliable foreigners, and the Korean government declined to support the project. Finally, the development started from a building on 32nd Street between 5th Avenue and Broadway, where a contract of sale was first concluded. A supermarket opened at the newly purchased building, and as footfall increased, ethnic businesses began to accumulate.

In addition, as the area around Herald Square had been designated and developed as a Business Improvement District, security was better and local footfall also increased. The New York Association of Korean-American Businessmen submitted a proposal to the city council to officially designate 4 or 5 blocks as Koreatown.

Table 2. Number and percentage of Korean ethnic businesses in Koreatowns

| Ethnic business     | Flushing and surrounding Areas | Lower Manhattan | Northern areas in Bergen County |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
|                     | Number | Percentage (%) | Number | Percentage (%) | Number | Percentage (%) |
| Restaurant          | 117    | 4.5            | 44     | 7.3            | 79     | 6.0            |
| Medical clinic      | 348    | 13.4           | 58     | 9.6            | 141    | 10.7           |
| Real estate agent   | 148    | 5.7            | 48     | 8.0            | 83     | 6.3            |
| Beauty salon        | 59     | 2.3            | 11     | 1.8            | 47     | 3.6            |
| Private educational institute | 139 | 5.3 | 22 | 3.7 | 63 | 4.8 |
| Supermarket         | 53     | 2.0            | 8      | 1.3            | 47     | 3.6            |
| Law office          | 110    | 4.2            | 66     | 11.0           | 75     | 5.7            |
| Other major services| 507    | 19.4           | 145    | 24.2           | 274    | 20.7           |
| Other               | 1,131  | 43.3           | 197    | 32.9           | 514    | 38.9           |
| Total               | 2,612  | 100            | 599    | 100            | 1,323  | 100            |

Source: Korea Times online business directory

Figure 3. Distribution of Korean ethnic facilities in the Lower Manhattan, New York.

Source: Korea Times online business directory.
The proposal was approved in a somewhat downsized ordinance that designated 32nd Street between 5th Avenue and Broadway as Korea Way. This was subsequently nicknamed K-town and is known as such by local people (Figure 3).

The current Korea Way includes some of the original Korean restaurants and supermarkets, as well as branch offices of Korean companies and many Korean franchise stores. In the old skyscrapers on Korea Way, there are restaurants, bookstores, banks, supermarkets on the first floor, as well as taverns and karaoke bars on the second and third floors. On the upper floors, there are private educational institutes (e.g., TOEFL, art portfolio, nail art, hairdressing, English lounge), agencies for studying abroad, international delivery service offices, and real estate agents trading in high-end houses, as well as law offices, accountants’ offices, medical clinics, and newspaper branch offices. In other words, higher service sector businesses are concentrated alongside entirely ethnic businesses. Along other parts of Korea Way, there are newly opened Korean fusion bistros and upscale Korean restaurants influenced by the “globalization of Korean food” as enacted by the Korean government. In terms of business, the proportion of offices of high-paying professions such as real estate agents and law office is high. There also seems a number of restaurants, although there are few Korean residents. The proportion of medical clinics, beauty salons, private educational institutes, and “other” businesses is also low compared to that of Flushing.

There is little visible sign of Korean residential areas around Korea Way. This is partly because most of the area is designated for office use, with only a few residential buildings. A small number of Korean migrants live in high-grade condominiums or run unauthorized guesthouses for Koreans, but there is little visible sign of these.

Palisades Park Koreatown In Palisades Park, a residential area in Bergen County, New Jersey, there has been a suburban-type Koreatown since the 1990s. Koreans congregate in Palisades Park, Ridgefield, Leonia, and Fort Lee, and Palisades Park especially attracts a Korean community of about 10,000. In 1980, there were only 102 Koreans in the area, but by 2010, this population had increased to 10,115. Two factors seem to have contributed to this effect: renowned schools in a better school district and the convenience of commuting to schools and offices in the city center. Most of the residences are single-family houses or duplexes, usually occupied by upper middle class families.

The main shopping street is Broad Avenue, which links Ridgefield and Palisades Park (Figure 4). The commercial area was originally run by European migrants, but since Koreans took over their stores in the 1990s, Korean ethnic business has increased. In recent years, Grand Avenue (a warehouse district behind Broad Avenue) has also been remodeled as a commercial area. The ethnic businesses in Palisades Park are diverse, but general goods and services are of a higher grade than those in Flushing, and prices are also slightly higher (Table 2).

Changes in Korean Migrants’ Characteristics and Migration Experiences Based on Time of Arrival

This section describes and classifies interview respondents to show how migration patterns have changed over time. In 1989, Korean migration to the US changed dramatically with the liberalization of overseas travel. For present purposes, respondents are divided into two groups, old-timers (who arrived up to 1988) and newcomers (who migrated after 1989).

Table 3 refers to old-timers who have been in the United States for approximately 30 years. All are now in their fifties or older, with the exception of respondent A1, who is a second-generation immigrant. Most of them moved to the United States by family invitation, but a few (respondents A5, A6, A7) came to the United States as graduate students and later settled down after securing a job or starting their own business. Most have remained in the New York metropolitan area since their arrival (with the exception of respondents A3 and A13, who...
relocated from other areas of the United States), and their history in the United States more or less coincides with their history in the New York metropolitan area. Having lived in the area for about 30 years while undertaking economic activities such as self-employed business, the US government has comprehensively evaluated their dwelling history, English ability, common sense as a US citizen, and history of tax payments as the basis for citi-

| Table 3. Basic characteristics of old-timer respondents |
|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Respondent | Gender | Age | Time of Arrival | Dwelling history in NY | Citizenship          |
|------------|--------|-----|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| A1         | Male   | 30s | (Born in the U.S.) | Over 20 years           | U.S. citizenship     |
| A2         | Female | 50s | Unknown         | Over 20 years           | U.S. Permanent residency |
| A3         | Female | 50s | 1983            | 27 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A4         | Female | 60s | Unknown         | Over 20 years           | U.S. citizenship     |
| A5         | Male   | 60s | 1982            | 31 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A6         | Male   | 60s | 1983            | Over 20 years           | U.S. citizenship     |
| A7         | Male   | 60s | 1983            | 27 years                | U.S. Permanent residency |
| A8         | Female | 60s | Unknown         | Approx. 40 years        | U.S. citizenship     |
| A9         | Female | 60s | 1985            | 28 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A10        | Female | 60s | 1983            | 30 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A11        | Male   | 60s | 1980            | 33 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A12        | Male   | 70s | 1985            | 28 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A13        | Male   | 70s | 1976            | 8 years                 | U.S. citizenship     |
| A14        | Male   | 70s | Unknown         | Over 20 years           | U.S. citizenship     |
| A15        | Female | 70s | 1983            | 30 years                | U.S. citizenship     |
| A16        | Male   | 70s | Unknown         | Over 18 years           | U.S. citizenship     |

Source: Based on the interview results.

| Table 4. Basic characteristics of newcomer respondents |
|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Respondent | Gender | Age | Time of arrival | Dwelling history in NY | Citizenship          |
|------------|--------|-----|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| B1         | Female | 20s | 2007            | 6 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B2         | Female | 20s | 2012            | 1 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B3         | Female | 20s | 2012            | 1 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B4         | Male   | 20s | 2012            | 1 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B5         | Male   | 20s | 1990s           | 12 years               | U.S. citizenship     |
| B6         | Male   | 20s | 2011            | 1 year and 10 months   | Korean nationality   |
| B7         | Male   | 30s | 2010            | 3 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B8         | Male   | 30s | 2009            | 4 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B9         | Female | 30s | 2008            | 5 years                | Korean nationality+U.S. citizenship |
| B10        | Male   | 30s | 2012            | 1 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B11        | Male   | 30s | 2008            | 5 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B12        | Female | 30s | Unknown         | Less than 10 years     | Korean nationality   |
| B13        | Male   | 30s | 2010            | 3 years                | Korean nationality   |
| B14        | Female | 50s | 1993 (assumed)  | Approx. 20 years        | Korean nationality   |
| B15        | Male   | 60s | 1989            | 24 years               | U.S. citizenship     |
| B16        | Female | 60s | 1989            | 24 years               | U.S. citizenship     |
| B17        | Male   | 70s | 1992            | 21 years               | U.S. citizenship     |
| B18        | Male   | 70s | Unknown         | Approx. 20 years        | U.S. citizenship     |

Source: Based on the interview results.
izenship or permanent residence. Because they migrated when international transportation was less prevalent, only a few respondents frequently visited Korea. Most of the old-timers have visited Korea only two or three times after migration, typically for the funeral of a family member or relative.

Newcomers, who migrated after 1989, range in age from 20s to 70s (Table 4). They arrived in the United States during two periods: from 1989 to the 1990s, or since 2000. This is because the East Asian financial crisis of the 1990s temporarily reduced the flow of migrants. Almost all of the respondents have lived in the New York metropolitan area since migrating to improve their career prospects through employment or studying abroad. The exceptions were respondent B5, who migrated because all of his family members moved to the United States when he was ten years old, and respondent B17, who migrated to enjoy life after retirement. This indicates that the reasons for migration have become more diverse. In addition, the fact that about a quarter of newcomers have experience of living in other regions of the United States or in another country such as Japan, the United Kingdom, or France, indicates that newcomers are likely to migrate more than once. Even after settling down in the New York metropolitan area, most of the newcomers said that they traveled to Korea at least once or twice a year. This more frequent contact means they have closer links to Korea than the old-timers.

Newcomers are also more diverse than old-timers in terms of their nationality and visa status. Because they can find stable work that provides a work visa, they do not need to secure citizenship or permanent residence in order to stay in the United States. However, this repeated migration also makes it hard for them to obtain a visa for a given country.

Tables 5 and 6 show the composition of occupations among the two migrant groups, indicating the concentration of old-timers in ethnic business and the diverse occupations of newcomers. Old-timers’ occupations include dry cleaners, nail salons, clothes stores, and general stores dealing in wigs or accessories. The reason for this job concentration is that migrants who settled down first provided professional assistance to new migrants. Among the 12 old-timers with a job, 7 worked in Koreatown while 3 worked elsewhere but sometimes served Korean customers. Respondent A3 stated that his current business (a business-to-business cleaning shop) was not Korean-related but this cleaning shop could also avail of ethnic assistance from Korean acquaintances as one of the major occupations to pass down to newly arriving old-timers. Only respondent A7 secured a position at an American company after architecture graduate

| Respondent | Occupation | Detail | Ethnic factor |
|------------|------------|--------|---------------|
| A1         | Restaurant business | Owner of Pastry | ○ |
| A2         | Other self-employed business | Employee of nail salon | △ |
| A3         | Other self-employed business | Owner of dry cleaners | × |
| A4         | Other self-employed business | Owner of clothing store | ○ |
| A5         | Ethnic organization | Student → Office worker (trading company) → executive of ethnic organization | × → ○ |
| A6         | Ethnic organization | Student → self-employed business → executive of ethnic organization | ○ → ○ |
| A7         | White-collar worker | Student → Office worker (construction) | × |
| A8         | Other self-employed business | Employee of nail salon | ○ |
| A9         | Other self-employed business | Hairdresser | △ |
| A10        | Housewife | Housewife | — |
| A11        | Other self-employed business | Owner of dry cleaners | △ |
| A12        | Retired | Retired (self-employed business: clothing store, delicatessen, construction) | — |
| A13        | Ethnic organization | Employee of Korean welfare organization | ○ |
| A14        | Other self-employed business | Korean traditional music lecturer | ○ |
| A15        | Retired | Retired (Self-employed business: general store) | — |
| A16        | Retired | Retired (self-employed business) | — |

*○: Ethnic business located in ethnic enclave; ○: General business located in ethnic enclave that local people visit frequently as well; △: Ethnic business located outside ethnic enclave; ×: Non-ethnic business. Occupation includes student.
Source: Based on the interview results.
school and had no ethnic job connections. He can be considered a transitional case in that he shared the same career path as the newcomers.

The newcomers were highly educated and had diverse occupations, and relatively few of them worked in ethnic businesses. Of the 18 newcomers, only 6 were involved in Korean-related work in Koreatown, and still fewer worked full-time in an ethnic business. Even then, the specific characteristics of the work distinguished them from the old-timers, with more jobs in cultural centers and courier services dispatching American goods to Korea as personal imports. Newcomers’ occupations were generally unrelated to ethnic business, including graduate students, overseas interns, employees of American companies, pâtissiers, and priests. These are professional jobs that require a bachelor or vocational school degree. In the case of company employees, many worked in art-related companies or at the headquarters of multinational corporations. For example, respondents B2 and B9 moved to New York City to work in the theater industry (specializing in Broadway musicals and the film industry, respectively). Respondent B7 came to New York City because the city is a leader in confectionery culture. In short, newcomers migrated to the New York metropolitan area to get a competitive career in a professional workplace because it is a global city, offering everything from a thriving financial sector to art and service industries.

The above characteristics of old-timers and newcomers can be summarized as follows. Old-timers migrated up to the late 1980s to secure permanent residence in a developed country. Most arrived by family invitation and ran small, self-employed ethnic businesses. Their chosen occupation relied heavily on their Korean origins, and they have strong links with other Koreans in the New York metropolitan area but almost none with Korea. In contrast, newcomers migrated after 1989. They tended to stay for the mid- or long-term for the sake of their careers rather than as immigrants seeking citizenship. They are engaged in jobs that require an advanced degree and professional skills, and they have had other experience of international migration before coming to the United States. They visit Korea frequently while living in New York, and in contrast to the old-timers, they have very strong links with Korea.

### Table 6. Occupations of newcomer respondents

| Respondent | Occupation               | Detail                                                                 | Ethnic factor |
|------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| B1         | Student                  | Graduate Student                                                       | X             |
| B2         | White-collar worker      | International intern                                                   | ×             |
| B3         | White-collar worker      | International intern                                                   | X             |
| B4         | White-collar worker      | International intern                                                   | X             |
| B5         | White-collar worker      | Office worker                                                          | ×             |
| B6         | Restaurant business      | Employee of Korean restaurant                                          | O             |
| B7         | Restaurant business      | Pâtissier                                                              | ×             |
| B8         | White-collar worker      | Office worker (advertising agency), owner of culture center and Korean  | X, O, O       |
|            |                          | language school (a side business)                                      |               |
| B9         | White-collar worker      | Office worker (Film distribution company)                              | X             |
| B10        | Student                  | Graduate Student                                                       | X             |
| B11        | Restaurant business      | Employee of Korean restaurant                                          | △             |
| B12        | Other self-employed      | Owner of international delivery company                                | O             |
| B13        | Student                  | Graduate Student                                                       | X             |
| B14        | Other self-employed      | Owner of studying abroad agency                                        | O             |
| B15        | Religious organization   | Pastor                                                                  | △             |
| B16        | Religious organization   | Assistant of pastor                                                    | Δ             |
| B17        | Ethnic organization      | Employee of Korean welfare organization                                | O             |
| B18        | Ethnic organization      | Employee of Korean welfare organization                                | O             |

*O: Ethnic business located in ethnic enclave; O: General business located in ethnic enclave that local people visit frequently as well; △: Ethnic business located outside ethnic enclave; ×: Non-ethnic business. Occupation includes student.

Source: Based on the interview results.
Korean Migrants’ Residential Choices and Visits to Koreatown

Based on in-depth interviews, this section discusses how the differing characteristics of old-timers and newcomers influenced their residential choices and how they used Koreatown. This section also explores how the appearance of newcomers has affected Koreatown and other enclaves in the metropolitan area.

Residential choices of old-timers and newcomers

The distribution of old-timers’ and newcomers’ residences clearly differs. The first residences of old-timers were in either the Flushing area or in New Jersey (Figure 5). Of the 16 old-timers, 4 resided in Flushing; 2 were assumed to live in Flushing, and 6 had experience of residing in and around Palisades Park. Three continued to live in Flushing while one had moved to another area of New York City; the rest had relocated to Palisades Park and the neighboring area. In general, it seems that migrants who have accumulated sufficient capital in an ethnic enclave will relocate to a suburb inhabited by middle-class citizens of the host society; for Koreans, the most popular option for relocation was Palisades Park (Yoon 2007). Relocation from Flushing increased because Bergen County is famous for its high-quality public schools, and Koreans favor Palisades Park because rents are comparatively low and the area is convenient for public transportation.

Respondents who had lived in New Jersey from the beginning followed their family or relatives there, lived in Flushing, and moved to New Jersey. This is similar to chain migration among old-timers based on family invitation (although they did not pass through Flushing). In the move, only the first destination has changed from ethnic enclave to suburb. Old-timers had relocated several times but only within New Jersey, which is close to the CBD, rather than moving to suburban areas further out. These decisions were influenced by the prospect of a better lifestyle and school district.

Newcomers (Figure 6) tended to search for a place outside the enclave from the beginning of their life in New York. As the only newcomer who first lived in Flushing, respondent B11 said that he actually stayed for about two weeks in a guesthouse run by a Korean while he looked for a place to live. No one had lived in Flushing for a long time, and no one currently lived in Koreatown. Their residential choices focused on Manhattan or certain areas of Queens and New Jersey where they could commute easily to Manhattan by subway or bus.

Unmarried people’s residences were dispersed and did not indicate any congregation tendency. However, this reflected the influence of young Americans’ housing preferences rather than assimilation to the host society. In New York City, the young generation cannot afford the high rents, and there is a shortage of small houses where young and unmarried persons can live alone. For that reason, most singles rent a large condominium or single-family house and share it with a couple of roommates. For that reason, newcomers look for a place with good prox-
imity to a school or workplace and rooms for sharing.

In addition, there are many flat sharing websites, and almost all of the newcomers used such sites. Although they referred to American websites such as ‘Craigslist,’ most finally found a roommate on a website for Koreans in the United States. The reason for seeking Korean roommates is that sharing the same culture, lifestyle, and manners seemed important for peaceful flat sharing. In contrast, married respondents such as B17 and B18 differed from single people, noting that houses where the whole family can live together are found mainly in suburban areas.

**Newcomers’ experience of visiting Koreatown**

Although newcomers’ residences were dispersed in various areas of the city, this does not mean that they assimilated completely to American society or abandoned their Korean identity. Newcomers used Koreatown in ways that differed from old-timers. All of the newcomers said that they visited Koreatown to eat Korean food, to meet Korean people, or to buy Korean food items in Korean supermarkets. Some visits also involved services such as private education institutes and medical clinics specializing in rehabilitation. Nevertheless, only a few said that their work and basic living requirements centered on Koreatown.

Newcomers—even those who lived near Flushing Koreatown—said that they mainly used K-town because it is nearer to visit after school or work, with more transport links from K-town to their home. This indicates that K-town is closest to offices and schools in the city center, and that newcomers can afford to visit K-town when they please without concerns about travel costs. In contrast, respondent A8, the old-timer living in Flushing, said “I can get almost everything I need in Flushing, so I don’t need to go to Manhattan or pay the subway fee, do I?” (Table 7).

The respondents’ statements indicate that psychological factors also affect their use of Koreatown. Old-timers not only spend a lot of time there but also have a strong attachment to Koreatown (respondent A8). Of the 16 old-timers, 13 seemed to spend a lot of time in Koreatown, whether for work or in everyday life, and 3 emphasized their strong affinity. They were also enthusiastic about forming new relationships, and stressed the importance of Koreatown in this regard. Eleven old-timers stated directly or indirectly that Koreatown was indispensable for Koreans (e.g., respondent A16); only a few such as A7, who entered the host society directly after studying at an American university and resembled the newcomers.

| Category      | Respondent | Utterance                                                                 |
|---------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Old-timer     | A7         | I began my career in an American construction company, but none of the projects related much to Korea (omitted) I sometimes go to Koreatown on the weekend, which means I don't have much connection with Koreatown. I use both Korean and American supermarkets. I use a Korean drycleaner because the owner is coincidentally Korean, (but I don't have a strong preference for ethnic business). I sometimes rent a Korean movie DVD and maybe that’s all. |
|               | A8         | I can get almost everything I need in Flushing, so I don’t need to go to Manhattan or pay the subway fee, do I? I need a bus ticket if I want to go to the station (from home). Korean people can settle down if they live in this area. |
|               | A16        | In the past, if Korean people saw someone who looked Korean, they would usually ask ‘Are you Korean?’ If the person was Korean, people exchanged phone numbers and went to have a meal or a drink together (omitted). I have lived in New York for 18 years and built my life here, but I wanted to find a calm residential area when my child was born. (That is the reason I relocated to New Jersey.) |
| Newcomer      | B1         | I’ve never lived in Queens. I don’t have a good image of the area—dirtier than here, worse security. (It is said that) the entire area is not that safe, apart from some districts like Astoria. |
|               | B9         | 1980s old Korea—that’s Flushing. The landscape here (K-town) looks exactly like Korea nowadays. It looks like Kangnam (a downtown area of Seoul). I don’t like Flushing; the area is too dirty, and there are too many Chinese. |
|               | B10        | There is a group of Korean PhD students in New York that I got to know (right after receiving a letter of acceptance from the graduate school), and I met them in Korea first. There is also a senior member of movie club that I attended 10 years ago (omitted) and a junior member of movie club that I joined (when I was an undergraduate) who is holding a high school reunion meeting in New York too (omitted). We meet in K-town, so I got used to going there. We used to go to a Korean-style fried chicken pub, when Korean people meet, most of them go to this restaurant. |
|               | B13        | Flushing is a place I sometimes go, but you need a strong reason to go there (because the area is quite a long way from downtown.) When my friends and I want to eat Korean-style Sashimi, we decide in advance when to go and schedule a visit to Flushing. On the other hand, we go to K-town quite often—once or twice a week. There is a supermarket (omitted) Although I can’t say that Koreatown is another hometown, I feel familiar with the town. |

*( ) Added by the author.
*The interviews are conducted in Korean and translated to English by the author.
Source: Based on the interview results.
ers in career terms, indicated no particular regard for Koreatown, although acknowledging its convenience.

Newcomers regarded Koreatown’s links to Korea as more important than the emotional stability and reciprocal help of its inner circle. They used Koreatown as a place for maintaining and developing human networks that originated in Korea rather than for business networking or social organizations for friendship (e.g., respondent B10). Similarly, 5 newcomers stated that they already had acquaintances when they arrived in New York, such as college and high school reunions interns who arrived in the same year or study group members who prepared together for studying abroad. Even before arriving, they had various connections to help them adapt to the United States, and they could expand their social network from these groups after migration.

Newcomers’ descriptions of Koreatowns frequently included expressions like “The landscape here (K-town) looks exactly like Korea nowadays.” (respondent B9). Seven of the eighteen newcomers used similar expression to describe K-town, indicating that although they lived in a foreign city, they wanted contemporary Korean food and services. The stores that impressed them were the “Korean-style Sashimi” restaurant (respondent B13) and the “Korean-style fried-chicken pub” (respondent B10), which were popular at that time in Korea. However, in relation to Flushing Koreatown, they felt distanced, describing Flushing as “not that safe” (Respondent B1) or needing “a strong reason to go there” (respondent B13). Some described the landscape and community of Flushing as a place from the past, using terms like “old” or “1980s” (respondent B9). When interviewed, only 4 newcomers referred much to Flushing, indicating their psychological distance in phrases like the place that “needs a strong reason to go there”, which was mentioned three times. Similar sentiments included “too many Chinese”, “far from where I live”, and “not clean (dirty)” (two times each), and “not that safe” and “old” (once each).

Flushing is home to many senior Korean migrants, and its products and services target the elderly, which may cause newcomers to feel uncomfortable and uprooted. At the same time, in their attitude to old-timers, newcomers recognize that their lifestyle and generation are different, even though they share the same nationality. For newcomers, this perceived difference weakens any sense of an ethnic bond and distances them from Flushing Koreatown.

Transnational Migrants and Ethnicity Relationships

Characteristics such as lifestyle, occupation, and links to Korea clearly distinguish newcomers from old-timers and influence their residential choices and their relationship with Koreatown. This explains how Koreatown services and functions have gradually changed to meet new demands. Differences in residential distribution and experiences of visiting reflect Koreatown’s status as a place for old-timers. Coming from a developing country, old-timers had little capital or English language skills, and the culture shock made everyday life difficult. They needed help in relation to low-cost housing, adapting to American life, and securing a job. A spatial base and community helped them to cope with their loneliness for a home country to which they could not easily return. As ethnic enclaves, Koreatowns offered low-cost housing and employment, along with other ethnic services provided by communities of old-timers, and gradually became a haven for people who had little prospect of returning home.

Old-timers are similar in terms of life stage, family composition, and reasons for migration. In most cases, they traveled to the United States by family invitation; the entire family migrated together and became disconnected from their home country. Koreatown’s churches met both the religious and social needs of old-timers, and Flushing became an optimal location for them. However, this environment fails to meet the demands of newcomers. Korea’s development means that the economic gap between the two countries has decreased, and more professional workers are now entering the host society directly.

For migrants living in an era of globalization, coming to America is also less of a culture shock than before. Newcomers no longer need a period of adaptation in the ethnic enclave; instead, they look for a residence that allows them to maintain the quality of life they had in Korea. The interviews confirmed that only a few newcomers came to Flushing, and that most were not engaged in ethnic business.

The purpose of migration has also become more personal and specific, often for career development. Looking for a job in Koreatown became meaningless as professional roles such as researcher, artist, or company employee required proficiency in English and professional skills and knowledge. For that reason, newcomers search for jobs outside the enclave and have no need to live there, as it is farther from their workplace.

In addition, the jobs that recruit foreigners directly are
white-collar roles with high salaries. This allows migrants to move more freely, and highly skilled Korean workers can retain strong links with Korea, visiting their families more frequently and maintaining their human networks through smartphone and internet. Because those human networks are global, newcomers have no need to participate in the old-timers’ community; instead, they form job-related communities with the many other newcomers already working in the host society. Their lifestyle and identity distinguishes them from the old-timers living in Flushing, who have no strong links with people in Korea or with the host society. One of the newcomers’ few ethnic needs is merchandise and services from contemporary Korea. K-town and Palisades Park Koreatowns meet this demand and are recognized as qualitatively different from Flushing.

With the globalization of emerging countries and changing patterns of transnational migration, Koreatowns are also changing, with less congregation and more residential dispersion. Korea’s economic development means that migration no longer necessarily relates to the wage gap as assumed by classical migration theory (see for example Borjas 1989, Harris and Todaro 1970). Unlike the old-timers, those who migrated in the wake of this economic growth do not rely on individual contacts in Koreatown to secure jobs or residences. These changes mean that ethnic enclaves have also changed to reflect the needs of the new generation of diverse migrants—although, like the old-timers, they continue to utilize Korean commercial facilities, especially food-related services.

Conclusion

This investigation of the emergence of transnational migrants and their behavior yielded two main findings in relation to three Koreatowns in New York City and New Jersey.

First, the attributes and lifestyles of Korean migrants identify them as old-timers or newcomers on the basis of their time of arrival in the United States. Following the 1965 reformation of the Immigration Act, the first Korean immigrants were professional workers, but family invitation immigrants gradually became mainstream. The old-timers, who settled prior to the end of the 1980s, continued to live in the New York metropolitan area for decades, engaging in ethnic business and securing citizenship. From the 1990s onward, migrants became more diverse, with an increase in mid- or long-term migration of highly educated, high-income professionals such as international students and white-collar workers. These newcomers are relatively young and pursue professional occupations in a global city. Rather than trying to assimilate to the host society or secure permanent residence or citizenship, they engage in multi-directional movement while maintaining cultural links and human networks in Korea and elsewhere.

Secondly, old-timers and newcomers differ in their residential choices and in their relationship with Koreatown. Most of the interviewed old-timers had passed through Koreatown in Flushing before relocating to the suburban residential area of Palisades Park. For them, Koreatown was a place that provided help in securing jobs and affordable housing, as well as new ethnic relationships. They relied strongly on Koreatown and congregated densely there. In contrast, newcomers dispersed across more central areas of New York City and some areas in New Jersey, using city center Koreatown as a human network node and to access Korean-style goods and services.

The fieldwork results help to explain the relationship between capitalist globalization, international migration, and urban space. The post-war political and economic shift to neo-liberalism, changes in US immigration policy, and the economic growth of emerging countries combined to alter the characteristics of migrant groups. In turn, the diversification of migrant groups changed the urban space of the global city, especially within ethnic enclaves.

Examining recent migration trends in global cities, the study highlights how globalization has driven the ongoing increase in new migrants. Looking beyond earlier classifications of migrants by nationality alone, the present results confirm that economic growth in the country of origin and the changing face of capitalism have exerted a significant influence on migrant patterns and ethnic enclaves. These data are also important in predicting the trajectory of increasing international migration from emerging countries.
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Notes

1. Methodological nationalism refers to the use of the nation-state which should be regarded as a social structure as an essential concept and unit of analysis (Beck 2007). In the case of migration studies, this means that migrants of the same nationality are assumed to share a common culture, which risks overlooking other variables such as diverse sub-ethnic groups or behavioral differences among social classes within migrant groups (see for example Ooi 2006, Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002).

2. The term "Hangukin" (meaning Korean citizen) refers only to nationals of the Republic of Korea and does not include Korean ethnic groups who are citizens of other countries. Lee (2001) used the term "Hanis" (Korean ethnic groups) to describe those known as Korean or Korean-American in English, regardless of their nationality, which is a commonly used distinction in the United States. However, in this paper, although the words "Korean" and "Korean ethnic groups" basically refer the Korean ethnic groups who have their roots in South Korea, the terms do not include North Korean and Korean Chinese. Several thousands of North Korean and Korean Chinese in the United States are not captured in official statistics, as they mostly stay as undocumented migrants or refugees. A few Korean Chinese who legally entered to the United States are officially counted as Chinese citizen, which means "Korean" or "Korean–American" is confined to South Korean.

3. According to the US Department of Homeland Security (2016), anyone who holds US citizenship or permanent residence, has an income of more than 125% of the poverty standard income as determined by the federal government, and can provide a financial guarantee for the invitee can bring family members from abroad to secure permanent residence.

4. According to the United States Yearbook of Immigration Statistics, the number of Korean migrants in the non-immigrant short-term work force was 9,871 in 1996; 21,855 in 2001; and 83,080 in 2011—an eightfold increase in 15 years. Most were treaty traders and investors or intra-company transferees (E1–E3, H1B, H2, L1), with only about 100 short-term workers in agricultural and other sectors.

5. A telephone directory of ethnic business offices in the United States is published each year, usually by newspaper companies such as the Korea Times and the Korean Daily. For present purposes, the distribution of commercial facilities by district was estimated by referring to zip codes in the Korea Times online business directory http://yp.koreatimes.com/ (in Korean) (Last accessed: August 7, 2016).

6. The overview of K-town's formation is based on the interview findings.

7. According to respondent B9, commercial and residential areas must be linked within the same area to designate ethnic enclaves with national names such as "Koreatown" and "Chinatown", because the term "town" contains a meaning of residential congregation. On receiving a residents' application, local government screens the name and makes a decision on the basis of the distribution of ethnic businesses, the ethnic population, and relationships with other ethnic groups. In the case of K-town, the area had a commercial district with only a few Korean residents, which made the city council name it "Korea Way" instead of "Koreatown".

8. The state of New Jersey publishes an online journal called NJ Labor Market Views that analyzes demographic phenomena in New Jersey based on the 2010 US census. In one article, Wu (2012) reported that the Korean population of New Jersey had increased by 43.4% between 2000 and 2010; of these, more than 60% live in Bergen County.

9. A residential building with two dwelling units aligned symmetrically.

10. Of 42 respondents, 4 were not classified as Korean ethnic group, and 4 Korean respondents who did not provide basic personal information were excluded from the classification.

11. Exceptionally, respondent A14 worked illegally for about 20 years before securing legal status as a permanent resident under the Immigration Act (245 (i)).

12. The center was established for cultural exchange activities, including Korean language classes for foreigners with an interest in Korean culture. The center also introduces English speakers to Koreans seeking opportunities for English conversation.

13. In general, the term "professional workers" refers to white-collar workers. However, the term is used here to include the many jobs in New York City that relate to music, art, fashion, and gastronomy, as many specialized institutions recruit experienced professionals in these fields.

14. According to the US census, the average annual income in Palisades Park in 2008–2012 was $57,937, which is higher than the US average of $53,046 but lower than the New Jersey average of $71,637. Neighborhoods such as Leonia, Fort Lee, and Ridgefield have average annual incomes of $72,195, $70,913, and $62,191, respectively, indicating that Palisades Park is more lower middle class than those areas. The ratio of Palisades Park residents who are college graduates or higher is 66.1%, which is higher than in New Jersey (35.4%) and Ridgefield (35.4%) but lower than Leonia (61.0%) and Fort Lee (53.9%).

15. Respondents B6 and B11 work at Korean restaurants, and respondents B12, B13, B17, and B18 are also engaged in businesses that target Koreans. Their only Korean ethnic networks involved ethnic business partners. Although other newcomers visited various commercial outlets in Koreatown, none indicated that they relied on Koreatown for job hunting, housing, or networking.
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